United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2018 No. 103

# House of Representatives

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

## MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

## THE COST OF HEALTHCARE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is great to see so many youth in the audience today, and I look forward to sharing what I think is perhaps the biggest problem that is facing Americans right now, and that is the cost of healthcare. Not the cost of healthcare insurance, but truly the cost of healthcare itself.

When I look at the problems facing this country, most of us are very concerned about our national debt of over $20 trillion. In fact, 28 percent of our Federal budget goes towards healthcare right now, and until we can start driving the true cost of healthcare down, we will never be able to fix this huge Federal debt.

When I talk to small businesses across my district, their number one concern is the cost of healthcare. A sixth of their budget is going towards healthcare.

Certainly, I believe that transparency, innovation, and consumerism are the basic principles to drive down the cost of healthcare, but I want to stop today and applaud what the President and the Secretary of Labor did yesterday by opening up association plans. This is one small piece that will help drive down the cost of healthcare for folks who purchase healthcare as individuals or in small groups.

This will start to break down the State walls which prevent competition and once again allow different groups—all my farmers could join together through their associations, or other small businesses would be able to group together and have better purchasing power. This is going to give 400,000 people more health insurance and quality health insurance with true access to healthcare.

Now, on the House side, we passed H.R. 1101, and that bill basically codifies what the Secretary of Labor did yesterday. But like some 6,000 other bills, it has been sitting over in the Senate and, in this case, has been sitting in the Senate for over a year. We need leadership on both sides of the House to help drive down the cost of healthcare.

## IMMIGRATION AND CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, as we stand here, a 5-year-old woke up in a cage. She committed no crime. She came here seeking hope and refuge.

Instead, Madam Speaker, she was taken from her parents, from her bothers and sisters, from all she knows and loves. She does not know where she is; she does not know where her family is; she does not speak the language of her captives; and she may never see her family again.

This morning, Madam Speaker, that innocent little child is crying in a cage, and we stand here doing nothing as innocent little babies sit in modern-day camps.

That is not right; it is not fair; and it is not just. And, Madam Speaker, history will not be kind to us if we continue to pass this unbelievable injustice on to our children.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, there is only one word that goes through my mind when I think about what this White House is doing to children right now. It's ''shame.'' Shame on them.

For years, we saw Republicans try to attack Democrats for having the gall to give millions of Americans healthcare or to address global warming. Your leaders stood up on this floor and said shame on us.

Shame on you for letting this happen, for being willing to let kids be kept in warehouses because you can't stand up to this President.

These are children, children who deserve the love of a mother and a father, not cages and concrete floors. These are children, babies in some cases. They need someone to comfort them when they can't sleep, to cool their food when it is too hot, to give them those basics of love and kindness that these children need.

What they don't need is to be used as hostages for President Trump to get his anti-immigrant wish list and a wall. They don't need to be demonized when their families are seeking refuge.

If President Trump and the Republicans don't think these families deserve asylum or protection, if they don't think these people deserve a chance of a life of safety, they are wrong. But these are matters that we can debate.

But you mean to tell me you don't think these children deserve the love of their mother and the comfort of their father? You mean to tell me that the Bible puts law above keeping families together? Absolutely not.



Printed on recycled paper.

Shame on this White House and on everyone who stands with them. Shame on our country if we let this continue.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, this is what it has come to. We stand here in the well of the House appealing to—in a sense, begging—the President to acknowledge the undeniable truth, the undeniable truth that this is a crisis that he can end with the stroke of a pen. This is a crisis that he has created, and it is a crisis that he can eliminate.

The undeniable truth is that, if a President can see these babies crying and pleading for their parents—momma, father, papa—if the President can see this and not take action, his heart has hardened to the extent that he is unfit to be President.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, our Nation is mourning. Our Nation is crying out to save our little children, save our babies.

History will not be kind to us as a nation and as a people if we continue to go down this road. We must stop the madness, and stop it now.

There was a man by the name of A. Philip Randolph, who was the dean of Black leadership during the sixties when we were planning the March on Washington. He kept saying: ''Maybe our foremothers and our forefathers all came to this great land in different ships, but we're all in the same boat now.''

Our little children, our babies, our young people, are crying out for help. We need help from Members of Congress. We can do better.

## ARTISTS ADVOCATING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of several young people in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who are advocating for environmental protection using their artistic talents.

Recently, the Countryside Gallery in Newtown featured an exhibit, titled, ''One Planet: Wildlife Vulnerable to Climate Change.'' This exhibit gave students, under the guidance of artist Bonnie Porter, the ability to share their wildlife paintings in an effort to spread awareness of the threat of climate change. I am proud to recognize them now:

Amelia Binkley, Bella Cacciatore, Allison Cirillo, Victoria Cirillo, Taylor Dahms, Amanda Gardner, Olivia Kelly, Brady Klein, Addison Kohler, Emily LaPlante, Kate Logan, Jessica Martin, Nicole Mercora, Grace Porter, Olivia Ralston, Nolan Riesenberger, Chris Riether, Violet Schroeher, Gabi Smith, Abby Steadman, Erin Stone, Katie Sukunda, Ella Walsh, and Anna Williamson.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the activism, thoughtfulness, and impressive artistic abilities of these young citizens. I am proud to stand with them and will continue to fight with my colleagues to combat climate change and protect our environment.

### RECOGNIZING BUCKS COUNTY OUTSTANDING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of two outstanding law enforcement officials in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who are working tirelessly to make our community a safer place. Assistant District Attorney Megan Brooks and Deputy District Attorney Kristen McElroy were selected by fellow prosecutors in honor of their public service in pursuit of justice.

Megan received the Danny E. Khalouf Memorial Award for Outstanding Performance. Described as a rising star, Megan works for the Youthful Offender program and the Special Victims Unit.

Kristen received the Robert Rosner Memorial Award for Exceptional Service, Professionalism and Integrity. Known for her unparalleled work ethic, Kristen is the chief of the Special Victims Unit for adult sex crimes and directs the internship program.

I commend these fine public servants for their dedication to law, to safety, and to protecting our community.

I applaud District Attorney Matt Weintraub for leading such a fine team of attorneys that work tirelessly on behalf of all of us in Bucks County.

### POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, June is Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month, and I would like to take this time to recognize an organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that works to rehabilitate heroes who struggle with this illness.

Since 2014, Shamrock Reins in Pipersville has offered equine therapy to help veterans and first responders recover from PTSD.

Founded by Janet Brennan, a registered nurse whose father served in the Vietnam war, Shamrock Reins uses a range of equine services, including riding therapy, to help assimilate our servicemen and -women back into society following their tours of duty.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am continually in awe of the sacrifices that our soldiers and our first responders make every day. I applaud Janet for her service to our Nation's heroes, and I encourage all of our constituents to follow her lead. Together, we can defeat PTSD.

## IMMIGRATION AND CHILDREN

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. As a father, as a grandfather, as a human being who cares about children, I ask: For God's sake, America, what is happening to your soul?

There are 11,000 children who are being held in jail cells throughout the country. Families arriving at the border seeking asylum voluntarily, seeking refuge voluntarily, are being detained, and they are being held in jail. Children as young as the children here today—as young as the children here today—are being held in jail. Babies are being separated from their mothers, even while breastfeeding them. This constitutes child abuse.

Madam Speaker, show some basic compassion for these young children, their brothers and sisters and their parents. Every single Member of Congress should be able to stand behind the simple idea that families, regardless of where they are born, belong together.

I know that Jesus of Nazareth was a refugee, and he paid the ultimate price.

Madam Speaker, this is a historic fight for the soul of our Nation, whether we remain a nation of aspirations or we become a nation of deportation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 0915

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, you can hear the babies crying. When I went to the south Texas processing center, places where they were holding children, you could see the cages. You could hear and feel the warmth of Roger that was 9 months old who I held in my hands and who I did not want to let go. I could feel that because Roger's relatives had been taken from him, and he was crying.

The babies are coming every day. There are 2,000 children who have been snatched from their families. It is child abuse.

Mr. President, you can come to the Republican Conference and make jokes and raise your fist, but you can sign right now on behalf of the American people that you will let these babies go to their families.

Pope Francis said: ''A person's dignity does not depend on them being a citizen, a migrant, or a refugee. Saving the life of someone fleeing war and poverty is an act of humanity.''

This is a sin. Please, for Carlos and Alajerry, please let our children go to their families.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, look at these young, innocent faces. I suspect many of these children are seeing the House floor for the very first time.

It is unfortunate that their first experience in this temple of democracy, the people's House, is to be here as we call our government to stop terrorizing children on the U.S.-Mexico border.

This past weekend, Madam Speaker, I traveled with Leader PELOSI and the

chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. What we saw there was heart-wrenching. We have heard the audio of children crying: ''Mami, papi.''

Madam Speaker, it begs the question: Has our Nation lost its way? But nothing is as heart-wrenching as seeing children's faces in person, kids who were just taken from the arms of their parents, and children in cages crying for their parents. This is child abuse.

Let's be clear, Madam Speaker, this travesty could end today. Donald Trump could end this today by a single phone call.

To my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle, I simply say this: What happened to the party of family values? History will remember this moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members to refrain from references to guests on the floor, and Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

## NATION'S MORAL TRADITIONS

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to find words after what has unfolded before our eyes and the eyes of the American people these last few days, and it has gotten worse the last few days.

So today, I rise in defense of children on this House floor to demand of this House and, more importantly, the Trump administration to end this cruel exploitation of children by separating them from their families, by tearing children from their moms, and what appears to be, no doubt, a very craven political tactic by President Trump to try to hold hostage children to get other draconian items done on his immigration bill.

This tactic is fueled by some very ugly things that the American people have to reject. It is fueled by bigotry. It is fueled by hatred. It is fueled by fearmongering and is now being fueled by the endangerment of children.

As a father, as a grandpa, I cannot believe how we are debasing our Nation's moral traditions, how we are replacing our sacred values with autocratic comments and rhetoric from the President.

Mr. President, no more lies, no more child hostages. End this now. You can, and for our Nation's sake and for the children's sake, this needs to be done.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ), my friend.

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, it is obvious that the administration doesn't care about the welfare of immigrant children being separated from their parents, but they should at least care about what kind of long-term impact they will have on all children, those currently living in the United States, documented or not, U.S. citizens or not.

We act like kids, all kids, don't know what is going on, but they do. They might not watch CNN, MSNBC, or FOX, but they talk to their classmates, siblings, teachers, and caregivers. They are hearing that kids are being torn away from their parents. We have to ask ourselves: What are they thinking? What goes through their minds? Are the young ones thinking that they can be next?

I am not exaggerating because shortly after the election of Donald Trump, my nephew cried because he thought if my sister left the country—because she is a resident and not a U.S. citizen—that she would not be able to return. So we know that these kids are paying attention. Yes, we might not know for certain what they are all thinking, but what we do know is that this policy must end now.

This must stop for the immigrant children and for all our children so that they feel secure and safe where it is natural, where they feel loved, and that is with their parents.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), my good friend.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, what do you call a country that institutionalizes child abuse? Tragically, today you call that country the United States of America.

We have heard the children screaming. We have seen the images of children being told to go to sleep in cages. We know that children have been ripped from the breasts of nursing mothers and taken away, maybe never to be found to be reunited again.

As a mother, as a grandmother, I can't stand it. Madam Speaker, can you stand it? Can this country stand it? What happens to the soul of America when we do this to children?

These parents have come with their children, fleeing violence; thinking they are coming to the land of the free, the home of the brave; thinking that they are going to be able to get asylum here in the United States of America or at least a chance to get asylum here and to be safe, finally, with their children. Instead, they are put in jail. They are put in prison.

I am here today with Bruce and Felix, children whose parents are in the gallery. They will go home tonight and sleep in a comfortable bed while thousands of children are put to sleep in cages.

I say to you, Mr. President: You can end this. This is your decision. Please, for the sake of our country, for the sake of the children, for the sake of families, end this now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

## FAMILY SEPARATION

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, today, I brought with me two young people: Alcides Guandique, age 11, and Jose Guandique, age 13.

When I look at them, I think of 2 days ago when I visited the Trump detention center at the southern border in San Diego with Members and Leader PELOSI.

There we saw children torn from the arms of their parents under Trump's zero-tolerance policy. We talked to the kids. We talked to the mental health counselors who told us that children are traumatized.

Most of them have come here with their parents because they were threatened with murder and rape by gangs in Central America and Mexico. But because of Trump's policy of separation, these children have lost the one constant person in their lives.

As a psychologist, I took note when the president of the American Academy of Pediatrics visited detained kids. She said that, normally, kids like this are rambunctious and running around. But these kids are either screaming or crying or permanently quiet, and, in fact, that kind of toxic stress can permanently affect their brains.

There is only one way to describe it: government-sanctioned child abuse.

President Trump must own up to the policy that is his and his only. He has the power to stop this terrible cruelty. Instead, he is using these kids as a bargaining chip for $25 billion for a border wall. It is time for him to stop. Stop ripping children from the arms of their parents. America is better than this.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time, because I was compelled to come to the floor this morning to protest this cruel Trump GOP policy of family separation. This is a new policy.

Under past Presidents, when people come to this country legally asking for asylum because they are fleeing violence, domestic violence and gang violence in other countries, it is legal to request asylum in the United States of America. But under this new Trump policy that is so cruel and so horrible, he is trying to send a message to the world that this is an anti-immigrant country. We are not. He is trying to send a message to this world that children can be used for pawns. We are not going to let that happen.

President Trump and the GOP now want to use children as bargaining chips to try to exact concessions from Democrats on a very anti-immigrant, very cruel, very wasteful policy, and we need people across America to stand up and speak out.

The calls to my office are overwhelming. People think this family

separation policy that rips children away from their families is horrible and cruel, and it is. And we need you to keep the calls coming.

We are not going to let this happen. We are not going to let children continue to be ripped away from their families, but we need backup.

We are here to say we stand with the families. We love these children. Everyone should love these children, and we are not going to put up with Trump's anti-immigrant, hateful policy any longer.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I spent the day before Father's Day at the Federal prison in Oregon, meeting the 123 asylum-seeking immigrant men who are incarcerated in prison. They were fleeing horrific violence and religious persecution. They were Christian and Sikh men from India. There was an LGBTQ man from Honduras and a man from Mexico whose property was burned because he has been targeted by gangs. We spoke with men who were separated from their wives and children and who, on Father's Day, had no idea where they were or how they were.

Criminalizing asylum seekers and separating families is cruel, and it is appalling.

Now we find out that there are tender-age shelters. Babies don't need their own jail. They need their own parents. This must stop. The President and the Department of Justice could stop it right now.

The American Academy of Pediatrics said that separating families in this way causes irreparable harm. Mistreating children for political leverage is outside of moral bounds, even for this administration.

As a mother, it breaks my heart. As an American and granddaughter of immigrants, it makes me furious.

And if the President won't sign something today, which he could, then, Speaker RYAN, bring us the Keeping Families Together Act, and let us do something to stop this horrific atrocity that is happening to children and to people who are coming to this country.

## FAMILIES HAVE A RIGHT TO PETITION FOR ASYLUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, this past week, my colleagues and I traveled to different parts of the border to see firsthand how children, mothers, and fathers are being terrorized by the most anti-immigrant, xenophobic, and racist administration of my lifetime.

We did this because we cannot stand by, cannot stand idly by, and watch the most powerful country in the world tearing children from their mothers and their fathers at their most vulnerable and desperate moments. The stories of babies and toddlers being torn from the arms of their mothers and fathers, the heartbreaking audio of children crying and screaming for their parents, the account of a distraught father taking his own life after his own child was wrestled from his arms, and of a mother who was deported before she could recover her son from detention, these are the atrocities perpetrated by President Trump, and they must stop.

□ 0930

Families fleeing violence deserve and have a right to petition their claim for asylum, for that is the law of the land.

I am here with two children today to call on this administration to stop this cruel, inhumane practice that betrays who we are as a country.

The President could make the decision to end this practice right now and do the right thing. Failing that, Congress must act.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, 10 days ago, I visited a Federal prison south of Seattle that holds 174 women. I met with all of those women. They are seeking asylum. One woman had three children. The first child was shot and murdered by gangs. The second child was shot and paralyzed by gangs, and the third child was the child she tried to bring here to safety.

These are the stories of the people who are coming across the border. All of the mothers and the 174 people who were at the Federal prison had not even been able to say good-bye to their children. They did not know where their children were. They had been subjected to the worst conditions at the border.

Madam Speaker, what is this country coming to? This is a country that should value our children, that should value the rights of our children; and these children are sitting in cages on the border in tent cities.

This President created this crisis, and this President can stop this crisis right now with a phone call. Do not tell us it is about Congress. It is about the President of the United States who has chosen to take this democracy to its very bottom.

This is the bottom. This is abuse. It is a human rights violation, and we must end it. He must end it.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues from all over the United States. I would like to ask them all to please step forward and bring your guests. Every Member of Congress is allowed two children under the age of 12. Please bring them forward with you.

I think more powerful than anything I could say is to stand with children. Please. Please. We only have 5 minutes, but let's take the minutes so the children can step forward. Please bring them forward. All of the Members of Congress, you are all allowed under our rules to have two children.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, under the protection of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we are here with the children because we believe that this is what is important.

I want to thank all of my colleagues, I know that the rules do not allow all of you to speak. But I think you speak with your presence here and with these children in your arms.

I want to tell you something. I know this is a tragic moment, but this weekend, I couldn't have felt prouder to be an American. I couldn't have felt prouder about just what our exceptionalism is.

I saw Americans everywhere across this country standing up for children, standing up for those who are in need, and standing up for moms and dads who are being separated.

Let's celebrate, too, that America sees this injustice, sees this cruelty, sees this evil, and did not remain silent. That is the America that I am so happy I was born into.

We have a great country. Let's remember that. So let's keep the fight. Let's keep the fight for these children who are here. They are so beautiful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Mexico's time has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois is not recognized.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will reiterate an announcement by the Chair on July 7, 2016: An exhibition involving Members trafficking the well is a breach of decorum.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 10 a.m.

## PRAYER

Rabbi Mark Schiftan, The Temple: Congregation Ohabai Sholom, Nashville, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

God bless this land and all its inhabitants, this land built on foundations we may call our own, pledged to law and freedom, to equality and harmony, haven for the huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

We and you who lead us are a nation of immigrants. Each of us, all of us, are here because of the individually and mutually inspired hopes and dreams of those who came before us, those who often fled persecution to find safe haven on this Nation's shores for them and for future generations that follow them, including each and every one of us.

More than any other instruction in the Bible is the sacred reminder to embrace the stranger, to love the newcomer as much or even more than the native born. May we, may you who lead us, do just that.

Help us, O God, to fulfill the promise of America. May we and you who lead us be true to this land and its traditions. Renew in all of us a zeal for justice, tempered always with mercy. Awaken within us compassion so we may enter upon the future with restored vision and dedicated afresh to a proud destiny for all.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## WELCOMING RABBI MARK SCHIFTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer today was given by Rabbi Mark Schiftan of Nashville, the senior rabbi of the oldest and largest Jewish congregation in middle Tennessee. The congregation dates back to 1851, when the Vine Street Temple began worship services in downtown Nashville, even before the Civil War.

Rabbi Schiftan has led today's temple, Congregation Ohabai Sholom, for nearly 20 years and is well known and beloved in our community.

His family escaped the Holocaust from Vienna, Austria, fleeing first to Shanghai, China, and then to San Francisco.

Rabbi Schiftan was educated at San Francisco State University, the Hebrew Union of Los Angeles, and then was ordained at the Hebrew Union of Cincinnati.

Under Rabbi Schiftan's leadership, the temple has been the indispensable religious and cultural institution for all of middle Tennessee.

I would like to personally thank the rabbi for his strong leadership in our community, for our personal friendship, and for opening the House with prayer today.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

## ADDRESSING THE ROHINGYA HUMAN RIGHTS CRISIS

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on World Refugee Day to draw attention to the plight of the Rohingya people in Myanmar.

Since October 2016, the Burmese military has targeted the Rohingya people with what the State Department has described as ethnic cleansing. Through interviews in refugee camps and other fact-finding missions, the U.N. Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights and multiple NGOs have documented a systematic campaign of mass rape, extrajudicial killings of young babies and children, brutal beatings, burning of entire villages, and other serious human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, 7,000 Rohingya were killed in the first month of the violence, while an estimated 700,000 have fled to Bangladesh. At the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, we have worked to bring attention to the sickening discrimination and mistreatment of the Rohingya.

The oncoming monsoon season in Bangladesh will cause more difficulties for the Rohingya refugees. Congress must hold the Burmese military accountable for their actions and provide the necessary aid needed to meet this crisis.

## FAMILY SEPARATION

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration's abhorrent immigration policy that is tearing families apart and separating children from their parents is a shameful betrayal of our values. It needs to end immediately.

Americans of all political stripes are contacting our office, heartbroken and outraged by the images and stories of the treatment of these vulnerable young people by our Nation.

The President and his Attorney General have created this crisis. The President has the power to immediately stop this cruelty, but so far, Mr. Speaker, he refuses to do so. That is why today I am proud to join more than 190 colleagues introducing legislation to stop this inhumane treatment of children at our border.

The Keep Families Together Act prohibits the Department of Homeland Security from separating children from their parents, except in extraordinary circumstances. The bill also limits criminal prosecution of asylum seekers fleeing persecution, increases child welfare training, and creates a policy preference for family reunification.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join us on this bill. Let's fix this stain on the character of our Nation and swiftly end this policy.

## HONORING TOM NEUBAUER

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tom Neubauer, the recipient of the 2018 Defense Community Leadership Award.

Tom is a highly respected leader of the defense community in Florida and a personal friend of mine back in Bay County, which is my home.

Tom has been the leading communicator between our military and civilian communities for as long as I can remember. He was instrumental in bringing the MQ–9 Reaper Wing to Tyndall Air Force Base and worked tirelessly to support and protect the Military Mission Line.

Both Tom and his wife, Margaret, are Air Force brats. Their love for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen shines through in all that they do. Tom has been building better relations and a

tighter sense of community between military and civilian communities not only in Bay County, but throughout Florida and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Tom Neubauer on receiving this prestigious award and thanking him for his work for military communities throughout this country.

## KEEP FAMILIES TOGETHER

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as I speak, the Trump Republicans wrestle another child from the arms of a refugee parent at our southern border, but I still rise today to honor World Refugee Day.

Every year, thousands of refugees journey to the United States of America in search of safety, be it from human rights violations, warfare, natural disasters, or the war on drugs.

We pride ourselves on being a nation of immigrants. I am proud that Clarkston, Georgia, known as the Ellis Island of the South, is in my district. But Trump Republicans have lain waste to our custom of welcoming asylum seekers as they commit the inhumane practice of separating children from their parents at the border.

America is weakened in the eyes of the world, and separating families is our national shame. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the Keep Families Together Act. Congress must act now on this important legislation.

## CONGRATULATING MICKI ELLIOTT TUCKER ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Micki Elliott Tucker on her retirement. She is the nursing home administrator at Sweden Valley Manor in Coudersport, Pennsylvania.

Micki has been a dedicated leader, and she is well loved by the residents and staff alike. She has been instrumental in the development of the Charles Cole Transitions of Care Committee in Potter, McKean, and Cameron Counties. Micki was the liaison between the transitional care team and the implementation of the PenTec LPN Clinical Program at Sweden Valley Manor.

The nursing home also received numerous awards over the years with Micki at the helm. In 2014, the American Health Association awarded Sweden Valley with a National Bronze Commitment of Quality award. In 2008, Sweden Valley Manor was named Coudersport Business of the Year. In 1994, it received the Outstanding Employer award from the Pennsylvania Department of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the highlights of a long-spent career caring for others. To say she will be missed is an understatement.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly wish Micki Elliott Tucker the best in her well-deserved retirement.

## KEEP FAMILIES TOGETHER

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think about my wife, Andrea, and I when we go to take a couple days away from the kids and we leave our 4-year-old with his grandparents, how heartbreaking it is to even leave that kid when you are leaving him with grandparents.

I think about my great-grandparents, who came here from Italy as immigrants. I think about the 13 years of Catholic school that I attended. I think about the conversations in Washington, D.C., about family values.

And then I think about how, in the most powerful country in the world, our governmental policy is to strip kids—babies, toddlers, infants—from their parents. The most powerful country in the world has resorted to this nonsense. This is a joke.

It is by choice, Mr. Speaker. This is a choice that the most powerful men in the most powerful country are choosing to take poor kids away from their parents.

It is time for this most powerful President to act immediately and stop the American carnage.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, June 20, 2018.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 20, 2018, at 9:37 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2269.

Appointment:

United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1015

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, SUBSTANCE USE-DISORDER PREVENTION THAT PROMOTES OPIOID RECOVERY AND TREATMENT FOR PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5797, INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICAID DESERVE CARE THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND RESPONSIBLE IN ITS EXECUTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6082, OVERDOSE PREVENTION AND PATIENT SAFETY ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 949 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 949

*Resolved,* That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for opioid use disorder prevention, recovery, and treatment, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-76, modified by Rules Committee Print 115-78 and the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5797) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow

States to provide under Medicaid services for certain individuals with opioid use disorders in institutions for mental diseases. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6082) to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-75 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. In the engrossment of H.R. 6, the Clerk shall—

(a) add the respective texts of H.R. 2851, H.R. 5735, and H.R. 5797, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 6;

(b) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(c) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 949 provides for the consideration of three important bills aimed at curbing the deadly opioid epidemic plaguing this country and providing Americans with the tools to overcome their addictions: H.R. 6, the Substance Use-Disorder Prevention that Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment for Patients and Communities Act, or the SUPPORT Act; H.R. 5797, the Individuals in Medicaid Deserve Care that is Appropriate and Responsible in its Execution Act; and H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act.

The three bills included in today's rule all seek to accomplish one goal: assist Americans struggling with opioid addiction in controlling their addictions and moving forward in achieving productive and healthy lives.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on H.R. 6, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The rule makes in order eight amendments offered by both Republicans and Democrats. Further, the rule provides the minority with one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The resolution also provides for a structured rule for H.R. 5797, allowing 1 hour of debate to be divided and controlled between the chair and ranking minority member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. The rule also provides for debate on an amendment by Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, an active member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Finally, the rule provides the minority with the customary motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The final bill included in today's resolution, H.R. 6082, will also receive 1 hour of debate on the House floor, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. As the Committee on Rules received no germane amendments to H.R. 6082, no amendments were made in order in today's rule. The minority does receive the customary motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The statistics that many of us have heard on numerous occasions—at our district townhalls, in opioid roundtables with stakeholders, constituent meetings in our offices, and in our committee hearings—are truly heartbreaking stories, with more than 115 people dying in the United States every day from an opioid overdose. That is five people per hour.

According to national reports, emergency room visits and opioid overdose deaths have more than quadrupled in the last 15 years, and a preliminary analysis indicates those numbers are to rise. The misuse of and addiction to opioids—including prescription pain medications, heroin, and synthetic opioids such as fentanyl—is, indeed, an urgent national crisis that continues to threaten our public health, social fabric, and economic welfare. Both community hospitals and local paramedics are frequently coming across people overdosing on an opioid drug or a drug laced with fentanyl.

The opioid epidemic has affected families not only in my district in north Texas, but in communities large and small from Maine to California. It has also impacted American employers and businesses due to lost productivity and difficulty finding qualified candidates for employment. President Trump is right to call this epidemic the ''crisis next door.''

The efforts of the Energy and Commerce Committee in the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act and the 21st Century Cures Act in the previous Congress were a good start, delivering critical funding and resources to communities hit most hard by the opioid epidemic. But there was much more we still could do.

To start this process, the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, which I chair, held a Member Day last October, where more than 50 bipartisan Members of this body, both on and off the committee, shared their personal stories from their districts and offered their solutions. This was followed by a series of three legislative hearings with markups where nearly 60 bills were considered and advanced to the full Energy and Commerce Committee that acted on these bills shortly thereafter.

The culmination of the work from the Energy and Commerce Committee and other House committees has brought us to consider many of these policies over the course of the last 2 weeks on the House floor. It required an all-hands-on-deck approach, and I believe the American people will see that, by this week's end, we did, indeed, come together in a bipartisan fashion and worked to address this crisis.

Today's rule provides for consideration of three important bills that will expand treatment options, deliver lifesaving services, and make necessary public health reforms, including Medicare and Medicaid, to bolster prevention and recovery efforts.

First, H.R. 5797, the Individuals in Medicaid Deserve Care that is Appropriate and Responsible in its Execution Act, the IMD CARE Act, allows State Medicaid programs to remove the institutions for mental diseases exclusion for beneficiaries aged 21 to 64 with an opioid use disorder for 5 years' time. The bill provides the continuum of care

by removing a barrier of care under current law, so Medicaid can cover up to a total of 30 days of care in an institute for mental disease during a 12-month period, and eligible enrollees can get the care that they actually need.

The IMD exclusion is one of the treatment barriers consistently identified by State Medicaid directors, health policy experts, and many provider groups. Currently, this exclusion under Medicaid significantly limits the circumstances under which Federal Medicaid matching funds are available for inpatient services or for outpatient treatments.

Unfortunately, this policy has barred individuals with an opioid use disorder and mental illness from accessing short-term, acute care in psychiatric hospitals, or receiving treatment in residential substance use disorder treatment facilities. A 2017 Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission report stated that the Medicaid IMD exclusion is one of the few examples in the Medicaid program where Federal financial participation cannot be used for medically necessary and otherwise covered services for a specific Medicaid population receiving treatment in a specific setting.

In the midst of the opioid crisis, States must leverage all available tools to combat this epidemic. Section 1115 demonstration waivers are an important tool, but, so far, less than half of the States have sought or received an appropriate waiver from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to help patients with substance use disorder.

The IMD CARE Act also allows States the option to use the State plan amendment process, which is generally faster than using waivers. Under this process, once a State plan amendment is submitted, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has 90 days to decide or the proposed change will automatically go into effect.

H.R. 5797 amends an outdated law that has been in effect since the enactment of the Medicaid program in 1965. Since that time, there have been advances in behavioral health, and there have been advances in addiction treatment services where more, improved treatment options now exist.

It is long overdue to revisit this policy so that State Medicaid programs can better meet patients' needs and physicians can determine the most appropriate setting for care based on an individual's treatment plan.

Next, H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act, makes timely reforms to a privacy law that affects patient access to healthcare and creates barriers to treatment. Specifically, the bill updates the Public Health Service Act to permit substance use disorder records to be shared among covered entities and 42 CFR part 2 programs by aligning part 2 with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 for the purposes of treatment, payment, and healthcare operations.

□ 1030

As a physician, I believe it is vital that when making clinical decisions, I have all of the appropriate information to make the correct determination in the treatment of a particular patient. Those suffering from substance use disorder should receive the same level of treatment and care as other individuals.

Patients afflicted with substance use disorder deserve to be treated by physicians who are armed with all of the necessary information to provide the best possible care.

I certainly do understand and respect that patient privacy protection is paramount and should be held in the highest regard.

The Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act maintains the original intent of the 1970s statute behind 42 CFR part 2 by protecting patients and improving care coordination. In fact, this bill increases protections for those seeking treatment by more severely penalizing those who share patient data to noncovered entities and non-part 2 programs than under the current statute, with certain exceptions.

Lastly, it requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to, among other things, issue regulations prohibiting discrimination based on disclosed health data and requiring covered entities to provide written notice of privacy practices.

The issue of the stigma associated with substance use disorder has been a constant in many of the discussions members of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the stakeholders have had in both our offices and in our hearings.

This carefully crafted legislation seeks to help break the stigma and help individuals with this complex disease gain access to healthcare and support services critical to getting them on the road to recovery.

We should not continue to silo the substance use disorder treatment information of a select group of patients if we want to ensure that these patients are indeed receiving quality care. This information should be integrated into our medical records and comprehensive care models to prevent situations where physicians, not knowing a patient's substance use disorder, may prescribe medications that have significant drug interactions, or worse, may prescribe a controlled substance that makes their patient's substance use disorder worse.

As it currently stands, 42 CFR part 2 is actively prohibiting physicians from ensuring proper treatment and patient safety and, paradoxically, it is perpetuating that stigma.

Providing high quality healthcare is a team effort, but physicians leading the team must have the necessary information to adequately coordinate care. We must align payment, operations, and treatment to allow coordination of both behavioral and physical health services for individuals with substance use disorder.

There is a reason why the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and most of the health stakeholder community are asking for this change. Clearly, there is an issue here that must be addressed. H.R. 6082 achieves the goal and contributes to Congress' effort in trying to stem the current crisis.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6, the Substance Use-Disorder Prevention that Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment for Patients and Communities Act, is a package of bills that reform Medicare, Medicaid, and other health provisions to further combat this crisis by advancing many critical initiatives.

As we all know, this opioid epidemic is in our hospitals, but it is also in our living rooms and on our streets. Our partners at Federal agencies must rise to the challenge and deliver vital resources for States and communities most devastated by the crisis. The SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act will provide our Department of Health and Human Services, including the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the Food and Drug Administration, with the necessary tools to address this crisis.

Title I of H.R. 6 addresses the ways in which Medicaid can be used to increase access to quality care and management for individuals suffering from substance use disorders. Some of these changes in Medicaid reflect the success of our State Medicaid programs by implementing State successes at the Federal level.

Section 101 under title I will expand protection for at-risk youth by requiring State Medicaid programs to restore Medicaid coverage of a juvenile following their release from incarceration. The next section also allows former foster youth to maintain their Medicaid coverage across State lines until they turn 26 years of age. These are vulnerable populations of individuals that will greatly benefit from increased access to treatment.

Section 105 builds on the current State Medicaid drug utilization review, which saves money and promotes patient safety. This section will require State Medicaid programs to have safety edits in place for opioid refills, monitor concurrent prescribing of opioids and certain other drugs, and monitor antipsychotic prescribing for children.

Care for mothers suffering from substance use disorder and their babies who are born with neonatal abstinence syndrome is a growing problem in the face of this epidemic. Section 106 requires HHS to improve care for these infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome and their mothers. It also requires that the General Accountability Office study the gaps in Medicaid coverage for pregnant and postpartum women with substance use disorders.

Section 107 of the bill provides additional incentives for Medicaid health homes for patients with substance use disorder.

Mr. Speaker, these health homes will allow States to create a comprehensive person-centered system of care coordination for primary care, acute and behavioral healthcare, including mental health and substance use. As our healthcare system moves towards caring for the whole person, it is important that we enable our physicians and our payers to provide that comprehensive care.

The SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act also enables better pain management for our Nation's Medicare beneficiaries, ranging from increased access to substance use disorder treatment, including through the use of telehealth, to modification of physician payment for certain nonopioid treatments in Ambulatory Surgery Centers.

Title II of the bill contains Medicare provisions that encourage the use of nonopioid analgesics where appropriate and also aims to decrease fraud and abuse regarding prescriptions by requiring e-prescribing for the coverage of Medicare Part D controlled substances.

H.R. 6 strives to provide support for at-risk beneficiaries who might fall victim to substance use disorder. Section 206 of the bill accelerates the development and the use of drug management programs for at-risk beneficiaries. While this program is currently voluntary, by plan year 2021, it will become a mandatory program.

Lastly, the bill expands Medicare coverage to include opioid treatment programs for the purpose of providing medication-assisted treatment. Opioid treatment programs are not currently Medicare providers, which forces Medicare beneficiaries who need medication-assisted treatment to pay out-of-pocket costs for those services. These efforts should provide improved access to treatment for Medicare beneficiaries who have substance use disorders while also incentivizing the use of opioid alternatives, which hopefully will prevent the development of substance use disorders.

Even though an estimated 46,000 Americans died from opioid overdoses from October 2016 to October 2017, there is a lack of innovation and a lack of investment in the development of nonaddictive pain and addiction treatment.

A bill that I introduced, H.R. 5806, the 21st Century Tools for Pain and Addiction Treatments, is included in section 301 on H.R. 6 and requires the Food and Drug Administration to hold at least one public meeting to address the challenges and the barriers of developing nonaddictive medical products intended to treat pain or addiction.

The Food and Drug Administration is also required to issue or update existing guidance documents to help address challenges to developing nonaddictive medical products to treat pain or addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I did work closely with the Food and Drug Administration to get the policy in this section correct and to ensure that it will clarify those pathways for products that, in fact, are so desperately needed by America's patients.

I have remaining concerns about the language in section 303 that will allow nonphysician providers to prescribe buprenorphine. While I understand and greatly appreciate the intent to increase access to medication-assisted treatment, as a physician, I also respect how complicated the treatment of patients suffering from substance use disorder may be.

The Hippocratic Oath, we all know, is to first, do no harm. Patient safety should be our highest priority.

This is a complex patient population, Mr. Speaker. On average, people with substance use disorder die 20 years sooner than other Americans.

Additionally, buprenorphine is a schedule III drug that can be misused and could exacerbate the underlying problem. I am unsure about expanding these authorities to additional nonphysician providers at the risk of making the problem worse. I have worked to strengthen the reporting requirements of this section of H.R. 6 and look forward to reviewing that report on this particular policy.

Taken together, H.R. 6, the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act, will improve access to care for individuals suffering from substance use disorder, provide our healthcare system with tools and resources that it needs to care for patients, and to help prevent future misuse of opioids.

Before I close, I would like to share a quote from President Trump. He said: ''Together, we will face this challenge as a national family with conviction, with unity, and with a commitment to love and support our neighbors in times of dire need. Working together, we will defeat this opioid epidemic.''

The number of bills and policies advanced on the House floor in the last 2 weeks illustrates our shared commitment, and I am confident that we will make significant progress in defeating this epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and the three underlying bills that are critical to our Nation's effort to stem the opioid crisis.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are rushing to congratulate themselves for finally addressing opioid addiction. But, Mr. Speaker, what took them so long? This is an epidemic that fueled more drug overdoses in America in 2016 than died in the Vietnam war. In fact, opioids now kill more people every year than breast cancer. 115 Americans are dying from them every single day.

These statistics aren't new. They have been staring the Republicans in the face for months. The public has been pushing this Congress to act. Democrats have been pushing measure after measure after measure to address opioid addiction, but the majority has used their restrictive amendment process to block them from even getting a vote on the House floor.

More than a dozen amendments dealing with opioids have been blocked by the majority from even getting a debate. One of these amendments had bipartisan support, but it was blocked all the same.

This from a Republican majority that has already turned this Congress into the most closed Congress in history. Let me say that again. These guys, my Republican colleagues, have presided over the most closed Congress in history. There have already been 86 completely closed rules during the 115th Congress, and it is only June.

That number is expected to grow later this week as the majority considers their partisan immigration bills under a closed process.

Mr. Speaker, as well-intentioned as these bills may be, we aren't considering them in a vacuum. And here is the deal: We are taking them up at a time when Republicans are continuing their crusade against the Affordable Care Act, a law that has helped millions of Americans suffering from substance use disorders.

The Trump administration is refusing to defend the ACA. And get this: its Justice Department recently asked in a legal filing for the courts to invalidate this law's protections for preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, does the majority realize that substance use disorders are a preexisting condition?

If Republicans are successful, they will make the opioid crisis even worse. And it doesn't stop there. Some conservative groups are pushing the majority to try repealing the ACA completely again before the summer is out.

□ 1045

This, after Republicans came within a few votes of taking healthcare from 23 million Americans last year, including those suffering from opioid addiction.

These rightwing groups released their latest repeal plan yesterday, so the words from my Republican friends today ring particularly hollow.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the best answer to an epidemic is to get as many people as possible into treatment and to provide them and their families the support that they need. And one of the most effective ways to accomplish

this is to expand Medicaid and expand treatment options for substance abuse through the ACA.

Last October, the Republicans made clear what they think of the hundreds of thousands of Americans suffering from opioid addiction and alcohol and drug abuse. They passed a budget that makes $1.3 trillion in cuts to healthcare, including a 30 percent cut to Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans can't bemoan the opioid epidemic on one hand and vote time and time again to cut the very healthcare systems required to treat addiction.

Nor can you set up a biased, tiered system that grants access to treatment for opioid addiction at the expense of providing treatment for addiction and abuse of other substances, like key provisions in H.R. 5797. Not only is that inhumane and immoral, but it is also ineffective. It undermines the entire health system of treating substance abuse.

Mr. Speaker, many Democrats have joined the majority in supporting one of these bills, H.R. 6, the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act. It is a good bill. It would help Medicare and Medicaid better respond to substance use disorders. We are working with the majority here.

So, Mr. Speaker, why won't they work with us to defend the ACA, preserve protections for preexisting conditions, and expand Medicaid.

Now, I know asking Congressional Republicans to show some empathy right now is a tall order. This is the group that has furthered President Trump's spin on family separations at the border, a policy he can change unilaterally, right now if he wanted to. I mean, children are being ripped out of their parents' arms in tears and kept in cages, warehouses, and tent cities. It is appalling and it is un-American.

You don't have to take my word for it. Republicans, like First Lady Laura Bush and Senator JOHN MCCAIN, have spoken out against it. And a U.S. attorney in Texas made clear it was President Trump's policy choice alone. And get this: This is a U.S. attorney who the President himself appointed.

But change is possible. Congressional Republicans can see the error of their ways. They can reject these calls for repeal. They can stop sitting idly by as President Trump attacks the Affordable Care Act. And they can start standing up for the 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions. That includes those suffering from addiction.

They could stop giving the President cover when he falsely claims that Democrats caused the chaos at the border that he clearly caused.

Stop playing with people's lives. We are talking about their healthcare. We are talking about getting treatment for addiction. For God's sake, we are talking about taking children out of the arms of their mothers. This isn't a handful of cases, it is thousands of cases. It is outrageous.

It is time for the adults in Congress, men and women of conscience, to stand up for what is right, not only on the opioid crisis, but on so many other important issues facing this country. I hope the majority comes to its senses before it is too late.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), a fellow member on the Committee of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I want to speak specifically on my support for H.R. 6082, which allows for the flow of information among healthcare providers and health plans that is necessary to foster care coordination, provide proper treatment, promote patient safety, make payment, and, ultimately, improve the individual's health status.

Without alignment for treatment, payment, and operations, the following could not happen without an authorization: Coordinating care across behavioral and medical services. Case management to provide longer-term support after a patient ends treatment. Ensuring appropriate administrative and financial interaction between providers and plans, which support the core functions of treatment and payment for HIPAA-covered entities. Also conducting quality assessment and improvement activities to better integrate behavioral and medical services. This includes, Mr. Speaker, evaluating provider performance, conducting training programs, and accreditation, certification, and credentialing activities.

People with substance use disorder die, on average, decades sooner than other Americans. This is largely because of a strikingly high incidence of poorly-managed, co-occurring chronic diseases, including HIV/AIDS, cardiac conditions, lung disease, and cirrhosis.

Whatever we, as a Nation, are doing to coordinate care for this highly vulnerable patient population is utterly failing by any reasonable measure.

An extraordinary array of organizations, hospitals, physicians, patient advocates, and substance use treatment providers have approached our committee to clearly state that existing Federal addiction privacy law—and that is what H.R. 6082 is focused on, existing privacy law—is actively interfering with case management/care coordination efforts, and preserving a failed and deadly status quo.

Blocking certain substance use providers from accessing health records from these exchanges, which the part 2 regulations do, isolates patients in these programs from powerful exchanges of health information and from the protections of HIPAA and HITECH regulations governing these exchanges.

Mr. Speaker, treating patients' substance use in isolation from their medical and mental conditions, which predominated care in the 1970s, is not the current standard of good medical practice today.

There is overwhelming evidence now that patients' substance use cannot be treated in isolation from other physical and mental health conditions. In the 1970s, when part 2 was written, this was not widely known, and treatment for addiction was largely separate from treatment of other illnesses.

By continuing to segregate substance use disorder records for any treatment setting means that you are willing to allow those patients to receive care that is lower quality at a higher cost. Medically-ill inpatients who have alcohol or drug disorders are at greatly increased risk of rapid rehospitalization after discharge and greater healthcare use and costs.

Patients who have medical illnesses such as diabetes or cardiovascular disorders and who also have a substance use disorder use healthcare services two to three times more often than their peers with just diabetes or heart problems, and cost of care is similarly much higher.

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

Mr. BURGESS. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Finally, Mr. Speaker, untreated alcohol or drug use during pregnancy dramatically increases risk of poor birth outcomes, neonatal intensive care use and greater infant and maternal healthcare use. But treated as part of prenatal care, birth outcomes, infant and maternal health use and costs are no different from their non-substance-using peers. That is why support of this rule and support of H.R. 6082 is so important.

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

Just let me remind my colleagues again, because I think it is worth emphasizing, that no matter what we do in the next couple of days with these bills that are going to be before the House, they are rendered meaningless if the Republicans continue in their effort to cut Medicaid and to take away protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Substance use disorder is a preexisting condition and Republicans, working with the White House, are trying to eliminate that protection for people. I don't get it. It doesn't make sense. But we ought to make sure that we keep this debate in context and people know what is going on out there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. Throughout the Energy and Commerce Committee's process writing opioid legislation, I have raised the issue that we need to be making investments in the full spectrum of our behavioral health system

in order to truly address the root causes and the results of the opioid epidemic.

While crisis and high-level inpatient care will always be necessary for a subset of the population, and we must ensure it is adequately funded, we cannot do so in a vacuum. We need to ensure that people also have access to adequate outpatient treatment and prevention services.

And while the opioid epidemic is front and center in all our minds, we cannot forget patients suffering from other substance use disorders. It is important that we do not unintentionally set up a discriminatory system that will be useless during the next epidemic, whatever that might be. We want our legislative efforts to both save lives today and to prevent epidemics like this one in the future.

States already have the option to work around outdated exclusions in IMD facilities. States like California are already doing so in a comprehensive way, taking into account the continuum of care for opioid and other substance use disorders.

If we are going to be spending an additional nearly $1 billion in the Medicaid program, we need to spend it wisely on expanding access to services, and not narrowly duplicating something that is already available.

Ever since the Excellence in Mental Health demonstration project passed into law in 2014, I have been fiercely advocating to expand the program.

The demonstration project, which I coauthored with my Republican colleague, Congressman LANCE, and my Senate colleagues, Senators STABENOW and BLUNT, certifies community behavioral health clinics, known as CCBHCs. The demonstration is currently about halfway through its 2-year period in eight States and already showing great success.

The National Council for Behavioral Health recently issued a report entitled, ''Bridging the Addiction Treatment Gap.'' It surveys CCBHCs operating in the Excellence Act demonstration States, and the results offer great hope.

First, the demonstration has enabled near-universal adoption of Medication Assisted Treatment, or MAT, for opioid use disorder. Ninety-two percent of certified clinics in the program are offering at least one type of FDA-approved MAT.

Second, 100 percent of CCBHCs have expanded the scope of addiction treatment services under the demonstration. For many clinics, this is the first time such services have been available in their communities, very often in medically-underserved areas.

Third, even while seeing more patients, two-thirds of surveyed CCBHCs have seen a decrease in patient wait times. After an initial call or referral, half of the clinics now offer same-day access to care, and four out of five can offer an appointment within a week or less.

Mr. Speaker, the Excellence Act is showing concrete results in terms of patient outcomes. In western New York State, more than 1,000 people in Erie County died of opioid overdoses over the last 5 years; 142 people lost their lives in 2016 alone.

At the same time, according to media reports, local police chiefs are reporting a 60 percent reduction in overdose calls in 2018. Authorities specifically credit a certified behavioral health clinic in the city of Buffalo that is providing medication assisted treatment for people battling opioid addiction within 24 to 48 hours after initial assessment.

We want to expand upon this success for certified community behavioral health clinics across the country by allowing Medicaid reimbursement on a larger scale. These clinics are the ones in people's neighborhoods and communities, the ones on the front lines of treating behavioral health and substance use disorder. If we do not build them up and integrate them with our health system, we will never achieve the full continuum of care that we are looking for.

Every time I have pushed for an expansion of the Excellence program in the Energy and Commerce Committee on funding legislation on the floor, I have been told that we don't have the dollars available.

However, today, we are talking about spending nearly $1 billion on something that is both redundant and, I believe, does not fully address the entire spectrum of care like the Excellence program has. That is why I offered an amendment to H.R. 5797, based on my bipartisan bill, H.R. 3931, and why I am here discussing this on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider funding community behavioral health clinics and outpatient treatment to help address the opioid epidemic. When you look back on what we have done to address this crisis, this will have more of a positive impact today and in the long term in comparison with the other proposals we are considering.

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

I do want to remind everyone that 18 months ago, in the previous Congress, with the passage of the 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act, CARA, $1 billion was made available for treating people with substance use disorder. That was then supplemented with the passage of the more recent appropriations bill last month—2 months ago, with $4 billion.

□ 1100

Unprecedented amounts of money have been made available in the last 18 months to combat this crisis.

And then, finally, it is very, very difficult to integrate care if you don't reform the 42 CFR part 2, which is before us today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, none of what we are doing here today is going to matter if the Republicans and the Trump administration are successful in cutting Medicaid and in basically removing the guarantee that people who have preexisting conditions cannot be denied insurance.

I mean, if the Trump administration is successful, individuals with preexisting conditions all across the country, including individuals suffering from opioid use disorders, both in the individual and in the employer market, could face a denial of coverage or skyrocketing premiums beyond anything anybody could afford.

I don't get it. I don't understand the hypocrisy here. I know that the efforts here today are well intentioned and people are trying to do the right thing, but then you ruin it all when you gut the funding sources that help people deal with the treatment they need.

This has to stop.

I know some of my friends have ideological blinders on when it comes to anything that was passed during the Obama administration, but we have got to put the American people first, and this is a crisis that affects every single community in this country. If this administration is successful in what they are trying to do to undercut the ACA, then countless people will not have access to healthcare and will not have access to the treatment they need.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in the midst of a devastating opioid crisis that is spiraling out of control. Every day, more than 115 people in the United States die after overdosing on opioids, according to the National Institute on Drug Abuse. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has also found that opioids are responsible for 6 out of 10 overdose deaths in the United States.

The American people are in desperate need of strong action by Congress to stem the tide of the opioid scourge. We need serious public investment to quell this exploding crisis, not just legislation on the peripherals. We must direct resources to the States and local communities on the front lines of this devastating public health crisis where assistance is needed the most.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to bring up Representative LOEBSACK's legislation, H.R. 4501, the Combating the Opioid Epidemic Act. This bill would provide badly needed funding for State grants for the prevention, detection, surveillance, and treatment of opioid abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ).

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, as an emergency medicine physician, I know firsthand what this devastating opioid crisis does to families, to individuals, to children, to parents. I have taken care of many who have come in overdosed, blue in the face, not breathing, many of which I have been resuscitated successfully and a few tragic losses along the way.

I know that many of them rely on being able to get the treatment whenever we are able to convince them to get treatment, but one of the biggest concerns that they have is: How much is this going to cost?

Many of them rely on Medicaid to be able to take advantage of some of the rehabilitation and the medication-assisted treatments that are offered to them. But, unfortunately, many of them, being uninsured, are unable to do so, and so then they repeat the cycle of abuse and misuse, and unfortunately, again, they present themselves overdosed in the emergency department.

I have an article here that sheds light on the importance of Medicaid. I bring Medicaid up because I feel like we are taking a few good steps forward in this opioid crisis, but we are missing the big picture when we have to defend Medicaid over and over again. Up to 45 percent of opioid-addicted patients rely on Medicaid to get their opioid rehab or misuse treatments to get back on steady footing.

There is an article here that I brought by Alana Sharp, et al., that was published in the May 2018 American Journal of Public Health, entitled: ''Impact of Medicaid Expansion on Access to Opioid Analgesic Medications and Medication-Assisted Treatment.''

Basically, by using Medicaid enrollment and reimbursement data from 2011 to 2016 in all States, they evaluated prescribing patterns of opioids and the three FDA-approved medications used in treating opioid use disorders by using two statistical models—I won't bore you with which ones they used—and they found that although opioid prescribing for Medicaid enrollees increased overall, they observed no difference between expansion and nonexpansion. These are States that expanded Medicaid.

By contrast, per enrollee rates of buprenorphine and naltrexone prescribed increased more than 200 percent after States expanded eligibility, meaning that States that expanded Medicaid increased medication-assisted treatments for opioid misuse disorders by 200 percent. That means it works. That means when people get Medicaid, they use their Medicaid insurance to help get off of their dependency on opioids.

In the States that did not expand Medicaid, only less than 50 percent expansion of use.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the States that didn't expand their Medicaid enrollment, you saw that there continued to be a disparity of patients between those States and States that expanded their Medicaid in their ability to seek treatment.

So when we attempt to cut Medicaid in order to pay for the tax breaks we gave millionaires and billionaires, when we continue down that terrible path—or, I should say, government continues down that terrible path—to repeal the Medicaid expansion, which we must protect, then we are hurting patients. We are not providing them with tools that they need to get access to treatment.

The other big picture here is that mental health and emergency care payments are part of the essential health benefits. We have just passed experiences where we had to defend keeping these essential health benefits within the Affordable Care Act from being repealed.

We know that those patients who go to the emergency department at their last wits' end or that are suffering from overdose or severe side effects from misuse of the opioid medication, then they won't be covered if we repeal those essential health benefits.

And then, finally, having an addiction is a chronic condition. It is a mental health disorder with addiction characteristics, and this can be considered a preexisting illness.

We have States that are trying to repeal this through litigation. And when the government decides not to defend those protections for people with preexisting illnesses, they basically agree with those that want to repeal it and allow and facilitate the case to repeal those protections for preexisting illnesses. If that happens and if they are successful in doing so, that means that insurance companies can deny those who are addicted to opioids the insurance.

So I just want to keep the big picture in mind as we go forward that taking 2 steps forward doesn't justify taking 10 steps backwards.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the good news is that all forms of medication-assisted treatment are required for 5 years under H.R. 6. So I look forward to the gentleman's support when we get to the vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we are on the floor discussing the opioid crisis. This is an epidemic that is plaguing every community in the country, and it is killing 115 people every single day. It is heartbreaking, and, quite frankly, I am ashamed it is taking Congress so long to act.

I would again point out that anything we do in the next few days and anything we have done gets erased if the Republicans succeed in cutting Medicaid and if the President succeeds in basically eliminating protections for people with preexisting conditions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important that people know there is a lot of stuff going on this week, and we are also awaiting word from the House Republicans when the Rules Committee will have an emergency meeting, I guess today, on two immigration bills that were posted after 9 p.m. last night.

These bills were drafted without any Democratic input, and from what we can tell, they are dangerous and they are certainly not a comprehensive solution to immigration reform. They harm children, and they leave many Dreamers behind.

This is not what our constituents want us to do. They want the President to do what he could easily do and stop separating children from their parents.

The President says that he wants Democrats to come to the table, but we never get invited to anything. I tried to go and see the President yesterday when the Republicans were meeting with him, but I was not allowed to go into the room.

I tried to shout at the President as he was walking by, but he was quickly escorted by. I wanted to show him the pictures on the border of these young children who are being taken away from their parents.

The President continues to spread mistruths about immigration and practically every other issue that is before this Congress and before this Nation, and it seems just to be getting worse.

There are such things as facts. There are such things as truth.

Yesterday, The Washington Post published an article, entitled: ''President Trump Seems to be Saying More and More Things That Aren't True.'' Well, I would like to take a few minutes to read this article, because these aren't my words, Mr. Speaker. They are the words of The Washington Post, specifically, Ashley Parker, who wrote the piece.

If the President is watching, I think it is helpful for me to read because I know he doesn't read, so maybe he can hear this.

''He's done it on Twitter. He's done it in the White House driveway. And he's done it in a speech to a business group.

''President Trump, a man already known for trafficking in mistruths and even outright lies—has been outdoing himself with falsehoods in recent days, repeating and amplifying bogus claims on several of the most pressing controversies facing his Presidency.

''Since Saturday, Trump has tweeted false or misleading information at least seven times on the topic of immigration and at least six times on a Justice Department inspector general report into the FBI's handling of its investigation into Hillary Clinton's private email server. That is more than a

dozen obfuscations on just two central topics—a figure that does not include falsehoods on other issues, whether in tweets or public remarks.

''The false claims come as the President—emboldened by fewer disciplinarians inside the West Wing—indulges in frequent Twitter screeds. A Washington Post analysis found that in June, Trump has been tweeting at the fastest rate of his Presidency so far, an average of 11.3 messages per day.

''Inside the White House, aides and advisers say they believe the media is unwilling to give Trump a fair shot and is knee-jerk ready to accuse him of lying, even in cases where the facts support his point.

''The President often seeks to paint a self-serving and self-affirming alternate reality for himself and his supporters. Disparaging the 'fake news' media, Trump offers his own filter through which to view the world—offering a competing reality on issues including relationships forged (or broken) at the Group of Seven summit in Canada, the success of the Singapore summit with the North Koreans, and his administration's 'zero tolerance' policy on illegal immigration.

''''It's extraordinary how he is completely indifferent to the truth. There's just no relationship between his statements—anything he utters—and the actual truth of the matter,' said Thomas Murray, president emeritus of the Hastings Center, the founding institution in the field of bioethics. 'As far as I can tell, the best way to understand anything he says is what will best serve his interests in the moment. It's irrespective to any version of the truth.'

''According to an analysis by The Post's Fact Checker through the end of May, Trump has made 3,251 false or misleading claims in 497 days, an average of 6.5 such claims per day of his Presidency.''

□ 1115

''And within the past week, Trump seems to have ramped up both the volume and the intensity of his false statements on two of the most prominent topics currently facing his administration: the hardline immigration policy that has led to the separation of thousands of children from their parents—which Trump erroneously blames on others—and the 500-page inspector general report that he claims, incorrectly, exonerates him in special counsel Robert S. Mueller III's probe of Russian interference in the 2016 election.

''Bella DePaulo, a psychology researcher at the University of California Santa Barbara, said Trump's use of repetition is a particularly effective technique for convincing his supporters of the veracity of his false claims, in part because most people have a 'truth bias' or an initial inclination to accept what others say as true.

''''When liars repeat the same lie over and over again, they can get even more of an advantage, at least among those who want to believe them or are not all that motivated either way,' DePaulo said in an email. 'So when people hear the same lies over and over again—especially when they want to believe those lies—a kind of new reality can be created. What they've heard starts to seem like it is just obvious, and not something that needs to be questioned.'

''On immigration, Trump and many top administration officials have said that existing U.S. laws and court rulings have given them no choice but to separate families trying to cross illegally into the United States. But it is the administration's decision, announced in April, to prosecute all southern border crossings that has led to the separation of families.

''That hasn't stopped the President from blaming Democrats for his administration's decisions. 'Democrats are the problem,' Trump wrote in one tweet. In another, he was even more blunt: 'The Democrats are forcing the breakup of families at the border with their horrible and cruel legislative agenda. . . .'''

Mr. Speaker, let me divert a little bit here. The truth is that the President caused this crisis, and it is not just me saying it and The Washington Post saying it. Listen to what some of the Republicans have said, LINDSEY GRAHAM said: ''President Trump could stop this policy with a phone call. I'll go tell him: If you don't like families being separated, you can tell DHS, 'Stop doing it.'''

Senator JOHN MCCAIN: ''The administration's current family separation policy is an affront to the decency of the American people, and contrary to principles and values upon which our Nation was founded. The administration has the power to rescind this policy. It should do so now.''

Senator SUSAN COLLINS, former First Lady Laura Bush—and I can go on and on and on—a whole bunch of Republicans now are all agreeing with us that the President is not telling us the truth.

So let me go back to the article: ''While Congress could pass a legislative fix, Republicans control both the House and the Senate—making it disingenuous at best to finger the opposing party, as the President has repeatedly done.

''Speaking to the National Federation of Independent Business on Tuesday, Trump again falsely painted the humanitarian crisis as a binary choice. 'We can either release all illegal immigrant families and minors who show up at the border from Central America, or we can arrest the adults for the Federal crime of illegal entry,' he said. 'Those are the only two options.'

''On Twitter, the President twice in the past 4 days has singled out Germany as facing an increase in crime. 'Crime in Germany is up 10 percent-plus (officials do not want to report these crimes) since migrants were accepted,' Trump wrote. 'Others countries are even worse. Be smart, America.'''

That is his tweet.

''In fact, the opposite is true. Reported crime in Germany was actually down by 10 percent last year and, according to German Interior Minister . . . the country's reported crime rate last year was actually at its lowest point in three decades.

''The President has also falsely claimed that the inspector general report 'exonerated' him from Mueller's probe, when the report did not delve into the Russia investigation. When he made this argument Friday during an impromptu press gaggle in the White House driveway, a reporter pressed him on the falsehood.

''''Sir, that has nothing to do with collusion,' the reporter said. 'Why are you lying about it, sir?'''

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is, we have a President who has a problem with the truth, and Congress needs to stand up and do the right thing. We need to speak the truth; we need to embrace the truth; and we need to solve some of the issues that are before the American people.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't need to remind anyone that the lie of the year for 2012 was: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor—words that will ring through this body probably for the rest of time.

I want to read from the Statement of Administration Policy, back to the business at hand, the rule on the three bills that we are considering today. This is the Statement of Administration Policy: ''Addressing the opioid crisis has been a top priority of the President since day one, and the administration welcomes legislation that complements its efforts to end the opioid crisis. The administration strongly supports House passage of bipartisan bills to protect patients enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid, create targeted programs for at-risk populations, expand access to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, and provide resources for States and communities struggling to deal with the scale of the opioid crisis.''

The statement goes on, and it concludes: ''These initiatives represent bold, evidence-based steps to prevent and treat opioid abuse, and will help save the lives of countless Americans. The administration commends the House on taking up these important bills. . . . The administration supports House passage of H.R. 5797, H.R. 6082, and H.R. 6. . . .''

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of these three important pieces of legislation aimed at

addressing the opioid crisis affecting so many of our fellow Americans.

H.R. 6, the Substance Use-Disorder Prevention that Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment for Patients and Communities Act; H.R. 5797, the Individuals in Medicaid Deserve Care that is Appropriate and Responsible in its Execution Act; and H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act, will all play a critical role in treating patients and providing Americans the tools to put the pieces of their lives back together again.

I commend Chairman WALDEN for his efforts on bringing so many Members of this body into the discussion and taking the many ideas offered by Members, incorporating them into the legislative products. The result of those efforts is a legislative trio that this entire body can be proud of, and this entire body can support.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support today's rule and the three underlying pieces of legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 949 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4501) to increase funding for the State response to the opioid misuse crisis and to provide funding for research on addiction and pain related to the substance misuse crisis. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4501.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 4 of rule XVI, I move that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, June 21, 2018, for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to fix the convening time will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 949; and

Adopting House Resolution 949, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 184, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

YEAS—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis

Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—184

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Black
Blum
Cheney
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Davidson
Ellison
Frankel (FL)
Gallagher
Graves (MO)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kinzinger
Pelosi
Polis
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Turner
Vela
Walz

□ 1149

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from ''yea'' to nay.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, SUBSTANCE USE-DISORDER PREVENTION THAT PROMOTES OPIOID RECOVERY AND TREATMENT FOR PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5797, INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICAID DESERVE CARE THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND RESPONSIBLE IN ITS EXECUTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6082, OVERDOSE PREVENTION AND PATIENT SAFETY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 949) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for opioid use disorder prevention, recovery, and treatment, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5797) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide under Medicaid services for certain individuals with opioid use disorders in institutions for mental diseases; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6082) to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 185, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

YEAS—221

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—185

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

Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Cheney
Collins (GA)
Davidson
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Frankel (FL)
Gallagher
Graves (MO)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kinzinger
Pelosi
Polis
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Turner
Vela
Walz

□ 1157

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 180, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—225

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—180

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

NOT VOTING—22

Bergman
Black
Blum
Cheney
Collins (GA)
Ellison
Frankel (FL)
Gallagher
Graves (MO)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kinzinger
Pascrell
Pelosi
Polis
Rush
Sinema
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Turner
Vela
Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1204

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, today, June 20, 2018, I was absent during the first vote series due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 272, "Yea" on rollcall No. 273, and "Yea" on rollcall No. 274.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote of the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

## COORDINATED RESPONSE THROUGH INTERAGENCY STRATEGY AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5925) to codify provisions relating to the Office of National Drug Control, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5925

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act'' or the ''CRISIS Act''.

**SEC. 2. OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL.**

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The Office of National Drug Control Policy shall be known as the ''Office of National Drug Control''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any other Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or relating to the Office of National Drug Control Policy is deemed to refer to the Office of National Drug Control.

(c) CODIFICATION.—Subtitle I of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

**''CHAPTER 10—OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL**

''SUBCHAPTER I—OFFICE

''1001. Definitions.
''1002. Office of National Drug Control.
''1003. Administration of the Office.
''1004. National drug control program budget.
''1005. National drug control strategy.
''1006. Development of an annual national drug control assessment.
''1007. Monitoring and evaluation of national drug control program.
''1008. Coordination and oversight of the national drug control program.

''1009. Emerging threats task force, plan, campaign.
''1010. National and international coordination.
''1011. Interdiction.
''1012. Treatment coordinator.
''1013. Critical information coordination.
''1014. Authorization of appropriations.
''SUBCHAPTER II—DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM
''1021. Establishment of drug-free communities support program.
''1022. Program authorization.
''1023. Information collection and dissemination with respect to grant recipients.
''1024. Technical assistance and training.
''1025. Supplemental grants for coalition mentoring activities.
''1026. Authorization for National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute.
''1027. Definitions.
''1028. Drug–free communities reauthorization.
''SUBCHAPTER I—OFFICE

**"§ 1001. Definitions**

''In this chapter:

''(1) AGENCY.—The term 'agency' has the meaning given the term 'executive agency' in section 102.

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(i) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Caucus on International Narcotics Control of the Senate; and

''(ii) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

''(B) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Any submission to Congress shall mean submission to the appropriate congressional committees.

''(3) DEMAND REDUCTION.—The term 'demand reduction' means any activity conducted by a National Drug Control Program Agency, other than an enforcement activity, that is intended to reduce or prevent the use of drugs or support or provide treatment and recovery efforts, including—

''(A) education about the dangers of illicit drug use;

''(B) services, programs, or strategies to prevent substance use disorder, including evidence-based education campaigns, community-based prevention programs, collection and disposal of unused prescription drugs, and services to at-risk populations to prevent or delay initial use of an illicit drug;

''(C) substance use disorder treatment;

''(D) illicit drug use research;

''(E) drug-free workplace programs;

''(F) drug testing, including the testing of employees;

''(G) interventions for illicit drug use and dependence;

''(H) expanding availability of access to health care services for the treatment of substance use disorders;

''(I) international drug control coordination and cooperation with respect to activities described in this paragraph;

''(J) pre- and post-arrest criminal justice interventions such as diversion programs, drug courts, and the provision of evidence-based treatment to individuals with substance use disorders who are arrested or under some form of criminal justice supervision, including medication assisted treatment;

''(K) other coordinated and joint initiatives among Federal, State, local, and Tribal agencies to promote comprehensive drug control strategies designed to reduce the demand for, and the availability of, illegal drugs;

''(L) international illicit drug use education, prevention, treatment, recovery, research, rehabilitation activities, and interventions for illicit drug use and dependence; and

''(M) research related to any of the activities described in this paragraph.

''(4) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of National Drug Control.

''(5) DRUG.—The term 'drug' has the meaning given the term 'controlled substance' in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)).

''(6) DRUG CONTROL.—The term 'drug control' means any activity conducted by a National Drug Control Program Agency involving supply reduction or demand reduction.

''(7) EMERGING DRUG THREAT.—The term 'emerging drug threat' means the occurrence of a new and growing trend in the use of an illicit drug or class of drugs, including rapid expansion in the supply of or demand for such drug.

''(8) ILLICIT DRUG USE; ILLICIT DRUGS; ILLEGAL DRUGS.—The terms 'illicit drug use', 'illicit drugs', and 'illegal drugs' include the illegal or illicit use of prescription drugs.

''(9) LAW ENFORCEMENT.—The term 'law enforcement' or 'drug law enforcement' means all efforts by a Federal, State, local, or Tribal government agency to enforce the drug laws of the United States or any State, including investigation, arrest, prosecution, and incarceration or other punishments or penalties.

''(10) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM.—The term 'National Drug Control Program' means programs, policies, and activities undertaken by National Drug Control Program Agencies pursuant to the responsibilities of such agencies under the National Drug Control Strategy, including any activities involving supply reduction, demand reduction, or State, local, and Tribal affairs.

''(11) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM AGENCY.—The term 'National Drug Control Program Agency' means any agency (or bureau, office, independent agency, board, division, commission, subdivision, unit, or other component thereof) that is responsible for implementing any aspect of the National Drug Control Strategy, including any agency that receives Federal funds to implement any aspect of the National Drug Control Strategy, but does not include any agency that receives funds for drug control activity solely under the National Intelligence Program or the Military Intelligence Program.

''(12) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY; STRATEGY.—The term 'National Drug Control Strategy' or 'Strategy' means the strategy developed and submitted to Congress under section 1005.

''(13) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

''(14) OFFICE.—The term 'Office' means the Office of National Drug Control.

''(15) STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL AFFAIRS.—The term 'State, local, and Tribal affairs' means domestic activities conducted by a National Drug Control Program Agency that are intended to reduce the availability and use of illegal drugs, including—

''(A) coordination and enhancement of Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement drug control efforts;

''(B) coordination and enhancement of efforts among National Drug Control Program Agencies and State, local, and Tribal demand reduction and supply reduction agencies;

''(C) coordination and enhancement of Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement initiatives to gather, analyze, and disseminate information and law enforcement intelligence relating to drug control among domestic law enforcement agencies; and

''(D) other coordinated and joint initiatives among Federal, State, local, and Tribal agencies to promote comprehensive drug control strategies designed to reduce the demand for, and the availability of, illegal drugs.

''(16) SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT.—The term 'substance use disorder treatment' means an evidence-based, professionally directed, deliberate, and planned regimen including evaluation, observation, medical monitoring, and rehabilitative services and interventions such as pharmacotherapy, behavioral therapy, and individual and group counseling, on an inpatient or outpatient basis, to help patients with substance use disorder reach recovery.

''(17) SUPPLY REDUCTION.—The term 'supply reduction' means any activity or program conducted by a National Drug Control Program Agency that is intended to reduce the availability or use of illegal drugs in the United States or abroad, including—

''(A) law enforcement outside the United States;

''(B) domestic law enforcement;

''(C) source country programs, including economic development programs primarily intended to reduce the production or trafficking of illicit drugs;

''(D) activities to control international trafficking in, and availability of, illegal drugs, including—

''(i) accurate assessment and monitoring of international drug production and interdiction programs and policies; and

''(ii) coordination and promotion of compliance with international treaties relating to the production, transportation, or interdiction of illegal drugs;

''(E) activities to conduct and promote international law enforcement programs and policies to reduce the supply of drugs;

''(F) activities to facilitate and enhance the sharing of domestic and foreign intelligence information among National Drug Control Program Agencies, relating to the production and trafficking of drugs in the United States and in foreign countries;

''(G) activities to prevent the diversion of drugs for their illicit use; and

''(H) research related to any of the activities described in this paragraph.

**"§ 1002. Office of National Drug Control**

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—There is established in the Executive Office of the President an Office of National Drug Control, which shall—

''(1) lead the national drug control effort, including coordinating with Nation Drug Control Program Agencies;

''(2) coordinate and oversee the implementation of the national drug control policy, including the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(3) assess and certify the adequacy of National Drug Control Programs and the budget for those programs;

''(4) monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of national drug control policy efforts, including the National Drug Control Program Agencies' programs, by developing and applying specific goals and performance measurements and tracking program-level spending;

''(5) identify and respond to emerging drug threats related to illicit drug use;

''(6) administer and evaluate grant programs in furtherance of the National Drug Control Strategy; and

''(7) facilitate broad-scale information sharing and data standardization among Federal, State, and local entities to support the national drug control efforts.

''(b) DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR.—

''(1) DIRECTOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be at the head of the Office a Director who shall hold the same rank and status as the head of an executive department listed in section 101 of title 5.

''(B) APPOINTMENT.—The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

''(2) DEPUTY DIRECTOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Deputy Director who shall report directly to the Director, be appointed by the President, and serve at the pleasure of the President.

''(B) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Deputy Director shall—

''(i) carry out the responsibilities delegated by the Director; and

''(ii) be responsible for effectively coordinating with the each Coordinator established under this chapter.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(1) POLICIES, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES.—The Director shall assist the President in directing national drug control efforts, including establishing policies, goals, objectives, and priorities for the National Drug Control Program that are based on evidence-based research.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—To formulate the National Drug Control policies, goals, objectives, and priorities, the Director—

''(A) shall consult with—

''(i) State and local governments;

''(ii) National Drug Control Program Agencies;

''(iii) each committee, working group, council, or other entity established under this chapter, as appropriate;

''(iv) the public;

''(v) appropriate congressional committees; and

''(vi) any other person in the discretion of the Director; and

''(B) may—

''(i) establish advisory councils;

''(ii) acquire data from agencies; and

''(iii) request data from any other entity.

**''§ 1003. Administration of the Office**

''(a) EMPLOYMENT.—

''(1) AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR.—The Director may select, appoint, employ, and fix compensation of such officers and employees of the Office as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Office under this chapter.

''(2) PROHIBITIONS.—

''(A) GENERALLY.—No person shall serve as Director or Deputy Director while serving in any other position in the Federal Government.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING.—Any officer or employee of the Office who is appointed to that position by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may not participate in Federal election campaign activities, except that such officer or employee is not prohibited by this subparagraph from making contributions to individual candidates.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS OR BALLOT INITIATIVES.—No funds authorized under this chapter may be obligated for the purpose of influencing any Federal, State, or local election or ballot initiative.

''(c) PERSONNEL DETAILED TO OFFICE.—

''(1) EVALUATIONS.—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 43 of title 5, the Director shall perform the evaluation of the performance of any employee detailed to the Office for purposes of the applicable performance appraisal system established under such chapter for any rating period, or part thereof, that such employee is detailed to the Office.

''(2) COMPENSATION.—

''(A) BONUS PAYMENTS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Director may provide periodic bonus payments to any employee detailed to the Office.

''(B) RESTRICTIONS.—An amount paid under this paragraph to an employee for any period—

''(i) shall not be greater than 20 percent of the basic pay paid or payable to such employee for such period; and

''(ii) shall be in addition to the basic pay of such employee.

''(C) AGGREGATE AMOUNT.—The aggregate amount paid during any fiscal year to an employee detailed to the Office as basic pay, awards, bonuses, and other compensation shall not exceed the annual rate payable at the end of such fiscal year for positions at level III of the Executive Schedule.

''(d) CONGRESSIONAL ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The location of the Office in the Executive Office of the President shall not be construed as affecting access by Congress, or any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate, to any—

''(1) information, document, or study in the possession of, or conducted by or at the direction of the Director; or

''(2) personnel of the Office.

''(e) OTHER AUTHORITIES OF THE DIRECTOR.—In carrying out this chapter, the Director may—

''(1) use for administrative purposes, on a reimbursable basis, the available services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal, State, and local agencies;

''(2) procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5 relating to appointments in the Federal Service, at rates of compensation for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate of pay payable under level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5311 of such title; and

''(3) use the mails in the same manner as any other agency.

''(f) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Director, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Director may request.

**''§ 1004. National drug control program budget**

''(a) BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than July 1 of each year, the Director shall provide to the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency budget recommendations, including requests for specific initiatives that are consistent with the priorities of the President under the National Drug Control Strategy, which shall—

''(1) apply to the budget for the next fiscal year scheduled for formulation under chapter 11, and each of the 4 subsequent fiscal years; and

''(2) address funding priorities developed in the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency shall transmit to the Director a copy of the proposed drug control budget request of such agency at the same time as that budget request is submitted to their superiors (and before submission to the Office of Management and Budget) in the preparation of the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a).

''(2) SUBMISSION OF DRUG CONTROL BUDGET REQUESTS.—The head of each National Drug Control Program Agency shall ensure timely development and submission to the Director of each proposed drug control budget request transmitted pursuant to this subsection, in such format as may be designated by the Director with the concurrence of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(3) CONTENT OF DRUG CONTROL BUDGET REQUESTS.—A drug control budget request submitted by the head of a National Drug Control Program Agency under this subsection shall include all requests for funds for any drug control activity undertaken by such agency, including demand reduction, supply reduction, and State, local, and Tribal affairs, including any drug law enforcement activities. If an activity has both drug control and nondrug control purposes or applications, such agency shall estimate by a documented calculation the total funds requested for that activity that would be used for drug control, and shall set forth in its request the basis and method for making the estimate.

''(c) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF BUDGET REQUESTS AND BUDGET SUBMISSIONS OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall review each drug control budget request submitted to the Director under subsection (b).

''(2) REVIEW OF BUDGET REQUESTS.—

''(A) INADEQUATE REQUESTS.—If the Director concludes that a budget request submitted under subsection (b) is inadequate, in whole or in part, to implement the objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy with respect to the agency or program at issue for the year for which the request is submitted, the Director shall submit to the head of the applicable National Drug Control Program Agency a written description identifying the funding levels and specific initiatives that would, in the determination of the Director, make the request adequate to implement those objectives.

''(B) ADEQUATE REQUESTS.—If the Director concludes that a budget request submitted under subsection (b) is adequate to implement the objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy with respect to the agency or program at issue for the year for which the request is submitted, the Director shall submit to the head of the applicable National Drug Control Program Agency a written statement confirming the adequacy of the request.

''(C) RECORD.—The Director shall maintain a record of each description submitted under subparagraph (A) and each statement submitted under subparagraph (B).

''(3) SPECIFIC REQUESTS.—The Director shall not confirm the adequacy of any budget request that requests a level of funding that will not enable achievement of the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy, including—

''(A) requests funding for Federal law enforcement activities that do not adequately compensate for transfers of drug enforcement resources and personnel to law enforcement and investigation activities;

''(B) requests funding for law enforcement activities on the borders of the United States that do not adequately direct resources to drug interdiction and enforcement;

''(C) requests funding for substance use disorder treatment activities that do not provide adequate results and accountability measures;

''(D) requests funding for substance use disorder treatment activities that do not adequately support and enhance Federal substance use disorder programs and capacity; and

''(E) requests funding for the operations and management of the Department of Homeland Security that does not include a specific request for funds for the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement to carry out its responsibilities under section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 458).

''(4) AGENCY RESPONSE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of a National Drug Control Program Agency that receives a description under paragraph (2)(A) shall include the funding levels and initiatives described by the Director in the budget submission for that agency to the Office of Management and Budget.

''(B) IMPACT STATEMENT.—The head of a National Drug Control Program Agency that has altered its budget submission under this paragraph shall include as an appendix to the budget submission for that agency to the Office of Management and Budget an impact statement that summarizes—

''(i) the changes made to the budget under this paragraph; and

''(ii) the impact of those changes on the ability of that agency to perform its other responsibilities, including any impact on specific missions or programs of the agency.

''(C) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The head of a National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit a copy of any impact statement under subparagraph (B) to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the appropriate congressional committees, at the time the budget for that agency is submitted to Congress under section 1105(a).

''(5) CERTIFICATION OF BUDGET SUBMISSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—At the time the head of a National Drug Control Program Agency submits its budget request to the Office of Management and Budget, the head of the National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit a copy of the budget request to the Director.

''(B) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF SUBMISSIONS.—The Director shall review each budget submission submitted under subparagraph (A) and submit to the appropriate congressional committees one of the following:

''(i) A written certification of the budget submission for the agency indicating such request fully funds the National Drug Control Programs as necessary to achieve the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy, including a written statement explaining the basis for the determination that the budget submission provides sufficient resources for the agency to achieve the goals of the Strategy.

''(ii) A written certification of the budget submission for the agency indicating such request partially funds the National Drug Control Programs as necessary to achieve the goals of the Strategy, including a written statement explaining the basis for the determination to certify the budget submission and identifying the level of funding sufficient to achieve the goals of the Strategy.

''(iii) A written decertification of the budget submission for the agency indicating the Director is unable to determine whether such budget submission for the agency fully funds or partially funds the National Drug Control Programs as necessary to achieve the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy, including a written statement identifying the additional information necessary for the Director to make a determination on such budget submission and the level of funding sufficient to achieve the goals of the Strategy.

''(iv) A written decertification of the budget submission for the agency indicating that such budget is insufficient to fund the National Drug Control Programs as necessary to achieve the goals of the Strategy, including a written statement explaining the basis for the determination that the budget is insufficient and identifying the level of funding sufficient to achieve the goals of the Strategy.

''(d) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM BUDGET PROPOSAL.—For each fiscal year, following the transmission of proposed drug control budget requests to the Director under subsection (b), the Director shall, in consultation with the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency and the head of each major national organization that represents law enforcement officers, agencies, or associations—

''(1) develop a consolidated National Drug Control Program budget proposal designed to implement the National Drug Control Strategy and to inform Congress and the public about the total amount proposed to be spent on all supply reduction, demand reduction, State, local, and Tribal affairs, including any drug law enforcement, and other drug control activities by the Federal Government, which shall conform to the content requirements set forth in subsection (b)(3) and include—

''(A) for each National Drug Control Program Agency, a list of whether the funding level is full, partial, or insufficient to achieve the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy or whether the Director is unable to make such determination;

''(B) a statement describing the extent to which any budget of a National Drug Control Program Agency with less than full funding hinders progress on achieving the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy; and

''(C) alternative funding structures that could improve progress on achieving the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy; and

''(2) submit the consolidated budget proposal to the President and Congress.

''(e) BUDGET ESTIMATE OR REQUEST SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Whenever the Director submits any budget estimate or request to the President or the Office of Management and Budget, the Director shall concurrently transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed statement of the budgetary needs of the Office to execute its mission based on the good-faith assessment of the Director.

''(f) REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER REQUESTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit to Congress a reprogramming or transfer request with respect to any amount of appropriated funds in an amount exceeding $1,000,000 that is included in the National Drug Control Program budget unless the request has been approved by the Director. If the Director has not responded to a request for reprogramming subject to this paragraph within 30 days after receiving notice of the request having been made, the request shall be deemed approved by the Director under this paragraph and forwarded to Congress.

''(2) APPEAL.—The head of any National Drug Control Program Agency may appeal to the President any disapproval by the Director of a reprogramming or transfer request under this subsection.

**''§ 1005. National drug control strategy**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) STATEMENT OF DRUG POLICY PRIORITIES.—The Director shall release a statement of drug control policy priorities in the calendar year of a Presidential inauguration following the inauguration but not later than April 1.

''(2) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT.—Not later than the first Monday in February following the year in which the term of the President commences, the President shall submit to Congress a National Drug Control Strategy.

''(b) DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—

''(1) PROMULGATION.—The Director shall promulgate the National Drug Control Strategy, which shall set forth a comprehensive plan to reduce illicit drug use and the consequences of such illicit drug use in the United States by limiting the availability of and reducing the demand for illegal drugs and promoting prevention, early intervention, treatment, and recovery support for individuals with substance use disorders.

''(2) STATE AND LOCAL COMMITMENT.—The Director shall seek the support and commitment of State, local, and Tribal officials in the formulation and implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(3) STRATEGY BASED ON EVIDENCE.—The Director shall ensure the National Drug Control Strategy is based on the best available medical and scientific evidence regarding the policies that are most effective in reducing the demand for and supply of illegal drugs.

''(4) PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—In developing and effectively implementing the National Drug Control Strategy, the Director—

''(A) shall consult with—

''(i) the heads of the National Drug Control Program Agencies;

''(ii) each Coordinator established under this chapter;

''(iii) the Interdiction Committee, the Treatment Committee, and the Emerging Threats Task Force;

''(iv) the appropriate congressional committees and any other committee of jurisdiction;

''(v) State, local, and Tribal officials;

''(vi) private citizens and organizations, including community and faith-based organizations, with experience and expertise in demand reduction;

''(vii) private citizens and organizations with experience and expertise in supply reduction; and

''(viii) appropriate representatives of foreign governments; and

''(B) in satisfying the requirements of subparagraph (A), shall ensure, to the maximum extent possible, that State, local, and Tribal officials and relevant private organizations commit to support and take steps to achieve the goals and objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(c) CONTENTS OF THE NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The National Drug Control Strategy submitted under subsection (a)(2) shall include the following:

''(A) A description of the current prevalence of illicit drug use in the United States, including both the availability of illicit drugs and the prevalence of substance use disorders, which shall include the following:

''(i) Such description for the previous three years for any drug identified as an emerging threat under section 1009 and any other illicit drug identified by the Director as having a significant impact on the prevalence of illicit drug use.

''(ii) A summary of the data and trends presented in the Drug Control Data Dashboard required under section 1013.

''(B) A mission statement detailing the major functions of the National Drug Control Program.

''(C) A list of comprehensive, research-based, long-range, quantifiable goals for reducing illicit drug use, including—

''(i) the percentage of the total flow of illicit drugs to be interdicted during the time period covered by the Strategy; and

''(ii) the number of individuals to receive substance use disorder treatment.

''(D) A description of how each goal established under subparagraph (C) will be achieved, including for each goal—

''(i) a list of each relevant National Drug Control Program Agency and each such agency's related programs, activities, and available assets and the role of each such program, activity, and asset in achieving such goal;

''(ii) a list of relevant stakeholders and each such stakeholder's role in achieving such goal;

''(iii) an estimate of Federal funding and other resources needed to achieve such goal;

''(iv) a list of each existing or new coordinating mechanism needed to achieve such goal; and

''(v) a description of the Office's role in facilitating the achievement of such goal.

''(E) For each year covered by the Strategy, a performance evaluation plan for each goal established under subparagraph (C) for each National Drug Control Program Agency, including—

''(i) specific performance measures for each National Drug Control Program Agency and each such agency's related programs and activities;

''(ii) annual and, to the extent practicable, quarterly objectives and targets for each performance measure; and

''(iii) an estimate of Federal funding and other resources needed to achieve each performance objective and target.

''(F) A list identifying existing data sources or a description of data collection needed to evaluate performance, including a description of how the Director will obtain such data.

''(G) A list of any anticipated challenges to achieving the National Drug Control Strategy goals and planned actions to address such challenges.

''(H) A description of how each goal established under subparagraph (C) was determined, including—

''(i) a description of each required consultation and a description of how such consultation was incorporated;

''(ii) data, research, or other information used to inform the determination to establish the goal; and

''(iii) for any goal established under subparagraph (C)(i), a statement of whether the goal will be adequate to disrupt drug trafficking organizations that supply the majority of foreign-sourced illicit drugs trafficked into the United States.

''(I) A 5-year projection for program and budget priorities.

''(J) A review of international, State, local, and private sector drug control activities to ensure that the United States pursues coordinated and effective drug control at all levels of government.

''(K) Such statistical data and information as the Director considers appropriate to demonstrate and assess trends relating to illicit drug use, the effects and consequences of illicit drug use (including the effects on children), supply reduction, demand reduction, drug-related law enforcement, and the implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(2) ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall include in the National Drug Control Strategy the additional strategies described under this paragraph and shall comply with the following:

''(i) Provide a copy of the additional strategies to the appropriate congressional committees and to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

''(ii) Issue the additional strategies in consultation with the head of each relevant National Drug Control Program Agency, any relevant official of a State, local, or Tribal government, and the government of other relevant countries.

''(iii) Not change any existing agency authority or construe any strategy described under this paragraph to amend or modify any law governing interagency relationship but may include recommendations about changes to such authority or law.

''(iv) Present separately from the rest of any strategy described under this paragraph any information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director or the head of any relevant National Drug Control Program Agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, local, or Tribal agency.

''(B) REQUIREMENT FOR SOUTHWEST BORDER COUNTERNARCOTICS.—

''(i) PURPOSES.—The Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall—

''(I) set forth the Government's strategy for preventing the illegal trafficking of drugs across the international border between the United States and Mexico, including through ports of entry and between ports of entry on that border;

''(II) state the specific roles and responsibilities of the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies for implementing that strategy; and

''(III) identify the specific resources required to enable the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies to implement that strategy.

''(ii) SPECIFIC CONTENT RELATED TO DRUG TUNNELS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.—The Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall include—

''(I) a strategy to end the construction and use of tunnels and subterranean passages that cross the international border between the United States and Mexico for the purpose of illegal trafficking of drugs across such border; and

''(II) recommendations for criminal penalties for persons who construct or use such a tunnel or subterranean passage for such a purpose.

''(C) REQUIREMENT FOR NORTHERN BORDER COUNTERNARCOTICS STRATEGY.—

''(i) PURPOSES.—The Northern Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall—

''(I) set forth the strategy of the Federal Government for preventing the illegal trafficking of drugs across the international border between the United States and Canada, including through ports of entry and between ports of entry on the border;

''(II) state the specific roles and responsibilities of each relevant National Drug Control Program Agency for implementing the strategy;

''(III) identify the specific resources required to enable the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies to implement the strategy;

''(IV) be designed to promote, and not hinder, legitimate trade and travel; and

''(V) reflect the unique nature of small communities along the international border between the United States and Canada, ongoing cooperation and coordination with Canadian law, enforcement authorities, and variations in the volumes of vehicles and pedestrians crossing through ports of entry along the international border between the United States and Canada.

''(ii) SPECIFIC CONTENT RELATED TO CROSS-BORDER INDIAN RESERVATIONS.—The Northern Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall include—

''(I) a strategy to end the illegal trafficking of drugs to or through Indian reservations on or near the international border between the United States and Canada; and

''(II) recommendations for additional assistance, if any, needed by Tribal law enforcement agencies relating to the strategy, including an evaluation of Federal technical and financial assistance, infrastructure capacity building, and interoperability deficiencies.

''(3) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Any contents of the National Drug Control Strategy that involve information properly classified under criteria established by an Executive order shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(4) SELECTION OF DATA AND INFORMATION.—In selecting data and information for inclusion in the Strategy, the Director shall ensure—

''(A) the inclusion of data and information that will permit analysis of current trends against previously compiled data and information where the Director believes such analysis enhances long-term assessment of the National Drug Control Strategy; and

''(B) the inclusion of data and information to permit a standardized and uniform assessment of the effectiveness of drug treatment programs in the United States.

''(d) ANNUAL PERFORMANCE SUPPLEMENT.—Not later than the first Monday in February of each year following the year in which the National Drug Control Strategy is submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(2), the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a supplement to the Strategy that shall include—

''(1) annual and, to the extent practicable, quarterly quantifiable and measurable objectives and specific targets to accomplish long-term quantifiable goals specified in the Strategy; and

''(2) for each year covered by the Strategy, a performance evaluation plan for each goal listed in the Strategy for each National Drug Control Program Agency, including—

''(A) specific performance measures for each National Drug Control Program Agency and each such agency's related programs and activities;

''(B) annual and, to the extent practicable, quarterly objectives and targets for each performance measure; and

''(C) an estimate of Federal funding and other resources needed to achieve each performance objective and target.

''(e) SUBMISSION OF REVISED STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may submit to Congress a revised National Drug Control Strategy that meets the requirements of this section—

''(A) at any time, upon a determination of the President, in consultation with the Director, that the National Drug Control Strategy in effect is not sufficiently effective; or

''(B) if a new President or Director takes office.

''(2) NO SUBMISSION .—In each year the President does not submit a National Drug Control Strategy or a revised National Drug Control Strategy, the Director shall evaluate the efficacy and appropriateness of the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy and include a statement affirming the adequacy of the goals in the performance supplement under subsection (d).

''(f) FAILURE OF PRESIDENT TO SUBMIT NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—If the President does not submit a National Drug Control Strategy to Congress in accordance with subsection (a)(2), not later than five days after the first Monday in February following the year in which the term of the President commences, the President shall

send a notification to the appropriate congressional committees—

''(1) explaining why the Strategy was not submitted; and

''(2) specifying the date by which the Strategy will be submitted.

**''§ 1006. Development of an annual national drug control assessment**

''(a) TIMING.—Not later than the first Monday in February of each year, the Director shall submit to the President, Congress, and the appropriate congressional committees, a report assessing the progress of each National Drug Control Program Agency toward achieving each goal, objective, and target contained in the National Drug Control Strategy applicable to the prior fiscal year.

''(b) PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than November 1 of each year, the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit, in accordance with guidance issued by the Director, to the Director an evaluation of progress by the agency with respect to the National Drug Control Strategy goals using the performance measures for the agency developed under this chapter, including progress with respect to—

''(1) success in achieving the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(2) success in reducing domestic and foreign sources of illegal drugs;

''(3) success in expanding access to and increasing the effectiveness of substance use disorder treatment;

''(4) success in protecting the borders of the United States (and in particular the Southwestern border of the United States) from penetration by illegal narcotics;

''(5) success in reducing crime associated with drug use in the United States;

''(6) success in reducing the negative health and social consequences of drug use in the United States; and

''(7) implementation of substance use disorder treatment and prevention programs in the United States and improvements in the adequacy and effectiveness of such programs.

''(c) CONTENTS OF THE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.—The Director shall include in the annual assessment required under subsection (a)—

''(1) a summary of each evaluation received by the Director under subsection (b);

''(2) a summary of the progress of each National Drug Control Program Agency toward the National Drug Control Strategy goals of the agency using the performance measures for the agency developed under this chapter;

''(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of each National Drug Control Program Agency and program in achieving the National Drug Control Strategy for the previous year, including a specific evaluation of whether the applicable goals, measures, objectives, and targets for the previous year were met;

''(4) for each National Drug Control Program Agency that administers grant programs, an evaluation of the effectiveness of each grant program, including an accounting of the funds disbursed by the program in the prior year and a summary of how those funds were used by the grantees and sub-grantees during that period;

''(5) a detailed accounting of the amount of funds obligated by each National Drug Control Program Agency in carrying out the responsibilities of that agency under the Strategy;

''(6) an assessment of the effectiveness of any Emerging Threat Response Plan in effect for the previous year, including a specific evaluation of whether the objectives and targets were met and reasons for the success or failure of the previous year's plan;

''(7) a detailed accounting of the amount of funds obligated during the previous fiscal year for carrying out the campaign under section 1009(d), including each recipient of funds, the purpose of each expenditure, the amount of each expenditure, any available outcome information, and any other information necessary to provide a complete accounting of the funds expended; and

''(8) the assessments required under this subsection shall be based on the Performance Measurement System describe in subsection (d).

''(d) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM.—The Director shall include in the annual assessment required under subsection (a) a national drug control performance measurement system, that—

''(1) develops annual, 2-year, and 5-year performance measures, objectives, and targets for each National Drug Control Strategy goal and objective established for reducing drug use, availability, and the consequences of drug use;

''(2) describes the sources of information and data that will be used for each performance measure incorporated into the performance measurement system;

''(3) identifies major programs and activities of the National Drug Control Program Agencies that support the goals and annual objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(4) evaluates the contribution of demand reduction and supply reduction activities implemented by each National Drug Control Program Agency in support of the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(5) monitors consistency between the drug-related goals, measures, targets, and objectives of the National Drug Control Program Agencies and ensures that each agency's goals and budgets support, and are fully consistent with, the National Drug Control Strategy; and

''(6) coordinates the development and implementation of national drug control data collection and reporting systems to support policy formulation and performance measurement, including an assessment of—

''(A) the quality of current drug use measurement instruments and techniques to measure supply reduction and demand reduction activities;

''(B) the adequacy of the coverage of existing national drug use measurement instruments and techniques to measure the illicit drug user population and groups that are at risk for illicit drug use;

''(C) the adequacy of the coverage of existing national treatment outcome monitoring systems to measure the effectiveness of substance use disorder treatment in reducing illicit drug use and criminal behavior during and after the completion of substance use disorder treatment; and

''(D) the actions the Director shall take to correct any deficiencies and limitations identified pursuant to subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

''(e) MODIFICATIONS.—A description of any modifications made during the preceding year to the national drug performance measurement system described in subsection (d) shall be included in each report submitted under subsection (a).

''(f) ANNUAL REPORT ON CONSULTATION.—The Director shall include in the annual assessment required under subsection (a)—

''(1) a detailed description of how the Office has consulted with and assisted State, local, and Tribal governments with respect to the formulation and implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy and other relevant issues; and

''(2) a general review of the status of, and trends in, demand reduction activities by private sector entities and community-based organizations, including faith-based organizations, to determine their effectiveness and the extent of cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between such entities and organizations and Federal, State, local, and Tribal government agencies.

''(g) PERFORMANCE-BUDGET COORDINATOR.—

''(1) DESIGNATION.—The Director shall designate or appoint a United States Performance-Budget Coordinator to—

''(A) ensure the Director has sufficient information necessary to analyze the performance of each National Drug Control Program Agency, the impact Federal funding has had on the goals in the Strategy, and the likely contributions to the goals of the Strategy based on funding levels of each National Drug Control Program Agency, to make an independent assessment of the budget request of each agency under section 1004;

''(B) advise the Director on agency budgets, performance measures and targets, and additional data and research needed to make informed policy decisions under sections 1004 and 1005; and

''(C) other duties as may be determined by the Director with respect to measuring or assessing performance or agency budgets.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF POSITION.—The Director shall determine whether the coordinator position is a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service or a career appointee at the GS–15 level (or equivalent) or above.

**''§ 1007. Monitoring and evaluation of national drug control program**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall monitor implementation of the National Drug Control Program and the activities of the National Drug Control Program Agencies in carrying out the goals and objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy including—

''(1) conducting program and performance audits and evaluations; and

''(2) requesting assistance from the Inspector General of the relevant agency in such audits and evaluations.

''(b) ACCOUNTING OF FUNDS EXPENDED.—(1) Not later than February 1 of each year, in accordance with guidance issued by the Director, the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit to the Director a detailed accounting of all funds expended by the agency for National Drug Control Program activities during the previous fiscal year and shall ensure such detailed accounting is authenticated for the previous fiscal year by the Inspector General for such agency prior to the submission to the Director as frequently as determined by the Inspector General but not less frequently that every three years.

''(2) The Director shall submit to Congress not later than April 1 of each year the information submitted to the Director under paragraph (1).

''(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Director shall notify any National Drug Control Program Agency if its activities are not in compliance with the responsibilities of the agency under the National Drug Control Strategy, transmit a copy of each such notification to the President and the appropriate congressional committees, and maintain a copy of each such notification.

''(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Director shall make such recommendations to the President and the appropriate congressional committees as the Director determines are appropriate regarding changes in the organization, management, and budgets of the National Drug Control Program Agencies, and changes in the allocation of personnel to and within those agencies, to implement the policies, goals, objectives, and priorities established under section 1002(c)(1) and the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A COORDINATED TRACKING SYSTEM.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish a coordinated tracking system of federally-funded initiatives and grant programs which shall—

''(A) be the central repository of all drug control grants;

''(B) identify duplication, overlap, or gaps in funding to provide increased accountability of federally-funded grants for substance use disorder treatment, prevention, and enforcement;

''(C) identify impediments that applicants currently have in the grant application process with applicable agencies; and

''(D) be developed and maintained by the Office with the support of designated National Drug Control Program Agencies and any other agency determined by the Director.

''(2) PERFORMANCE METRICS.—The Director shall identify metrics and achievable goals for grant recipients in furtherance of the Strategy. Such metrics shall be used to measure how effective each federally funded initiative is in achieving the objectives of the Strategy and to enable comparisons of federally funded initiatives to identify those that are the most cost effective.

''(3) GRANT APPLICATION STANDARDIZATION.—To reduce the administrative burden on grant applicants and improve oversight of Federal funds, the Director, in consultation with the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency, shall develop a plan for coordinating and standardizing drug control grant application processes and develop a joint application to be used by all National Drug Control Program Agencies.

''(4) CENTRAL PORTAL.—The Director shall maintain on the public, electronic portal of the Office a list all drug control grant programs available in a central location. The head of each National Drug Control Program Agency shall provide a complete list of all drug control program grant programs to the Director and annually update such list.

''(5) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall include in the assessment submitted to Congress under section 1006 an assessment on progress under this section.

**''§ 1008. Coordination and oversight of the national drug control program**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall coordinate and oversee the implementation by the National Drug Control Program Agencies of the policies, goals, objectives, and priorities established under section 1002(c)(1) and the fulfillment of the responsibilities of such agencies under the National Drug Control Strategy and make recommendations to National Drug Control Program Agency heads with respect to implementation of National Drug Control Programs.

''(b) DETAILING EMPLOYEES TO OTHER AGENCIES.—

''(1) REQUEST.—The Director may request the head of an agency or program of the Federal Government to place agency personnel who are engaged in drug control activities on temporary detail to another agency in order to implement the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(2) AGENCY COMPLIANCE.—The head of the agency shall comply with any request made under paragraph (1).

''(3) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF DETAILEES.—The maximum number of personnel who may be detailed to another agency (including the Office) under this subsection during any fiscal year is—

''(A) for the Department of Defense, 50; and

''(B) for any other agency, 10.

''(c) DIRECTING FEDERAL FUNDING.—The Director may transfer funds made available to a National Drug Control Program Agency for National Drug Control Strategy programs and activities to another account within such agency or to another National Drug Control Program Agency for National Drug Control Strategy programs and activities, except that—

''(1) the authority under this subsection may be limited in an annual appropriations Act or other provision of Federal law;

''(2) the Director may exercise the authority under this subsection only with the concurrence of the head of each affected agency;

''(3) in the case of an interagency transfer, the total amount of transfers under this subsection may not exceed 3 percent of the total amount of funds made available for National Drug Control Strategy programs and activities to the agency from which those funds are to be transferred;

''(4) funds transferred to an agency under this subsection may only be used to increase the funding for programs or activities authorized by law;

''(5) the Director shall—

''(A) submit to the appropriate congressional committees and any other applicable committee of jurisdiction, a reprogramming or transfer request in advance of any transfer under this subsection in accordance with the regulations of each affected agency; and

''(B) annually submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the effect of all transfers of funds made pursuant to this subsection or section 1004(f) during the 12-month period preceding the date on which the report is submitted; and

''(6) funds may only be used for—

''(A) expansion of demand reduction activities;

''(B) interdiction of illicit drugs on the high seas, in United States territorial waters, and at United States ports of entry by officers and employees of National Drug Control Program Agencies and domestic and foreign law enforcement officers;

''(C) accurate assessment and monitoring of international drug production and interdiction programs and policies;

''(D) activities to facilitate and enhance the sharing of domestic and foreign intelligence information among National Drug Control Program Agencies related to the production and trafficking of drugs in the United States and foreign countries;

''(E) activities to prevent the diversion of prescription drugs for illicit use; and

''(F) research related to any of these activities.

''(d) DIRECTING FEDERAL FUNDING TO RESPOND TO EMERGING THREATS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may transfer funds made available to a National Drug Control Program Agency for National Drug Control Strategy programs and activities to another account within such agency or to another National Drug Control Program Agency for National Drug Control Strategy programs and activities to implement the provisions of a plan developed under section 1009, except that—

''(A) the authority under this subsection may be limited in an annual appropriations Act or other provision of Federal law;

''(B) the Director may exercise the authority under this subsection only with the concurrence of the head of each affected agency;

''(C) in the case of an interagency transfer, the total amount of transfers under this subsection may not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of funds made available for National Drug Control Strategy programs and activities to the agency from which those funds are to be transferred;

''(D) funds transferred to an agency under this subsection may only be used to increase the funding for programs or activities authorized by law;

''(E) no transfer of funds under this subsection may result in a reduction in total Federal expenditures for substance use disorder treatment;

''(F) the Director shall—

''(i) submit to the appropriate congressional committees and any other applicable committee of jurisdiction, a reprogramming or transfer request in advance of any transfer under this subsection in accordance with the regulations of each affected agency; and

''(ii) annually submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the effect of all transfers of funds made pursuant to this subsection or section 1004(f) during the 12-month period preceding the date on which the report is submitted; and

''(G) funds may only be used for—

''(i) expansion of demand reduction activities;

''(ii) interdiction of illicit drugs on the high seas, in United States territorial waters, and at United States ports of entry by officers and employees of National Drug Control Program Agencies and domestic and foreign law enforcement officers;

''(iii) accurate assessment and monitoring of international drug production and interdiction programs and policies;

''(iv) activities to facilitate and enhance the sharing of domestic and foreign intelligence information among National Drug Control Program Agencies related to the production and trafficking of drugs in the United States and foreign countries;

''(v) activities to prevent the diversion of prescription drugs for illicit use; and

''(vi) research related to any of these activities.

''(2) INADEQUACY OF TRANSFER.—In the event the authority under this subsection is inadequate to implement the provisions of a plan developed under section 1009, the Director shall submit a request for funding to the appropriate congressional committees within 30 days after the date on which the Director determines there is a need for additional funding.

''(e) FUND CONTROL NOTICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may issue to the head of a National Drug Control Program Agency a fund control notice to ensure compliance with the National Drug Control Program Strategy. A fund control notice may direct that all or part of an amount appropriated to the National Drug Control Program Agency account be obligated by—

''(A) months, fiscal year quarters, or other time periods; and

''(B) activities, functions, projects, or object classes.

''(2) UNAUTHORIZED OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE PROHIBITED.—An officer or employee of a National Drug Control Program Agency shall not make or authorize an expenditure or obligation contrary to a fund control notice issued by the Director.

''(3) DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR VIOLATION.—In the case of a violation of paragraph (2) by an officer or employee of a National Drug Control Program Agency, the head of the agency, upon the request of and in consultation with the Director, may subject the officer or employee to appropriate administrative discipline, including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office.

''(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—Not later than 5 days after issuance of a fund control notice, the Director shall submit a copy of such fund control notice to the appropriate congressional committees and make such notice publicly available.

''(5) RESTRICTIONS.—The Director may not issue a fund control notice to direct that all or part of an amount appropriated to the National Drug Control Program Agency account be obligated, modified, or altered in any manner contrary, in whole or in part, to a specific appropriation or statute.

''(f) EXCLUSIONS.—The authorities described under subsections (c), (d), and (e) do not apply to any program under subchapter II or III.

''(g) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT PARTICIPATION.—The Director may participate in the drug certification process pursuant to section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) and section 706 of the Department of State Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 229j–1).

''(h) CERTIFICATIONS OF POLICY CHANGES TO DIRECTOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the head of a National Drug Control Program Agency shall, unless exigent circumstances require otherwise, notify the Director in writing regarding any proposed change in policies relating to the activities of that agency under the National Drug Control Program prior to implementation of such change. The Director shall promptly review such proposed change and certify to the head of that agency in writing whether such change is consistent with the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—If prior notice of a proposed change under paragraph (1) is not practicable—

''(A) the head of the National Drug Control Program Agency shall notify the Director of the proposed change as soon as practicable; and

''(B) upon such notification, the Director shall review the change and certify to the head of that agency in writing whether the change is consistent with the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(i) WORK IN CONJUNCTION WITH ASSISTANT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS.—The Director shall, in any matter affecting national security interests, work in conjunction with the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

''(j) AUTHORITIES NOT DEROGATED.—Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as derogating the authorities and responsibilities of the head of any agency, the Director of National Intelligence, or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency contained in the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a et seq.), or any other law.

**''§ 1009. Emerging threats task force, plan, campaign**

''(a) EMERGING THREATS TASK FORCE.—

''(1) EMERGING AND CONTINUING THREATS COORDINATOR.—The Director shall designate or appoint a United States Emerging and Continuing Threats Coordinator to perform the duties of that position described in this section and such other duties as may be determined by the Director. The Director shall determine whether the coordinator position is a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service or a career appointee at the GS–15 level (or equivalent) or above.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT AND MONITORING.—The Emerging and Continuing Threats Coordinator (referred to in this section as the 'Coordinator') shall monitor evolving and emerging drug threats in the United States and shall serve as Chair of an Emerging Threats Task Force (in this section, referred to as the 'task force'). The Director shall appoint other members of the task force, which shall include—

''(A) representatives from National Drug Control Program Agencies or other agencies;

''(B) representatives from State, local, and Tribal governments;

''(C) the Director of the National Drug Control Fusion Center established in section 1013; and

''(D) representatives from other entities as determined to be necessary by the Director.

''(3) INFORMATION REVIEW AND SHARING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The task force shall disseminate and facilitate the sharing with Federal, State, local, and Tribal officials and other entities as determined by the Director of pertinent information and data relating to the following:

''(i) Recent trends in drug supply and demand.

''(ii) Fatal and nonfatal overdoses.

''(iii) Demand for and availability of evidence-based substance use disorder treatment, including the extent of the unmet treatment need, and treatment admission trends.

''(iv) Recent trends in drug interdiction, supply, and demand from State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies.

''(v) Other subject matter as determined necessary by the Director.

''(B) CONTRACT, AGREEMENT, AND OTHER AUTHORITY.—The Director may award contracts, enter into interagency agreements, manage individual projects, and conduct other activities in support of the identification of emerging drug threats and in support of the development, implementation, and assessment of any Emerging Threat Response Plan.

''(C) DATA ANALYSIS ACTIVITIES.—In support of the task force, the National Drug Control Fusion Center is authorized to conduct and provide to the task force the results of data analysis activities that the task force requests to aid in their review of recent trends in the data disseminated under subparagraph (A).

''(4) CRITERIA TO IDENTIFY EMERGING DRUG THREATS.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a task force first meets, the task force shall develop and recommend to the Director criteria to be used to identify an emerging drug threat or the termination of an emerging drug threat designation based on information gathered by the task force in paragraph (2), statistical data, and other evidence.

''(5) MEETINGS.—The task force shall meet in person not less frequently than quarterly and at additional meetings if determined to be necessary by and at the call of the Chair to—

''(A) identify and discuss evolving and emerging drug trends in the United States using the criteria established in paragraph (3);

''(B) assist in the formulation of any plan described in subsection (c);

''(C) oversee implementation of the plan described in subsection (c); and

''(D) provide such other advice to the Coordinator and Director concerning strategy and policies for emerging drug threats and trends as the task force determines to be appropriate.

''(b) DESIGNATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Coordinator, the task force, and the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency, may designate an emerging drug threat in the United States.

''(2) STANDARDS FOR DESIGNATION.—The Director, in consultation with the Coordinator, shall promulgate and make publicly available standards by which a designation under paragraph (1) and the termination of such designation may be made. In developing such standards, the Director shall consider the recommendations of the task force and other criteria the Director considers to be appropriate.

''(3) PUBLIC STATEMENT REQUIRED.—The Director shall publish a public written statement on the portal of the Office explaining the designation of an emerging drug threat or the termination of such designation and shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the availability of such statement when a designation or termination of such designation has been made.

''(c) PLAN.—

''(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after making a designation under subsection (b), the Director shall publish and make publicly available an Emerging Threat Response Plan and notify the President and the appropriate congressional committees of such plan's availability.

''(2) TIMING.—Not less frequently than every 90 days after the date on which the plan is published under paragraph (1), the Director shall update the plan and report on implementation of the plan, until the Director issues the public statement required under subsection (b)(3) to terminate the emerging drug threat designation.

''(3) CONTENTS OF AN EMERGING THREAT RESPONSE PLAN.—The Director shall include in the plan—

''(A) a comprehensive strategic assessment of the emerging drug threat, including the current availability of, demand for, and effectiveness of evidence-based prevention, treatment, and enforcement programs and efforts to respond to the emerging drug threat;

''(B) comprehensive, research-based, long-range, quantifiable goals for addressing the emerging drug threat, including for reducing the supply of the drug designated as the emerging drug threat and for expanding the availability and effectiveness of evidence-based substance use disorder treatment and prevention programs to reduce the demand for the emerging drug threat;

''(C) performance measures pertaining to the plan's goals, including quantifiable and measurable objectives and specific targets;

''(D) the level of funding needed to implement the plan, including whether funding is available to be reprogrammed or transferred to support implementation of the plan or whether additional appropriations are necessary to implement the plan;

''(E) an implementation strategy for the education and public awareness campaign under subsection (d), including goals as described under subparagraph (B) and performance measures, objectives, and targets, as described under subparagraph (C); and

''(F) any other information necessary to inform the public of the status, progress, or response of an emerging drug threat.

''(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a designation is made under subsection (b), the Director, in consultation with the President, the appropriate congressional committees, and the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency, shall issue guidance on implementation of the plan described in this subsection to the National Drug Control Program Agencies and any other relevant agency determined to be necessary by the Director.

''(B) COORDINATOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Coordinator shall—

''(i) direct the implementation of the plan among the agencies identified in the plan, State, local, and Tribal governments, and other relevant entities;

''(ii) facilitate information-sharing between agencies identified in the plan, State, local, and Tribal governments, and other relevant entities; and

''(iii) monitor implementation of the plan by coordinating the development and implementation of collection and reporting systems to support performance measurement and adherence to the plan by agencies identified in plan, where appropriate.

''(C) REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which a designation is made under subsection (b) and in accordance

with paragraph (2)(C), the head of each agency identified in the plan shall submit to the Coordinator a report on implementation of the plan.

''(d) EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN FOR EMERGING DRUG THREATS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which a designation is made under subsection (b), the Director shall, to the extent feasible and appropriate, establish and implement an evidence-based substance use prevention education and public awareness campaign to inform the public about the dangers of any drug designated as an emerging drug threat. Such campaign shall—

''(A) educate the public about the dangers of such drug, including patient and family education about the characteristics and hazards of such drug and methods to safeguard against such dangers, including the safe disposal of such drug;

''(B) support evidence-based prevention programs targeting audiences' attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs concerning substance use and intentions to initiate or continue such use;

''(C) increase awareness of the negative consequences of drug use;

''(D) encourage individuals affected by substance use disorders to seek treatment and provide such individuals with information on how to recognize addiction issues, what forms of evidence-based treatment options are available, and how to access such treatment; and

''(E) combat the stigma of addiction and substance use disorders, including the stigma of treating such disorders with medication-assisted treatment therapies.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—For the planning of the campaign under paragraph (1), the Director shall consult with—

''(A) the head of any appropriate National Drug Control Program Agency to obtain advice on evidence-based scientific information for policy, program development, and evaluation;

''(B) experts in evidence-based media campaigns, education, evaluation, and communication;

''(C) experts on the designated drug;

''(D) State, local, and Tribal government officials and relevant agencies;

''(E) the public;

''(F) appropriate congressional committees; and

''(G) any other affected person, as determined by the Director.

''(3) GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may accept gifts and donations (in cash or in kind, including voluntary and uncompensated services or property), which shall be available until expended, for the purpose of supporting the education and public awareness campaign authorized in this section, including the media campaign.

''(B) ETHICS GUIDELINES.—The Director shall establish written guidelines setting forth the criteria to be used in determining whether a gift or donation should be declined under this section because the acceptance of the gift or donation would—

''(i) reflect unfavorably upon the ability of the Director or the Office, or any employee of the Office, to carry out responsibilities or official duties under this chapter in a fair and objective manner; or

''(ii) compromise the integrity or the appearance of integrity of programs or services provided under this chapter or of any official involved in those programs or services.

''(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For any campaign established under this subsection, the Director shall ensure the following:

''(i) Implementation is evidence-based, meets accepted standards for public awareness campaigns, and uses available resources in a manner to make the most progress toward achieving the goals identified in the Emerging Threats Response Plan and the requirements of paragraph (1).

''(ii) Information disseminated through the campaign is accurate.

''(iii) The Director approves the strategy of the campaign, all material distributed through the campaign, and the use of any Federal funds used for the campaign.

''(iv) The campaign is designed using strategies found to be most effective at achieving such goals and requirements of paragraph (1), which may include—

''(I) a media campaign, as described in subparagraph (B);

''(II) local, regional, or population specific messaging;

''(III) establishing partnerships and promoting coordination among community stakeholders, including public, nonprofit organizations, and for profit entities;

''(IV) providing support, training, and technical assistance to establish and expand school and community prevention programs;

''(V) creating websites to publicize and disseminate information;

''(VI) conducting outreach and providing educational resources for parents;

''(VII) establishing State or regional advisory councils to provide input and recommendations to raise awareness regarding the drug designated as an emerging drug threat;

''(VIII) collaborating with law enforcement; and

''(IX) support for school-based public health education classes to improve teen knowledge about the effects of such designated drug.

''(B) MEDIA CAMPAIGN.—Any campaign implemented under this subsection may include a media component, which—

''(i) shall be designed to prevent the use of the drug designated as an emerging drug threat and to achieve the goals and requirements of paragraph (1);

''(ii) shall be carried out through competitively awarded contracts to entities providing for the professional production and design of such campaign; and

''(iii) may include the use of television, radio, Internet, social media, and other commercial marketing venues and may be targeted to specific age groups based on peer-reviewed social research.

''(C) REQUIRED NOTICE FOR COMMUNICATION FROM THE OFFICE.—Any communication, including an advertisement, paid for or otherwise disseminated by the Office directly or through a contract awarded by the Office shall include a prominent notice informing the audience that the communication was paid for by of the Office.

''(5) EVALUATION.—

''(A) PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.—The Director shall include an evaluation of the campaign in the annual assessment under section 1006, which shall include the following:

''(i) A performance evaluation of the campaign, including progress toward meeting the goals, objectives, measures, and targets identified in the Emerging Threats Response Plan.

''(ii) A description of all policies and practices to eliminate the potential for waste, fraud, abuse, and to ensure Federal funds are used responsibly.

''(iii) A list of all contracts or other agreements entered into to implement the campaign.

''(iv) The results of any financial audit of the campaign.

''(v) A description of any evidence used to develop the campaign.

''(vi) The sources and amount of each gift or donation accepted by the Office, and the source and amount of each gift or donation accepted by a contractor to be used in its performance of a contract for the campaign.

''(B) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—Not later than 180 days after establishing a campaign under paragraph (1) and not less than frequently than every two years thereafter, the Director shall—

''(i) designate an independent entity to evaluate the effectiveness of the campaign with meeting the goals established in the Emerging Threat Response Plan and the requirements of paragraph (1); and

''(ii) submit the results of the independent evaluation to the appropriate congressional committees.

''(6) FUNDING PROHIBITIONS.—None of the amounts made available under this subsection may be obligated for any of the following:

''(A) To supplant current anti-drug community-based coalitions.

''(B) To supplant pro bono public service time donated by national and local broadcasting network for other public services campaigns.

''(C) For partisan political purposes, or express advocacy in support of or to defeat any clearly identified candidate, clearly identified ballot initiative, or clearly identified legislative or regulatory proposal.

''(D) For any advocacy in support of any particular company, industry association, or advocacy group or the explicit policy positions held by such groups.

''(E) To direct any individuals to a specific type of substance use disorder treatment, treatment facility, medical provider, or form of medication assisted treatment.

''(F) To fund any advertising that features any elected officials, persons seeking elected office, cabinet level officials, or other Federal officials employed pursuant to section 213 of Schedule C of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office to carry out this section, $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

**''§ 1010. National and international coordination**

''(a) DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH AND INFORMATION TO STATES.—The Director shall ensure that drug control research and information is effectively disseminated by National Drug Control Program Agencies to State and local governments and nongovernmental entities involved in demand reduction by—

''(1) encouraging formal consultation between any such agency that conducts or sponsors research, and any such agency that disseminates information in developing research and information product development agendas;

''(2) encouraging such agencies (as appropriate) to develop and implement dissemination plans that specifically target State and local governments and nongovernmental entities involved in demand reduction; and

''(3) supporting the substance abuse information clearinghouse administered by the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use and established in section 501(d)(16) of the Public Health Service Act by—

''(A) encouraging all National Drug Control Program Agencies to provide all appropriate and relevant information; and

''(B) supporting the dissemination of information to all interested entities.

''(b) STANDARDS.—

''(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Director shall coordinate the development of evidence-based

standards developed by National Drug Control Program Agencies and other relevant agencies and non-Federal entities to State, local, and Tribal governments and nongovernmental entities related to drug control policies, practices, and procedures, such as the investigation of drug-related deaths, by—

''(A) encouraging appropriate agencies and State, local, and Tribal governments to develop data standards for drug control practices and procedures and related statistical data;

''(B) encouraging information sharing between appropriate agencies and State, local, and Tribal governments of relevant drug control information and data;

''(C) establishing a working group of agencies, State, local, and Tribal governments, and other relevant stakeholders to discuss and develop such standards; and

''(D) facilitating collaboration among agencies, non-Federal entities, States, local, and Tribal governments, and nongovernmental agencies.

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director shall promote the implementation of the standards described in paragraph (1) by—

''(A) encouraging adoption by providing the standards to State and local governments through the internet, annual publications or periodicals, and other widely-disseminated means; and

''(B) facilitating the use and dissemination of such standards among State and local governments by—

''(i) providing technical assistance to State, local, and Tribal governments seeking to adopt or implement such standards; and

''(ii) coordinating seminars and training sessions for State, local, and Tribal governments seeking to adopt or implement such standards.

''(c) PRIVATE SECTOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director or the head of a National Drug Control Program (as designated by the Director) shall coordinate with the private sector to promote private research and development of medications to treat or prevent addiction, including research and development for non-addictive pain management medication, abuse deterrent formulations, medication-assisted treatment, and other addiction research determined to be necessary by the Director by—

''(A) encouraging the sharing of information regarding evidence-based treatment addiction findings and related data between agencies and the private sector, as appropriate;

''(B) encouraging collaboration between appropriate agencies and the private sector; and

''(C) providing private sector entities with relevant statistical data and information to enhance research as permissible.

''(2) WORKING GROUP.—The Director may establish a working group of National Drug Control Program Agencies, State, local, and Tribal governments, and the private sector stakeholders to discuss and disseminate best practices, research and development, and other related issues, as appropriate.

''(d) MODEL ACTS PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall provide for or shall enter into an agreement with a nonprofit organization to—

''(A) advise States on establishing laws and policies to address illicit drug use issues; and

''(B) revise such model State drug laws and draft supplementary model State laws to take into consideration changes in illicit drug use issues in the State involved.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $1,250,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

''(e) DRUG COURT TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

''(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Director may make a grant to a nonprofit organization for the purpose of providing training and technical assistance to drug courts.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

''(f) INTERNATIONAL COORDINATION.—The Director may facilitate international drug control coordination efforts.

''(g) STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL AFFAIRS COORDINATOR.—The Director shall designate or appoint a United States State, Local, and Tribal Affairs Coordinator to perform the duties of the Office outlined in this section and section 1005 and such other duties as may be determined by the Director with respect to coordination of drug control efforts between agencies and State, local, and Tribal governments. The Director shall determine whether the coordinator position is a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service or a career appointee at the GS–15 level (or equivalent) or above.

**''§ 1011. Interdiction**

''(a) UNITED STATES INTERDICTION COORDINATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall designate or appoint a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service or a career appointee at the GS–15 level (or equivalent) or above as the United States Interdiction Coordinator to perform the duties of that position described in paragraph (2) and such other duties as may be determined by the Director with respect to coordination of efforts to interdict illicit drugs from entering the United States.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The United States Interdiction Coordinator shall be responsible to the Director for—

''(A) coordinating the interdiction activities of the National Drug Control Program Agencies to ensure consistency with the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(B) on behalf of the Director, developing and issuing, on or before September 1 of each year and in accordance with paragraph (4), a National Interdiction Command and Control Plan to ensure the coordination and consistency described in subparagraph (A);

''(C) assessing the sufficiency of assets committed to illicit drug interdiction by the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies; and

''(D) advising the Director on the efforts of each National Drug Control Program Agency to implement the National Interdiction Command and Control Plan.

''(3) STAFF.—The Director shall assign such permanent staff of the Office as he considers appropriate to assist the United States Interdiction Coordinator to carry out the responsibilities described in paragraph (2), and may request that appropriate National Drug Control Program Agencies detail or assign staff to assist in carrying out such activities.

''(4) NATIONAL INTERDICTION COMMAND AND CONTROL PLAN.—

''(A) PURPOSES.—The National Interdiction Command and Control Plan—

''(i) shall set forth the Government's strategy for drug interdiction;

''(ii) shall state the specific roles and responsibilities of the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies for implementing that strategy; and

''(iii) shall identify the specific resources required to enable the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies to implement that strategy.

''(B) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—Before the submission of the National Drug Control Strategy or annual supplement required under section 1005(d), as applicable, the United States Interdiction Coordinator shall issue the National Interdiction Command and Control Plan, in consultation with the other members of the Interdiction Committee described in subsection (b).

''(C) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On or before September 1 of each year, the Director, through the United States Interdiction Coordinator, shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees, to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, a report that—

''(i) includes—

''(I) a copy of that year's National Interdiction Command and Control Plan;

''(II) information for the previous 10 years regarding the number and type of seizures of drugs by each National Drug Control Program Agency conducting drug interdiction activities and statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures; and

''(III) information for the previous 10 years regarding the number of air and maritime patrol hours undertaken by each National Drug Control Program Agency conducting drug interdiction activities and statistical information on the geographic areas in which such patrol hours took place; and

''(ii) may include recommendations about changes to existing agency authorities or laws governing interagency relationships.

''(D) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The report submitted pursuant to subparagraph (C) may include a classified annex.

''(b) INTERDICTION COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Interdiction Committee shall meet to—

''(A) discuss and resolve issues related to the coordination, oversight, and integration of international, border, and domestic drug interdiction efforts in support of the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(B) review the annual National Interdiction Command and Control Plan, and provide advice to the Director and the United States Interdiction Coordinator concerning that plan; and

''(C) provide such other advice to the Director concerning drug interdiction strategy and policies as the committee determines is appropriate.

''(2) CHAIR.—The Director shall designate one of the members of the Interdiction Committee to serve as Chair.

''(3) MEETINGS.—The members of the Interdiction Committee shall meet, in person and not through any delegate or representative, at least once per calendar year, before June 1. At the call of the Director or the Chair, the Interdiction Committee may hold additional meetings, which shall be attended by the members in person, or through such delegates or representatives as the members may choose.

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Chair of the Interdiction Committee shall submit to the Director and to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the results of the meetings and any significant findings of the committee during the previous 12 months. Such report may include a classified annex.

**''§ 1012. Treatment coordinator**

''(a) UNITED STATES TREATMENT COORDINATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall designate or appoint a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service or a career appointee at the GS–15 level (or equivalent) or above as the United States Treatment Coordinator to perform the responsibilities of that position described in paragraph (2) and

such other duties as may be determined by the Director with respect to coordination of efforts to expand the availability of substance use disorder treatment with the goal of eliminating the unmet treatment need.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The United States Treatment Coordinator shall be responsible to the Director for—

''(A) coordinating the activities of the National Drug Control Program Agencies undertaken to expand the availability of evidence-based substance use disorder treatment to ensure consistency with the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(B) on behalf of the Director, developing and issuing, on or before September 1 of each year and in accordance with paragraph (4), a National Treatment Plan to ensure the coordination and consistency described in subparagraph (A);

''(C) assessing the sufficiency of Federal resources directed to substance use disorder treatment by the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies;

''(D) encouraging the adoption by all substance use disorder treatment providers of evidence-based standards to guide all aspects of treatment provided; and

''(E) advising the Director on the efforts of each National Drug Control Program Agency to implement the National Treatment Plan.

''(3) STAFF.—The Director shall assign such permanent staff of the Office of the United States Treatment Coordinator as the Director determines to be appropriate to assist the United States Treatment Coordinator to carry out the responsibilities described in paragraph (2), and may request that appropriate National Drug Control Program Agencies detail or assign staff to assist in carrying out such responsibilities.

''(4) NATIONAL TREATMENT PLAN.—

''(A) PURPOSES.—The National Treatment Plan—

''(i) shall identify the unmet need for treatment for evidence-based substance use disorders and set forth the Government's strategy for closing the gap between available and needed treatment through all sources;

''(ii) shall describe the specific roles and responsibilities of the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies for implementing that strategy;

''(iii) shall identify the specific resources required to enable the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies to implement that strategy;

''(iv) shall identify the resources, including private sources, required to eliminate the unmet need for evidence-based substance use disorder treatment; and

''(v) may include recommendations about changes to existing agency authorities or laws governing interagency relationships.

''(B) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—Before the submission of the National Treatment Strategy or annual supplement required under section 1005(d), as applicable, the United States Treatment Coordinator shall issue the National Treatment Plan, in consultation with the other members of the Treatment Committee described in subsection (b).

''(C) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On or before September 1 of each year, the Director, through the United States Treatment Coordinator, shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes a copy of that year's National Treatment Plan.

''(b) TREATMENT COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Treatment Committee shall meet to—

''(A) review and discuss the adequacy of evidence-based substance use disorder treatment as well as the unmet need for treatment;

''(B) review and discuss the status of the implementation of the National Treatment Plan; and

''(C) provide such other advice to the Director concerning substance use disorder treatment initiatives as the committee determines is appropriate.

''(2) CHAIR.—The Director shall designate one of the members of the Treatment Committee to serve as Chair.

''(3) MEETINGS.—The members of the Treatment Committee shall meet, in person and not through any delegate or representative, at least once per calendar year, before June 1. At the call of the Director or the Chair, the Treatment Committee may hold additional meetings, which shall be attended by the members in person, or through such delegates or representatives as the members may choose.

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Chair of the Treatment Committee shall submit to the Director and to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the results of the meetings and any significant findings of the committee during the previous 12 months. Such report may include a classified annex.

**''§ 1013. Critical information coordination**

''(a) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL FUSION CENTER.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall, in consultation with the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency, designate an agency to establish a National Drug Control Fusion Center (referred to in this section as the 'Center'). The Center shall operate under the authority of the Director and shall work with the National Drug Control Program Agencies to collect, compile, analyze, and facilitate the sharing of data on the use of illicit drugs, treatment for substance use disorder, and interdiction of illicit drugs. The Center shall be considered a 'statistical agency or unit', as that term is defined in section 502 of the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note) and shall have the necessary independence to ensure any data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality and for exclusively statistical purposes is used exclusively for statistical purposes.

''(2) CENTER DIRECTOR.—There shall be at the head of the Center a Center Director who shall be appointed by the Director from among individuals qualified and distinguished in data governance and statistical analysis.

''(3) DATA COMPILATION.—The Director, acting through the Center Director, shall do the following:

''(A) Coordinate data collection activities among the National Drug Control Program Agencies.

''(B) Collect information not otherwise collected by National Drug Control Program Agencies as necessary to inform the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(C) Compile and analyze any data required to be collected under this chapter.

''(D) Disseminate technology, as appropriate, to States and local jurisdictions to enable or improve the collection of data on drug use, including the recordation of the occurrence of fatal and non-fatal drug overdoses.

''(E) Compile information collected by National Drug Control Program Agencies on grants issued through any National Drug Control Program, including for any grant the following:

''(i) The recipient.

''(ii) The amount.

''(iii) The intended purpose.

''(iv) Any evidence of the efficacy of the outcomes achieved by the program funded through the grant.

''(v) Any assessments of how the grant met its intended purpose.

''(4) TOXICOLOGY SCREENING.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Center Director may establish a toxicology screening program that engages in—

''(i) secondary analysis of urine samples that would otherwise be discarded by—

''(I) hospitals and substance use disorder treatment programs;

''(II) correctional facilities, booking sites, probation programs, drug courts, and related facilities; and

''(III) coroners and medical examiners; and

''(ii) analysis of other physical samples, as determined by the Center Director to be valuable for understanding the prevalence of any illicit drug.

''(B) DE-IDENTIFICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Center Director shall ensure that no samples have any personally identifiable information prior to collection.

''(C) LIMITATION ON USE.—No data obtained from analysis conducted under this paragraph may be used as evidence in any proceeding.

''(D) STATE PROGRAM.—The Center Director may establish a program that enables States and local jurisdictions to submit up to 20 urine samples per year for toxicology analysis for the purposes of identifying substances present in individuals who have suffered fatal drug overdoses.

''(5) AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT.—The Director may award contracts, enter into interagency agreements, manage individual projects, and conduct other operational activities under this subsection.

''(b) CRITICAL DRUG CONTROL INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the first Monday in February of each year, the Director shall submit to Congress a systematic plan for increasing data collection to enable real-time surveillance of drug control threats, developing analysis and monitoring capabilities, and identifying and addressing policy questions relevant to the National Drug Control Policy, Strategy, and Program. Such plan shall be made available on the public online portal of the Office, shall cover at least a 4-year period beginning with the first fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the plan is submitted and published, and contain the following:

''(A) A list of policy-relevant questions for which the Director and each National Drug Control Program Agency intends to develop evidence to support the National Drug Control Program and Strategy.

''(B) A list of data the Director and each National Drug Control Program Agency intends to collect, use, or acquire to facilitate the use of evidence in drug control policymaking and monitoring.

''(C) A list of methods and analytical approaches that may be used to develop evidence to support the National Drug Control Program and Strategy and related policy.

''(D) A list of any challenges to developing evidence to support policymaking, including any barriers to accessing, collecting, or using relevant data.

''(E) A description of the steps the Director and the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency will take to effectuate the plan.

''(F) Any other relevant information as determined by the Director.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing the plan required under paragraph (1), the Director shall consult with the following:

''(A) The public.

''(B) Any evaluation or analysis units and personnel of the Office.

''(C) Office officials responsible for implementing privacy policy.

''(D) Office officials responsible for data governance.

''(E) The appropriate congressional committees.

''(F) Any other individual or entity as determined by the Director.

''(c) EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY.—

''(1) HARM REDUCTION PROGRAMS.—When developing the national drug control policy, any policy of the Director, including policies relating to syringe exchange programs for intravenous drug users, shall be based on the best available medical and scientific evidence regarding the effectiveness of such policy in promoting individual health, preventing the spread of infectious disease and the impact of such policy on drug addiction and use. In making any policy relating to harm reduction programs, the Director shall consult with the National Institutes of Health and the National Academy of Sciences.

''(2) FUND RESTRICTION FOR THE LEGALIZATION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—The Director shall ensure that no Federal funds appropriated to the Office shall be expended for any study or contract relating to the legalization (for a medical use or any other use) for which a listing in schedule I is in effect under section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812).

''(d) DRUG CONTROL DATA DASHBOARD.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director, in consultation with the Center Director, shall establish and maintain a data dashboard on the online portal of the Office to be known as the 'Drug Control Data Dashboard'. The Director shall ensure the user interface of the dashboard is constructed with modern design standards. To the extent practicable, the data made available on the dashboard shall be publicly available in a machine-readable format and searchable by year, agency, drug, and location.

''(2) DATA.—The data included in the Drug Control Data Dashboard shall be updated quarterly to the extent practicable, but not less frequently than annually and shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(A) For each substance identified under section 1005(c)(1)(A)(i)—

''(i) the total amount seized and disrupted in the calendar year and each of the previous 3 calendar years, including to the extent practicable the amount seized by State, local, and Tribal governments;

''(ii) the known and estimated flows into the United States from all sources in the calendar year and each of the previous 3 calendar years;

''(iii) the total amount of known flows that could not be interdicted or disrupted in the calendar year and each of the previous 3 calendar years;

''(iv) the known and estimated levels of domestic production in the calendar year and each of the previous three calendar years, including the levels of domestic production if the drug is a prescription drug, as determined under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, for which a listing is in effect under section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812);

''(v) the average street price for the calendar year and the highest known street price during the preceding 10-year period; and

''(vi) to the extent practicable, related prosecutions by State, local, and Tribal governments.

''(B) For the calendar year and each of the previous three years data sufficient to show, disaggregated by State and, to the extent feasible, by region within a State, county, or city, the following:

''(i) The number of fatal and non-fatal overdoses caused by each drug identified under subparagraph (A)(i).

''(ii) The prevalence of substance use disorders.

''(iii) The number of individuals who have received substance use disorder treatment, including medication assisted treatment, for a substance use disorder, including treatment provided through publicly-financed health care programs.

''(iv) The extent of the unmet need for substance use disorder treatment, including the unmet need for medication-assisted treatment.

''(C) Data sufficient to show the extent of prescription drug diversion, trafficking, and misuse in the calendar year and each of the previous 3 calendar years.

''(D) Any quantifiable measures the Director determines to be appropriate to detail progress toward the achievement of the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(e) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Director, the head of any National Drug Control Program Agency shall cooperate with and provide to the Director any statistics, studies, reports, and other information prepared or collected by the agency concerning the responsibilities of the agency under the National Drug Control Strategy that relate to—

''(A) drug control; or

''(B) the manner in which amounts made available to that agency for drug control are being used by that agency.

''(2) PROTECTION OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The authorities conferred on the Office and the Director by this chapter shall be exercised in a manner consistent with provisions of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.). The Director of National Intelligence shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to protect information provided pursuant to this chapter regarding intelligence sources and methods.

''(B) DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.—The Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable in accordance with subparagraph (A), render full assistance and support to the Office and the Director.

''(3) REQUIRED REPORTS FROM NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM AGENCIES.—The head of each National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit to the Director such information and reports as requested from such National Drug Control Program Agency by the Director, which shall include from the appropriate National Drug Control Program Agencies:

''(A) Not later than July 1 of each year, the head of a National Drug Control Program Agency designated by the Director shall submit to the Director and the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the quantity of illegal drug cultivation and manufacturing in the United States on lands owned or under the jurisdiction of their respective agencies that was seized or eradicated by their personnel during the preceding calendar year.

''(B) Not later than July 1 of each year, the head of a designated National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit to the Director and the appropriate congressional committees information for the preceding year regarding—

''(i) the number and type of seizures of drugs by each component of the agency seizing drugs, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures; and

''(ii) the number of air and maritime patrol hours primarily dedicated to drug supply reduction missions undertaken by each component of the agency.

''(C) Not later than July 1 of each year, the head of a designated National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit to the Director and the appropriate congressional committees information for the preceding year regarding the number of air and maritime patrol hours primarily dedicated to drug supply reduction missions undertaken by each component of the agency.

''(D) Not later than July 1 of each year, the head of a designated National Drug Control Program Agency shall submit to the Director and the appropriate congressional committees information for the preceding year regarding the number and type of—

''(i) arrests for drug violations;

''(ii) prosecutions by United States Attorneys for drug violations; and

''(iii) seizures of drugs by each component of the Department of Justice seizing drugs, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures.

''(f) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) INTERAGENCY AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL DESIGNATION AND USE OF DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP.—The Director shall establish a working group of National Drug Control Program Agencies, State, local and Tribal government health and law enforcement agencies, and data governance experts to develop consensus data exchange standards for necessary categories of information that allow effective electronic exchange of information between States, between State agencies, between States and National Drug Control Program Agencies, and any other drug control relevant data exchange.

''(2) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS MUST BE NONPROPRIETARY AND INTEROPERABLE.—The data exchange standards developed under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable, be nonproprietary and interoperable.

''(3) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—In developing data exchange standards under this subsection, the working group shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate—

''(A) interoperable standards developed and maintained by an international voluntary consensus standards body, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget;

''(B) interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships; and

''(C) interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance.

''(4) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL REPORTING.—

''(A) DESIGNATION.—The Director may, in consultation with the working group established under this subsection, National Drug Control Program Agencies, and State, local, and Tribal governments, designate data exchange standards to govern Federal reporting and exchange requirements for National Drug Control Programs, as appropriate.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange reporting standards designated under subparagraph (A) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(i) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, machine-readable format;

''(ii) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(iii) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(iv) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(C) INCORPORATION OF NONPROPRIETARY STANDARDS.—In designating data exchange standards under this paragraph, the Director

shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate existing nonproprietary standards.

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards for Federal reporting about a program referred to in this section, if the head of the agency responsible for administering the program finds the standards to be effective and efficient.

''(5) TERMINATION.—The working group established under paragraph (1) shall terminate not earlier than 60 days after the public notification of termination by the Director.

''(g) ANNUAL DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall collect and disseminate, as appropriate, such information as the Director determines is appropriate, but not less than the information described in this subsection. To the extent practicable, the data shall be publicly available in a machine-readable format on the Drug Control Data Dashboard, be searchable by year, agency, drug, and location, and cover not less than the previous 10-year period.

''(2) PREPARATION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The Director shall prepare and disseminate the following:

''(A) An assessment of current illicit drug use (including inhalants and steroids) and availability, impact of illicit drug use, and treatment availability, which assessment shall include—

''(i) estimates of drug prevalence and frequency of use as measured by national, State, and local surveys of illicit drug use and by other special studies of nondependent and dependent illicit drug use;

''(ii) illicit drug use in the workplace and the productivity lost by such use; and

''(iii) illicit drug use by arrestees, probationers, and parolees.

''(B) An assessment of the reduction of illicit drug availability, for each drug identified under section 1005(c)(1)(A)(i), as measured by—

''(i) the quantities of such drug available for consumption in the United States;

''(ii) the amount of such drug entering the United States;

''(iii) the number of illicit drug manufacturing laboratories seized and destroyed of each such drug and the number of hectares cultivated and destroyed domestically and in other countries of such drug;

''(iv) the number of metric tons of such drug seized; and

''(v) changes in the price and purity of such drug.

''(C) An assessment of the reduction of the consequences of illicit drug use and availability, which shall include—

''(i) the cost of treating substance use disorder in the United States, such as the quantity of illicit drug-related services provided;

''(ii) the annual national health care cost of illicit drug use; and

''(iii) the extent of illicit drug-related crime and criminal activity.

''(D) A determination of the status of substance use disorder treatment in the United States, by assessing—

''(i) public and private treatment utilization; and

''(ii) the number of illicit drug users the Director estimates meet diagnostic criteria for treatment.

**''§ 1014. Authorization of appropriations**

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter, except as otherwise specified, to remain available until expended, $18,400,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

''SUBCHAPTER II—DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM

**''§ 1021. Establishment of drug-free communities support program**

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish a program to support communities in the development and implementation of comprehensive, long-term plans and programs to prevent and treat substance use and misuse among youth.

''(b) PROGRAM.—In carrying out the Program, the Director shall—

''(1) make and track grants to grant recipients;

''(2) provide for technical assistance and training, data collection, and dissemination of information on state-of-the-art practices that the Director determines to be effective in reducing substance use; and

''(3) provide for the general administration of the Program.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Director shall appoint an Administrator to carry out the Program.

''(d) CONTRACTING.—The Director may employ any necessary staff and may enter into contracts or agreements with National Drug Control Program Agencies, including interagency agreements, to delegate authority for the execution of grants and for such other activities necessary to carry out this chapter.

**''§ 1022. Program authorization**

''(a) GRANT ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive an initial grant or a renewal grant under this subchapter, a coalition shall meet each of the following criteria:

''(1) APPLICATION.—The coalition shall submit an application to the Administrator in accordance with section 1023(a)(2).

''(2) MAJOR SECTOR INVOLVEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The coalition shall consist of 1 or more representatives of each of the following categories:

''(i) Youth.

''(ii) Parents.

''(iii) Businesses.

''(iv) The media.

''(v) Schools.

''(vi) Organizations serving youth.

''(vii) Law enforcement.

''(viii) Religious or fraternal organizations.

''(ix) Civic and volunteer groups.

''(x) Health care professionals.

''(xi) State, local, or Tribal governmental agencies with expertise in the field of substance use prevention or substance use disorders (including, if applicable, the State authority with primary authority for substance use and misuse).

''(xii) Other organizations involved in reducing the prevalence of substance use and misuse or substance use disorders.

''(B) ELECTED OFFICIALS.—If feasible, in addition to representatives from the categories listed in subparagraph (A), the coalition shall have an elected official (or a representative of an elected official) from—

''(i) the Federal Government; and

''(ii) the government of the appropriate State and political subdivision thereof or the governing body or an Indian tribe (as that term is defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).

''(C) REPRESENTATION.—An individual who is a member of the coalition may serve on the coalition as a representative of not more than 1 category listed under subparagraph (A).

''(3) COMMITMENT.—The coalition shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

''(A) that the representatives of the coalition have worked together on substance use and misuse reduction initiatives, which, at a minimum, includes initiatives that target drugs described in section 1027(6)(A), for a period of not less than 6 months, acting through entities such as task forces, subcommittees, or community boards; and

''(B) substantial participation from volunteer leaders in the community involved (especially in cooperation with individuals involved with youth such as parents, teachers, coaches, youth workers, and members of the clergy).

''(4) MISSION AND STRATEGIES.—The coalition shall, with respect to the community involved—

''(A) have as its principal mission the reduction of illegal drug use, which, at a minimum, includes the use of illegal drugs described in section 1027(6)(A), in a comprehensive and long-term manner, with a primary focus on youth in the community;

''(B) describe and document the nature and extent of the substance use and misuse problem, which, at a minimum, includes the use and misuse of drugs described in section 1027(6)(A), in the community;

''(C)(i) provide a description of substance use and misuse prevention and treatment programs and activities, which, at a minimum, includes programs and activities relating to the use and misuse of drugs described in section 1027(6)(A), in existence at the time of the grant application; and

''(ii) identify substance use and misuse programs and service gaps, which, at a minimum, includes programs and gaps relating to the use and misuse of drugs described in section 1027(6)(A), in the community;

''(D) develop a strategic plan to reduce substance use and misuse among youth, which, at a minimum, includes the use and misuse of drugs described in section 1027(6)(A), in a comprehensive and long-term fashion; and

''(E) work to develop a consensus regarding the priorities of the community to combat substance use and misuse among youth, which, at a minimum, includes the use and misuse of drugs described in section 1027(6)(A).

''(5) SUSTAINABILITY.—The coalition shall demonstrate that the coalition is an ongoing concern by demonstrating that the coalition—

''(A) is—

''(i)(I) a nonprofit organization; or

''(II) an entity that the Administrator determines to be appropriate; or

''(ii) part of, or is associated with, an established legal entity;

''(B) receives financial support (including, in the discretion of the Administrator, in-kind contributions) from non-Federal sources; and

''(C) has a strategy to solicit substantial financial support from non-Federal sources to ensure that the coalition and the programs operated by the coalition are self-sustaining.

''(6) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The coalition shall—

''(A) establish a system to measure and report outcomes—

''(i) consistent with common indicators and evaluation protocols established by the Administrator; and

''(ii) approved by the Administrator;

''(B) conduct—

''(i) for an initial grant under this subchapter, an initial benchmark survey of drug use among youth (or use local surveys or performance measures available or accessible in the community at the time of the grant application); and

''(ii) biennial surveys (or incorporate local surveys in existence at the time of the evaluation) to measure the progress and effectiveness of the coalition; and

''(C) provide assurances that the entity conducting an evaluation under this paragraph, or from which the coalition receives information, has experience—

''(i) in gathering data related to substance use and misuse among youth; or

''(ii) in evaluating the effectiveness of community anti-drug coalitions.

''(7) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.—The Director shall not impose any eligibility criteria on new applicants or renewal grantees not provided in this chapter.

''(b) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) GRANTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (iv), for a fiscal year, the Administrator may grant to an eligible coalition under this paragraph, an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year.

''(ii) SUSPENSION OF GRANTS.—If such grant recipient fails to continue to meet the criteria specified in subsection (a), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

''(iii) RENEWAL GRANTS.—Subject to clause (iv), the Administrator may award a renewal grant to a grant recipient under this subparagraph for each fiscal year following the fiscal year for which an initial grant is awarded, in an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year, during the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant.

''(iv) LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant award under this subparagraph may not exceed $125,000 for a fiscal year.

''(B) COALITION AWARDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Administrator may, with respect to a community, make a grant to 1 eligible coalition that represents that community.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Administrator may make a grant to more than 1 eligible coalition that represents a community if—

''(I) the eligible coalitions demonstrate that the coalitions are collaborating with one another; and

''(II) each of the coalitions has independently met the requirements set forth in subsection (a).

''(2) RURAL COALITION GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to awarding grants under paragraph (1), to stimulate the development of coalitions in sparsely populated and rural areas, the Administrator may award a grant in accordance with this section to a coalition that represents a county with a population that does not exceed 30,000 individuals. In awarding a grant under this paragraph, the Administrator may waive any requirement under subsection (a) if the Administrator considers that waiver to be appropriate.

''(ii) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (C), for a fiscal year, the Administrator may grant to an eligible coalition under this paragraph, an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year.

''(iii) SUSPENSION OF GRANTS.—If such grant recipient fails to continue to meet any criteria specified in subsection (a) that has not been waived by the Administrator pursuant to clause (i), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

''(B) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The Administrator may award a renewal grant to an eligible coalition that is a grant recipient under this paragraph for each fiscal year following the fiscal year for which an initial grant is awarded, in an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, during the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant.

''(C) LIMITATIONS.—

''(i) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant award under this paragraph shall not exceed $125,000 for a fiscal year.

''(ii) AWARDS.—With respect to a county referred to in subparagraph (A), the Administrator may award a grant under this section to not more than 1 eligible coalition that represents the county.

''(3) ADDITIONAL GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (F), the Administrator may award an additional grant under this paragraph to an eligible coalition awarded a grant under paragraph (1) or (2) for any first fiscal year after the end of the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant under paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be.

''(B) SCOPE OF GRANTS.—A coalition awarded a grant under paragraph (1) or (2), including a renewal grant under such paragraph, may not be awarded another grant under such paragraph, and is eligible for an additional grant under this section only under this paragraph.

''(C) NO PRIORITY FOR APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator may not afford a higher priority in the award of an additional grant under this paragraph than the Administrator would afford the applicant for the grant if the applicant were submitting an application for an initial grant under paragraph (1) or (2) rather than an application for a grant under this paragraph.

''(D) RENEWAL GRANTS.—Subject to subparagraph (F), the Administrator may award a renewal grant to a grant recipient under this paragraph for each of the fiscal years of the 4-fiscal-year period following the fiscal year for which the initial additional grant under subparagraph (A) is awarded in an amount not to exceed amounts as follows:

''(i) For the first and second fiscal years of that 4-fiscal-year period, the amount of the non-Federal funds, including in-kind contributions, raised by the coalition for the applicable fiscal year is not less than 125 percent of the amount awarded.

''(ii) For the third and fourth fiscal years of that 4-fiscal-year period, the amount of the non-Federal funds, including in-kind contributions, raised by the coalition for the applicable fiscal year is not less than 150 percent of the amount awarded.

''(E) SUSPENSION.—If a grant recipient under this paragraph fails to continue to meet the criteria specified in subsection (a), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

''(F) LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant award under this paragraph may not exceed $125,000 for a fiscal year.

''(4) PROCESS FOR SUSPENSION.—A grantee shall not be suspended or terminated under paragraph (1)(A)(ii), (2)(A)(iii), or (3)(E) unless that grantee is afforded a fair, timely, and independent appeal prior to such suspension or termination.

''(c) TREATMENT OF FUNDS FOR COALITIONS REPRESENTING CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS.—Funds appropriated for the substance use and misuse activities of a coalition that includes a representative of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, or a Tribal government agency with expertise in the field of substance use prevention may be counted as non-Federal funds raised by the coalition for purposes of this section.

''(d) PRIORITY IN AWARDING GRANTS.—In awarding grants under subsection (b)(1)(A)(i), priority shall be given to a coalition serving economically disadvantaged areas.

**''§ 1023. Information collection and dissemination with respect to grant recipients**

''(a) COALITION INFORMATION.—

''(1) GENERAL AUDITING AUTHORITY.—For the purpose of audit and examination, the Administrator—

''(A) shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to any grant or grant renewal request under this subchapter; and

''(B) may periodically request information from a grant recipient to ensure that the grant recipient meets the applicable criteria under section 1022(a).

''(2) APPLICATION PROCESS.—The Administrator shall issue a request for proposal regarding, with respect to the grants awarded under section 1022, the application process, grant renewal, and suspension or withholding of renewal grants. Each application under this paragraph shall be in writing and shall be subject to review by the Administrator.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Administrator shall, to the maximum extent practicable and in a manner consistent with applicable law, minimize reporting requirements by a grant recipient and expedite any application for a renewal grant made under this subchapter.

''(b) DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may collect data from—

''(A) national substance use and misuse organizations that work with eligible coalitions, community anti-drug coalitions, departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or State or local governments and the governing bodies of Indian Tribes; and

''(B) any other entity or organization that carries out activities that relate to the purposes of the Program.

''(2) ACTIVITIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.—The Administrator may—

''(A) evaluate the utility of specific initiatives relating to the purposes of the Program;

''(B) conduct an evaluation of the Program; and

''(C) disseminate information described in this subsection to—

''(i) eligible coalitions and other substance use prevention organizations; and

''(ii) the general public.

''(3) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall carry out activities under this subsection in consultation with the National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute.

''(4) LIMITATION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAM.—Amounts for activities under paragraph (2)(B) may not be derived from amounts under section 1028(a) except for amounts that are available under section 1028(b) for administrative costs.

**''§ 1024. Technical assistance and training**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND AGREEMENTS.—With respect to any grant recipient or other organization, the Administrator may—

''(A) offer technical assistance and training; and

''(B) enter into contracts and cooperative agreements.

''(2) COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS.—The Administrator may facilitate the coordination of programs between a grant recipient and other organizations and entities.

''(b) TRAINING.—The Administrator may provide training to any representative designated by a grant recipient in—

''(1) coalition building;

''(2) task force development;

''(3) mediation and facilitation, direct service, assessment and evaluation; or

''(4) any other activity related to the purposes of the Program.

**"§ 1025. Supplemental grants for coalition mentoring activities**

''(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—As part of the Program, the Director may award an initial grant under this subsection, and renewal grants under subsection (f), to any coalition awarded a grant under section 1022 that meets the criteria specified in subsection (d) in order to fund coalition mentoring activities by such coalition in support of the program.

''(b) TREATMENT WITH OTHER GRANTS.—

''(1) SUPPLEMENT.—A grant awarded to a coalition under this section is in addition to any grant awarded to the coalition under section 1022.

''(2) REQUIREMENT FOR BASIC GRANT.—A coalition may not be awarded a grant under this section for a fiscal year unless the coalition was awarded a grant or renewal grant under section 1022(b) for that fiscal year.

''(c) APPLICATION.—A coalition seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Administrator an application for the grant in such form and manner as the Administrator may require.

''(d) CRITERIA.—A coalition meets the criteria specified in this subsection if the coalition—

''(1) has been in existence for at least 5 years;

''(2) has achieved, by or through its own efforts, measurable results in the prevention and treatment of substance use and misuse among youth;

''(3) has staff or members willing to serve as mentors for persons seeking to start or expand the activities of other coalitions in the prevention and treatment of substance use and misuse;

''(4) has demonstrable support from some members of the community in which the coalition mentoring activities to be supported by the grant under this section are to be carried out; and

''(5) submits to the Administrator a detailed plan for the coalition mentoring activities to be supported by the grant under this section.

''(e) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—A coalition awarded a grant under this section shall use the grant amount for mentoring activities to support and encourage the development of new, self-supporting community coalitions that are focused on the prevention and treatment of substance use and misuse in such new coalitions' communities. The mentoring coalition shall encourage such development in accordance with the plan submitted by the mentoring coalition under subsection (d)(5).

''(f) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The Administrator may make a renewal grant to any coalition awarded a grant under subsection (a), or a previous renewal grant under this subsection, if the coalition, at the time of application for such renewal grant—

''(1) continues to meet the criteria specified in subsection (d); and

''(2) has made demonstrable progress in the development of one or more new, self-supporting community coalitions that are focused on the prevention and treatment of substance use and misuse.

''(g) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the total amount of grants awarded to a coalition under this section for a fiscal year may not exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year. Funds appropriated for the substance use and misuse activities of a coalition that includes a representative of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, or a Tribal government agency with expertise in the field of substance use prevention may be counted as non-Federal funds raised by the coalition.

''(2) INITIAL GRANTS.—The amount of the initial grant awarded to a coalition under subsection (a) may not exceed $75,000.

''(3) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The total amount of renewal grants awarded to a coalition under subsection (f) for any fiscal year may not exceed $75,000.

''(h) FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR GRANTS.—The total amount available for grants under this section, including renewal grants under subsection (f), in any fiscal year may not exceed the amount equal to five percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1028 for that fiscal year.

''(i) PRIORITY IN AWARDING INITIAL GRANTS.—In awarding initial grants under this section, priority shall be given to a coalition that expressly proposes to provide mentorship to a coalition or aspiring coalition serving economically disadvantaged areas.

**"§ 1026. Authorization for National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall, using amounts authorized to be appropriated by subsection (d), make a competitive grant to provide for the continuation of the National Community Anti-drug Coalition Institute.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—An organization eligible for the grant under subsection (a) is any national nonprofit organization that represents, provides technical assistance and training to, and has special expertise and broad, national-level experience in community antidrug coalitions under this subchapter.

''(c) USE OF GRANT AMOUNT.—The organization that receives the grant under subsection (a) shall continue a National Community Anti-Drug Coalition Institute to—

''(1) provide education, training, and technical assistance for coalition leaders and community teams, with emphasis on the development of coalitions serving economically disadvantaged areas;

''(2) develop and disseminate evaluation tools, mechanisms, and measures to better assess and document coalition performance measures and outcomes; and

''(3) bridge the gap between research and practice by translating knowledge from research into practical information.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The Director shall, using amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 1028, make a grant of $2,000,000 under subsection (a), for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

**"§ 1027. Definitions**

''In this subchapter:

''(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator appointed by the Director under section 1021(c).

''(2) COMMUNITY.—The term 'community' shall have the meaning provided that term by the Administrator.

''(3) ELIGIBLE COALITION.—The term 'eligible coalition' means a coalition that meets the applicable criteria under section 1022(a).

''(4) GRANT RECIPIENT.—The term 'grant recipient' means the recipient of a grant award under section 1022.

''(5) PROGRAM.—The term 'Program' means the program established under section 1021(a).

''(6) SUBSTANCE USE AND MISUSE.—The term 'substance use and misuse' means—

''(A) the illegal use or misuse of drugs, including substances for which a listing is in effect under any of schedules I through V under section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812);

''(B) the misuse of inhalants or over the counter drugs; or

''(C) the use of alcohol, tobacco, or other related product as such use is prohibited by State or local law.

''(7) YOUTH.—The term 'youth' shall have the meaning provided that term by the Administrator.

**"§ 1028. Drug–free communities reauthorization**

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Office to carry out this subchapter $99,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 8 percent of the funds appropriated for this subchapter may be used by the Office or, in the discretion of the Director, an agency delegated to carry out the program under section 1021(d) to pay for administrative costs associated with carrying out the program.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle I of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''10. Office of National Drug Control 1001''.

**SEC. 3. HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Office a program to be known as the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program (in this section referred to as the ''Program'').

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Program is to reduce drug trafficking and drug production in the United States by—

(A) facilitating cooperation among Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies to share information and implement coordinated enforcement activities;

(B) enhancing law enforcement intelligence sharing among Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies;

(C) providing reliable law enforcement intelligence to law enforcement agencies needed to design effective enforcement strategies and operations; and

(D) supporting coordinated law enforcement strategies which maximize use of available resources to reduce the supply of illegal drugs in designated areas and in the United States as a whole.

(b) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the head of each National Drug Control Program Agency, and the Governor of each applicable State, may designate any specified area of the United States as a high intensity drug trafficking area.

(2) ACTIVITIES.—After making a designation under paragraph (1) and in order to provide Federal assistance to the area so designated, the Director may—

(A) obligate such sums as are appropriated for the Program;

(B) direct the temporary reassignment of Federal personnel to such area, subject to the approval of the head of the agency that employs such personnel;

(C) take any other action authorized under this section or chapter 10 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c), to provide increased Federal assistance to those areas; and

(D) coordinate activities under this section (specifically administrative, recordkeeping, and funds management activities) with State, local, and Tribal officials.

(c) PETITIONS FOR DESIGNATION.—The Director shall establish and maintain regulations under which a coalition of interested law enforcement agencies from an area may petition for designation as a high intensity drug trafficking area (in this section referred

to as the ''HIDTA''). Such regulations shall provide for a regular review by the Director of the petition, including a recommendation regarding the merit of the petition to the Director by a panel of qualified, independent experts.

(d) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In considering whether to designate an area under this section as a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall consider, in addition to such other criteria as the Director considers to be appropriate, the extent to which—

(1) the area is a significant center of illegal drug production, manufacturing, importation, or distribution;

(2) State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies have committed resources to respond to the drug trafficking problem in the area, thereby indicating a determination to respond aggressively to the problem;

(3) drug-related activities in the area are having a significant harmful impact in the area, and in other areas of the country; and

(4) a significant increase in allocation of Federal resources is necessary to respond adequately to drug-related activities in the area.

(e) ORGANIZATION OF HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.—

(1) EXECUTIVE BOARD AND OFFICERS.—To be eligible for funds appropriated under this section, each high intensity drug trafficking area shall be governed by an Executive Board. The Executive Board shall designate a chairman, vice chairman, and any other officers to the Executive Board that it determines are necessary.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Executive Board of a high intensity drug trafficking area shall be responsible for—

(A) providing direction and oversight in establishing and achieving the goals of the high intensity drug trafficking area;

(B) managing the funds of the high intensity drug trafficking area;

(C) reviewing and approving all funding proposals consistent with the overall objective of the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

(D) reviewing and approving all reports to the Director on the activities of the high intensity drug trafficking area.

(3) BOARD REPRESENTATION.—None of the funds appropriated under this section may be expended for any high intensity drug trafficking area, or for a partnership or region of a high intensity drug trafficking area, if the Executive Board for such area, region, or partnership, does not apportion an equal number of votes between representatives of participating agencies and representatives of participating State, local, and Tribal agencies. Where it is impractical for an equal number of representatives of agencies and State, local, and Tribal agencies to attend a meeting of an Executive Board in person, the Executive Board may use a system of proxy votes or weighted votes to achieve the voting balance required by this paragraph.

(4) NO AGENCY RELATIONSHIP.—The eligibility requirements of this section are intended to ensure the responsible use of Federal funds. Nothing in this section is intended to create an agency relationship between individual high intensity drug trafficking areas and the Federal Government.

(f) USE OF FUNDS.—The Director shall ensure that not more than 5 percent of Federal funds appropriated for the Program are expended for substance use disorder treatment programs and not more than 5 percent of the Federal funds appropriated for the Program are expended for drug prevention programs.

(g) COUNTERTERRORISM ACTIVITIES.—

(1) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Director may authorize use of resources available for the Program to assist Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies in investigations and activities related to terrorism and prevention of terrorism, especially but not exclusively with respect to such investigations and activities that are also related to drug trafficking.

(2) LIMITATION.—The Director shall ensure—

(A) that assistance provided under paragraph (1) remains incidental to the purpose of the Program to reduce drug availability and carry out drug-related law enforcement activities; and

(B) that significant resources of the Program are not redirected to activities exclusively related to terrorism, except on a temporary basis under extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Director.

(h) ROLE OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION.—The Director, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall ensure that a representative of the Drug Enforcement Administration is included in the Intelligence Support Center for each high intensity drug trafficking area.

(i) EMERGING THREAT RESPONSE FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Director may expend up to 10 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section on a discretionary basis, in accordance with the criteria established under paragraph (2)—

(A) to respond to any emerging drug trafficking threat in an existing high intensity drug trafficking area;

(B) to establish a new high intensity drug trafficking area; or

(C) to expand an existing high intensity drug trafficking area.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF IMPACT.—In allocating funds under this subsection, the Director shall consider—

(A) the impact of activities funded on reducing overall drug traffic in the United States, or minimizing the probability that an emerging drug trafficking threat will spread to other areas of the United States; and

(B) such other criteria as the Director considers appropriate.

(j) ANNUAL HIDTA PROGRAM BUDGET SUBMISSIONS.—As part of the documentation that supports the President's annual budget request for the Office, the Director shall submit to Congress a budget justification that includes—

(1) the amount proposed for each HIDTA, conditional upon a review by the Office of the request submitted by such HIDTA and the performance of such HIDTA, with supporting narrative descriptions and rationale for each request;

(2) a detailed justification that explains—

(A) the reasons for the proposed funding level and how such funding level was determined based on a current assessment of the drug trafficking threat in each high intensity drug trafficking area;

(B) how such funding will ensure that the goals and objectives of each such area will be achieved; and

(C) how such funding supports the National Drug Control Strategy; and

(3) the amount of HIDTA funds used to investigate and prosecute organizations and individuals trafficking in each major illicit drug, as identified by the Director, in the prior calendar year, and a description of how those funds were used.

(k) HIDTA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT.—As part of each report submitted pursuant to section 1006(a) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c), the Director shall include, for each designated high intensity drug trafficking area, a report that—

(1) describes—

(A) the specific purposes for the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

(B) the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives for the high intensity drug trafficking area;

(2) includes an evaluation of the performance of the high intensity drug trafficking area in accomplishing the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives identified under subparagraph (1)(B);

(3) assesses the number and operation of all federally funded drug enforcement task forces within such high intensity drug trafficking area;

(4) describes—

(A) each Federal, State, local, and Tribal drug enforcement task force operating in such high intensity drug trafficking area;

(B) how such task forces coordinate with each other, with any high intensity drug trafficking area task force, and with investigations receiving funds from the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Force;

(C) what steps, if any, each such task force takes to share information regarding drug trafficking and drug production with other federally funded drug enforcement task forces in the high intensity drug trafficking area;

(D) the role of the high intensity drug trafficking area in coordinating the sharing of such information among task forces;

(E) the nature and extent of cooperation by each Federal, State, local, and Tribal participant in ensuring that such information is shared among law enforcement agencies and with the high intensity drug trafficking area;

(F) the nature and extent to which information sharing and enforcement activities are coordinated with joint terrorism task forces in the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

(G) any recommendations for measures needed to ensure that task force resources are utilized efficiently and effectively to reduce the availability of illegal drugs in the high intensity drug trafficking areas; and

(5) in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence—

(A) evaluates existing and planned law enforcement intelligence systems supported by such high intensity drug trafficking area, or utilized by task forces receiving any funding under the Program, including the extent to which such systems ensure access and availability of law enforcement intelligence to Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies within the high intensity drug trafficking area and outside of such area;

(B) evaluates the extent to which Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies participating in each high intensity drug trafficking area are sharing law enforcement intelligence information to assess current drug trafficking threats and design appropriate enforcement strategies; and

(C) identifies the measures needed to improve effective sharing of information and law enforcement intelligence regarding drug trafficking and drug production among Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement participating in a high intensity drug trafficking area, and between such agencies and similar agencies outside the high intensity drug trafficking area.

(l) COORDINATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH ORGANIZED CRIME DRUG ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE PROGRAM.—

(1) DRUG ENFORCEMENT INTELLIGENCE SHARING.—The Director, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall ensure that any drug enforcement intelligence obtained by the Intelligence Support Center for each high intensity drug trafficking area is shared, on a timely basis, with the drug intelligence fusion center operated by the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force of the Department of Justice.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Before the Director awards any funds to a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall certify that the law enforcement entities participating in that HIDTA are providing laboratory seizure data to the national clandestine laboratory database at the El Paso Intelligence Center.

(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office to carry out this section $280,000,000 for each fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(n) SPECIFIC PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year for the Program, at least 2.5 percent is used in high intensity drug trafficking areas with severe neighborhood safety and illegal drug distribution problems.

(2) REQUIRED USES.—The funds used under paragraph (1) shall be used to ensure the safety of neighborhoods and the protection of communities, including the prevention of the intimidation of witnesses of illegal drug distribution and related activities and the establishment of or support for programs that provide protection or assistance to witnesses in court proceedings.

(3) BEST PRACTICE MODELS.—The Director shall work with the HIDTAs to develop and maintain best practice models to assist State, local, and Tribal governments in addressing witness safety, relocation, financial and housing assistance, or any other services related to witness protection or assistance in cases of illegal drug distribution and related activities. The Director shall ensure dissemination of the best practice models to each HIDTA.

**SEC. 4. OPIOID CRISIS RESPONSE.**

(a) EMERGING THREAT DESIGNATION.—The Director shall designate opioids and opioid analogues as emerging drug threats, in accordance with section 1009 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c).

(b) OPIOID RESPONSE PLAN.—

(1) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish, make publicly available, and notify the President and the appropriate congressional committees of, the plan required under section 1009 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c), to be designated as the ''National Opioid Crisis Response Plan''.

(2) CONTENTS.—The Director shall ensure the plan establishes measurable goals, including reducing fatal and non-fatal overdoses, and includes the following:

(A) An initiative to ensure the United States mail is effectively screened to prevent illicit drugs from entering the United States, including—

(i) designating the United States Postal Service as a National Drug Control Program Agency;

(ii) directing the United States Postal Service and any other related National Drug Control Program Agency to take any appropriate actions necessary to reduce the amount of illicit drugs entering the country; and

(iii) developing an international coordination plan, in consultation with the National Drug Control Program Agencies and in accordance with section 1010 of such title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c), to include efforts to address international drug control initiatives and strengthen bilateral and multilateral strategies to reduce illicit drugs and precursor chemicals from entering the United States through international mail or across land borders or ports of entry.

(B) Support for universal adoption of evidence-based prescribing guidelines, including—

(i) establishing a task force to supplement existing prescribing guidelines with evidence-based standards and to facilitate, coordinate, and, as appropriate, conduct research to inform such guidelines;

(ii) encouraging the adoption of evidence-based prescribing guidelines by each relevant agency, State and local governments, and private sector organizations;

(iii) issuing guidance to National Drug Control Program Agencies to, as appropriate, revise regulations to ensure professionals have effective continuing education requirements; and

(iv) disseminating and encouraging the adoption of best practices and evidence-based guidelines for effective prescribing practices.

(C) A program to monitor the prescription drug market and illicit drug market for changes in trends relevant to reducing the supply or demand of such drugs.

(D) An initiative to facilitate and coordinate Federal, State and local government initiatives, studies, and pilot or demonstration programs designed to evaluate the benefits of drug courts and related programs that reduce substance use prevalence.

(E) A program, developed in coordination with the private sector, to—

(i) facilitate the development of treatment and abuse-deterrent products, in accordance with section 1010(c) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c); and

(ii) encourage the expansion of medication disposal programs and technology.

(F) Initiatives to—

(i) encourage the National Drug Control Program Agencies and the program established under section 1010(d) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c), to prioritize the development of sentencing standards or model codes for trafficking opioids and opioid analogues; and

(ii) to advise States on establishing laws and policies to address opioid issues based on the recommendations developed and set forth by the President's Commission on Combating Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis.

(G) A program to identify successful college recovery programs, including sober housing programs that provide a shared living residence free of alcohol or illicit drug use for individuals recovering from drug or alcohol addiction and substance use disorders, on college campuses and disseminate best practices to Colleges and Universities to increase the number and capacity of such programs.

(H) Convening working groups, consisting of the appropriate National Drug Control Program Agencies, State, local and Tribal governments, and other appropriate stakeholders, established in accordance with section 1010 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c)—

(i) to support Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs by—

(I) facilitating the sharing and interoperability of program data among States and Federal prescription drug monitoring programs;

(II) assisting States in increasing utilization of such programs;

(III) facilitating efforts to incorporate available overdose and naloxone deployment data into such programs;

(IV) evaluating barriers to integrating program data with electronic health records; and

(V) offering recommendations to address identified barriers; and

(ii) to develop standards, and encourage the use of such standards, for the collection of data necessary to understand and monitor the opioid crisis, including—

(I) State medical examiner reports on deaths caused by overdoses and related statistical data; and

(II) first responder opioid intoxication incidents.

(I) Research initiatives, to be initiated not later than 30 days after the issuance of the plan, to evaluate the uses and barriers to use of and the effects of improving the following programs:

(i) Medication Assisted Treatment.

(ii) Data collection systems used to confirm opioid use by individuals who have been arrested or hospitalized.

(J) A requirement for an Advisory Committee on Substance Use Disorder Treatment Standards, to be established not later than 120 days after the issuance of the plan, to promulgate model evidence-based standards for substance use disorder treatment and recovery facilities which—

(i) shall be chaired by the Director;

(ii) shall include as members of the advisory committee representatives of the relevant National Drug Control Program Agencies;

(iii) may include as members of the advisory committee government regulators, State representatives, consumer representatives, substance use disorder treatment providers, recovery residence owners and operators, and purchasers of substance use disorder treatments; and

(iv) shall ensure such model standards are promulgated no later than 2 years after the date of the issuance of the plan.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the results of the initiatives conducted under subsection (b)(2)(I) and may include recommendations based on such results.

(d) GRANT REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an assessment on the feasibility of block grants of Federal funding to States.

**SEC. 5. EXCEPTIONS AND RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**

(a) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply to the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program, unless such program or an element of such program is designated as a National Drug Control Program—

(1) by the President; or

(2) jointly by—

(A) in the case of the National Intelligence Program, the Director and the Director of National Intelligence; or

(B) in the case of the Military Intelligence Program, the Director, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense.

(b) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Any contents of any report required under this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, that involve information properly classified under criteria established by an Executive order shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of such report.

(c) USE OF EXISTING RESOURCES.—To the extent practicable, the Director and the head of each agency shall use existing procedures and systems to carry out agency requirements under this Act, and the amendments made by this Act.

**SEC. 6. GAO AUDIT AND REPORTS.**

Not later than three and six years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall—

(1) conduct an audit relating to the programs and operations of—

(A) the Office; and

(B) certain programs within the Office, including—

(i) the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program;

(ii) the Drug-Free Communities Program; and

(iii) the campaign under section 1009(d) of title 31, as added by section 2(c); and

(2) submit to the Director and the appropriate congressional committees a report containing an evaluation of and recommendations on the—

(A) policies and activities of the programs and operations subject to the audit;

(B) economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of the reviewed programs and operations; and

(C) policy or management changes needed to prevent and detect fraud and abuse in such programs and operations.

**SEC. 7. REPEALS.**

(a) REPEALS TO THE LAW.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) The Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–277; 21 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(2) Chapter 2 of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–690; 21 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

(3) Section 203 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469; 21 U.S.C. 1708a).

(4) Section 1105 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469; 21 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(5) Section 1110 of Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469; 21 U.S.C. 1705 note).

(6) Section 1110A of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469; 21 U.S.C. 1705 note).

(7) Section 4 of Public Law 107–82 (21 U.S.C. 1521 note).

(b) EFFECT ON THE CODE.—The Law Revision Counsel shall ensure that the website and any other publication issued after the date of the enactment of this Act for the Office of the Law Revision Counsel shows that the laws reflected in subchapter II of chapter 20 and chapter 22 of nonpositive law title 21 of the United States Code have been repealed.

**SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act, the terms ''agency'', ''appropriate congressional committees'', ''Director'', ''drug'', ''emerging drug threat,'' ''illicit drug use'', ''illicit drugs'', ''National Drug Control Program Agencies'', and ''Office'' have the meaning given those terms in section 1001 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2(c).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5925, introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman GOWDY.

The Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing, or CRISIS, Act is a bill to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control. This relatively small office plays an important role in coordinating the Nation's drug control efforts. The office has become increasingly important as we look to engage governmentwide initiatives to combat the opioid epidemic.

Over the past 2 weeks, we have passed many good bills to help combat the opioid epidemic. Each will move us closer to ending the opioid crisis.

This bill is a critical piece of the puzzle. It ensures Federal, State, and local governments work with each other and other nongovernmental entities to achieve the results we are seeking. Congress needs to provide the Office of National Drug Control the authorities it needs to lead the effort to combat the opioid crisis. The CRISIS Act does just that.

The CRISIS Act updates and reaffirms the office's important role. That includes strengthening certain authorities to empower the office in the midst of this devastating epidemic.

The opioid epidemic has impacted nearly every community across the Nation. One person dies about every 4 hours from an opioid overdose. One of the most important aspects of this bill is a comprehensive response plan. It is not enough to simply have a plan. We need action and follow-through to end the opioid crisis.

The CRISIS Act requires measurable objectives so we know whether the programs we are funding are working.

Accountability is at the heart of this bill. The CRISIS Act requires the Office of National Drug Control to develop a national strategy to be carried out by a wide array of agencies. It then requires the office to oversee and coordinate implementation of that strategy each year. It requires the office to measure whether the agencies are meeting the specific goals of that strategy.

Our colleagues in the House and Senate are advancing a number of bills to address the opioid epidemic, and new initiatives are being announced daily. I offered an amendment in committee markup, with the support of Congressman RASKIN, which brings in requirements from the CODE RED Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

The CODE RED Act and the amendment require a coordinated tracking system of the Federal funding to be put toward drug control efforts throughout the country. This system includes a central repository of grants related to substance abuse treatment, prevention, and enforcement, and to identify those which are duplicative.

The government needs to know exactly what it is spending, where it is going, and if it is working. This is not the time to invest in ineffective strategies. We need to identify resources that work and apply Federal resources accordingly.

I would like to thank my fellow committee members for accepting the amendment, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for offering it with me, and, of course, Mr. ROTHFUS for all the work he has done in finding an effective approach to tackle the opioid crisis.

There are many bills and proposals that seek to end the opioid crisis, but it will only be possible with commitment to a coordinated strategy and a unified approach. This bill, through the reauthorization of the Office of National Drug Control, will provide the coordination, strategy, and unified approach we need.

This is an important and timely bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

*Washington, DC, June 5, 2018.*

Hon. EDWARD ROYCE,

*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 23, 2018, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 5925, the ''Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act,'' with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with additional referrals to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Intelligence, and Appropriations.

I ask you allow the Committee on Foreign Affairs to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so it may be scheduled for floor consideration by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Foreign Affairs represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

*Washington, DC, June 5, 2018.*

Hon. TREY GOWDY,

*Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOWDY: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 5925, the Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act, and for accommodating appropriate edits in the amended text of the bill.

I agree that the Foreign Affairs Committee may be discharged from further action on this bill, subject to the understanding that this waiver does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. The Committee also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this bill, and would appreciate your support for any such request.

I ask that you place our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation, and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, June 8, 2018.*

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
*Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 23, 2018, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 5925, the ''Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act,'' with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with additional referrals to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Intelligence, and Appropriations.

I ask you allow the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so it may be scheduled for floor consideration by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
*Washington, DC, June 11, 2018.*

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
*Chairman, Committee on Government and Oversight Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 23, 2018, H.R. 5925, the ''Coordinate Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act'' was additionally referred to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

In order to expedite the House's consideration of the measure, and in response to your letter dated June 8, 2018, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will forgo consideration of the measure. This courtesy is conditioned on our mutual understanding and agreement that it will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the resolution or any similar measure. I appreciate your support to the appointment of Members from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I would appreciate you including our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5925. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this and other matters between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, June 18, 2018.*

Hon. RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN,
*Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 23, 2018, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 5925, the Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act, with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with additional referrals to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Intelligence, and Appropriations.

I ask you allow the Committee on Appropriations to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so it may be scheduled for floor consideration by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Appropriations represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*Washington, DC, June 19, 2018.*

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
*Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5925, the Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act. As you know, certain provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of Committee on Appropriations.

So that H.R. 5925 may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor, I agree to discharging the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration thereof, subject to the understanding that forgoing formal consideration of the bill will not prejudice the Committee on Appropriations with respect to any future jurisdictional claim. The Committee on Appropriations also reserves the right to seek an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference on this or related legislation.

I request you include our exchange of letters in the bill report filed by your Committee, as well as in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the floor.

Sincerely,

RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, June 19, 2018.*

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 23, 2018, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 5925, the Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act, with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with additional referrals to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Intelligence, and Appropriations.

I ask you allow the Committee on the Judiciary to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so it may be scheduled for floor consideration by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, June 19, 2018.*

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 23, 2018, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 5925, the Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act, with an amendment, by voice vote. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with additional referrals to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Intelligence, and Appropriations.

I ask you allow the Committee on Energy and Commerce to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so it may be scheduled for floor consideration by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOWDY for his leadership and for working together to craft this legislation. I thank Chairman MEADOWS and Ranking Member CONNOLLY for helping us reach the compromises that made this legislation possible.

In 1988, Mr. Speaker, Congress created the Office of National Drug Control Policy. This is the office that should be coordinating our Nation's drug control efforts and leading our response to the drug crisis, which is now,

by the way, killing 175 people per day. Let me repeat that: killing 175 people per day.

However, ONDCP is failing, just when we need it the most. In fact, an article published this week described the office this way: ''empty desks, squabbles, inexperienced staff.''

The failure is glaring. For example, the office is required to produce a national drug control strategy by February 1 of each year. Two February 1sts have now come and two have gone since President Trump took office, but the Trump administration still has not come up with a solution to this most glaring and painful problem. This is simply unacceptable.

Life expectancy in this Nation is falling because we are failing to respond appropriately to this drug crisis. We urgently need to revitalize and strengthen ONDCP.

H.R. 5925, the CRISIS Act, would make changes we need and would improve our drug control efforts if it is fully funded and implemented—fully funded and implemented.

□ 1215

It would expand the office's authority to direct resources where they are most needed. It would strengthen data collection and analysis to help us develop the real-time monitoring we need to understand the rapidly changing dimensions of the opioid crisis.

The bill incorporates several proposals I have offered to give ONDCP new authorities to coordinate critical aspects of our response to the crisis.

I have often said that we must go about the business of being effective and efficient in what we do. These are examples of things that will make ONDCP more effective and efficient in addressing this problem.

For example, for the first time ever, it would create a treatment coordinator within the office responsible for coordinating efforts to expand the availability and quality of evidence-based treatment.

It would also require the office to develop and promulgate model standards for treatment facilities. Right now, too many so-called treatment facilities are taking advantage of desperate families, charging them outlandish prices, bilking insurance companies, but failing to help those in need. As a matter of fact, many people are going into these places seeking to get treatment and come out worse off because they are not being properly treated.

Remember what I said: We want to be effective and efficient in what we do, and we want to make sure that taxpayers' dollars are spent appropriately.

I believe that if H.R. 5925 is enacted and fully implemented, it will improve our drug control efforts, and, for that reason, I am supporting the measure.

However, I want to be real clear about something. Even if this bill is enacted and fully implemented, the drug crisis we are facing will likely get worse. That is because this bill does not provide the resources we need to treat millions of Americans who have the disease of addiction. According to the President's own commission on opioids, only 10 percent of individuals who need treatment for substance abuse disorders are getting it.

No one believes that we can fight cancer, or heart disease, or Alzheimer's if we don't treat people who have these diseases. The same is true here.

Imagine someone going into a doctor's office and the doctor says: Well, you are the 10th person, and you are lucky to get treatment. But the other nine who came before you won't get any treatment.

We will not stand for that. If we don't treat people who are addicted, we will not solve the drug crisis.

We may pass this bill today, celebrate the passage, and say we did a great job. We may work with the Senate to send it to the President. The President might even sign it. But then, next year's overdose fatality numbers will come out. They will show that deaths are continuing to rise. They will show emergency room visits increasing again. They will show the economic effects of a crisis that is already costing us $500 billion a year continuing to grow.

It doesn't have to be this way. No, it doesn't have to be this way. We don't have to just nibble at the edges or rearrange the deck chairs on the Titanic.

I have introduced legislation called the CARE Act with Senator ELIZABETH WARREN, modeled directly on the highly successful Ryan White Act, which Congress passed with bipartisan support in 1990 to address the AIDS crisis.

The CARE Act would provide $10 billion a year in stable, predictable Federal funding to States, counties, and other frontline responders. The CARE Act would provide funds for research to train health professionals to diagnose and treat addiction. It would also provide half a billion dollars per year to purchase the lifesaving drug naloxone at discounted prices and distribute it to first responders, public health agencies, and the public.

I offered the CARE Act as an amendment to this measure considered this week. My amendment was paid for by rolling back just a portion of the tax cuts given by the Republican-controlled Congress to the Nation's largest corporations, including the drug companies who have used their tax breaks to buy back billions of dollars' worth of stock rather than lower drug prices. By the way, there is something wrong with that picture.

But the Republican leadership did not make my amendment in order. The House never considered it.

I support H.R. 5925 and our critical efforts to ensure that we have an office that will effectively and efficiently coordinate our drug control efforts. However, what our Nation truly needs is for us to show the political courage to choose to save the lives of our fellow Americans by adequately funding treatment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support of my colleague for this bipartisan effort to address the opioid crisis in this country. I also appreciate his emphasis on effectively and efficiently addressing that crisis.

I will note that in the last appropriation cycle, we increased funding for opioid treatment by almost $4 billion in this year alone. There is much work to be done; it is a crisis; and we will work together to address that crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), the cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this particular initiative in managing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5925, the CRISIS Act, a bill I cosponsored with Chairman GOWDY; my good friend, the ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS; as well as the ranking member of the Government Operations Subcommittee and good friend, Mr. CONNOLLY.

I want to begin by thanking my colleagues for coming together on this bipartisan bill. H.R. 5925 reauthorizes the Office of National Drug Control Policy and gives the office greater responsibility by enhancing the office's authority to coordinate and oversee the national drug control program at the national, State, and local levels.

It provides communities with a process for sharing information and best practices, and implements recommendations from the President's opioid commission.

It requires an opioid response plan to coordinate with the private sector the implementation of the commission's recommendations and to facilitate the development of treatment and abuse-deterrent products.

Finally, this bill designates the United States Postal Service as a national drug control program agency and requires the office to coordinate actions to reduce the flow of illicit drugs entering the country through the mail.

The ongoing opioid epidemic has taken countless lives, touching literally every community in the country. The national response to this epidemic involves Federal, State, and local governments. It involves the treatment community, the medical community, the law enforcement community, and places of worship.

As we mobilize a national response, we must ensure that every effort to combat this epidemic works and works well. We have all heard too many tragic, life-changing, and, far too often, life-ending stories of opioid addiction.

There is no easy way to end this epidemic. By establishing an effective national response to this epidemic, this bill will support the people and the communities struggling with this addiction.

Mr. Speaker, it is the very lives of our friends, our neighbors, and our family members that depend on us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I would also like to go a little bit further, though, because so many times, when we come together in a bipartisan way, it is Members of Congress who are up here taking the credit for the hard work of a group that actually, behind the scenes, are doing the work. I thank all of the majority staff—Katy Rother, Richard Burkard, Betsy Ferguson, and Sarah Vance; and to Ranking Member CUMMINGS' staff, for all of their work and dedication as well. And I also thank Sally Walker from the Office of Legislative Counsel. Many times, they do the work on the bills behind the scene and nobody ever sees them or thanks them. So, on this day, I want to make sure that we acknowledge their effort, that it doesn't go unnoticed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment, before I yield to my distinguished colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY, to echo what my good friend just said about our staffs.

I, too, thank our staffs for all that they have done. So often they are unseen, unnoticed, and feel, I am sure, unappreciated and unapplauded. But our staffs worked very, very hard on this, and I, too, give the ultimate applause to them. I want to thank you for recognizing them.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Mr. MEADOWS for working so hard to bring all this together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, a man who has just been tireless on this issue and so many others, but who has done such a phenomenal job.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) and my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for their leadership. But I particularly want to thank my good friend from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS is not only a legislative expert, but he is also a moral voice. He speaks with clarity and eloquence, as he did yesterday, about innocent children being detained at the southern border as an un-American activity, something that does not reflect our values. And today, he is lending that same moral voice to the crisis that afflicts so many communities in America: the opioid addiction crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act, or the CRISIS Act, to reauthorize and revamp the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The chairman and ranking member of our full committee worked closely together and with committee members to produce a bipartisan bill that was reported out of the committee unanimously.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the CRISIS Act, which not only reauthorizes ONDCP, but also strengthens that office so that it has the resources it needs to coordinate an effective response to the opioid crisis. And that is something Mr. CUMMINGS stressed. It is not good enough to do something symbolic. We have to ensure it is effective. ONDCP's responsibilities are to produce a national drug control strategy.

□ 1230

Congress created it in 1988 at the height of the crack cocaine epidemic to oversee Federal drug control efforts and to advise the President and the administration on drug control policies and strategies.

It was designed to oversee the National Drug Control Budget to carry out the goals and policies of that strategy, and to evaluate the effectiveness of programs across the Federal Government in implementing the strategy, and to oversee the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas and Drug Free Communities initiatives.

Congress last authorized the ONDCP in 2006. The authorization expired in 2010. That is 8 years ago. Since then, we have developed an opioid crisis the magnitude of which we have never seen in America.

While ONDCP has continued to receive annual appropriations, it is important that Congress reauthorize this program and reflect the crisis we are in.

The opioid epidemic that is currently ravaging communities has taken hundreds of thousands of lives and shows no signs of abating. Every day, 115 Americans die from an opioid overdose.

The epidemic is destroying families, overwhelming first responders, straining public health, criminal justice, and child welfare resources.

This epidemic doesn't care where you live or what political party you belong to. The crisis has touched every community and every corner of our country.

In my State, the Commonwealth of Virginia, opioid overdose deaths spiked by 40 percent to 1,133 from 2015 to 2016, and deaths from synthetic opioids rose from 263 to 692 during that time period.

Northern Virginia, where I represent the good people of Fairfax and Prince William Counties, Fairfax County, for example, reported an increase from 67 to 97 opioid-related deaths from 2015 to 2016. And Prince William County, the other county I represent, increased from 26 to 59 deaths in this time period.

Last month, Dr. Rahul Gupta, Commissioner of the West Virginia Bureau of Public Health, testified before our committee, and he said that the crisis will get worse before it gets better. That was not welcome news.

Yet despite the President's pledges and his own Commission on Combating Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis recommendation that he declare an opioid crisis national emergency, the President, President Trump, took the lesser step of declaring a public health emergency last October.

Seventeen months into this administration, ONDCP is still without a confirmed director and the administration has failed to produce a National Drug Control Strategy.

Instead, the President, President Trump, proposed cutting ONDCP's budget by more than 90 percent. Thank goodness Congress, on a bipartisan basis, did not heed that recommendation.

Just earlier this week, the acting head of the Drug Enforcement Agency announced he is going to be retiring at the end of the month, stating that running that agency in an acting capacity for so long had become increasingly challenging.

As this administration continues to fail to address the opioid epidemic, it is imperative that we take immediate and decisive action on a bipartisan basis.

Reauthorizing the Office of National Drug Control Policy with enhanced authorities will improve the coordination and effectiveness of Federal Government drug control efforts. It is one of the many steps we can take to address the opioid epidemic. It won't solve everything, but it is a very important first step.

I hope the administration will join us in fighting this crisis with real solutions and not empty rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this important bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support of my colleague from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for this bipartisan effort. I certainly hope the American people have the opportunity to see this effort as we address this crisis on a bipartisan basis. Far too frequently, they see conflict and disagreement put forth by media and other sources, but there is a great deal we work together on, and I think we need to stress that as we talk to people about this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, in a moment, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), but first let me give him credit, because he is the sponsor of legislation on which my amendment was based, H.R. 5980, the CODE RED Act.

The CODE RED Act, like the amendment I offered with Mr. RASKIN in committee, requires a coordinated tracking system of Federal funding put towards drug control efforts throughout our country. It is a smart idea, especially given the opioid epidemic in our Nation and the costs of it, and I strongly supported it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MITCHELL for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5925, the Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act, or the CRISIS Act.

This bill reauthorizes the Office of National Drug Control Policy, which has not been reauthorized in a very long time. It makes needed overhauls and updates to the office and even streamlines the name of the office to the Office of National Drug Control, or ONDC.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman GOWDY and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for working in a bipartisan manner. I also thank Representative MITCHELL and Representative RASKIN for working with me to incorporate the first two recommendations of the President's opioid commission into the CRISIS Act.

I introduced a separate bill, the Coordinated Overdose and Drug Epidemic Response to the Emergency Declaration Act, or CODE RED Act, that authorizes ONDC to address those commission recommendations.

ONDC will now be authorized to implement a coordinated tracking system of all federally-funded initiatives and grants. This will help identify barriers and gaps in Federal efforts responding to the opioid crisis and it identifies places where efforts are being duplicated and potentially wasted. This legislation improves the grant application process by standardizing and streamlining it.

The mission here is to deploy Federal resources to localities that need them quickly and efficiently instead of localities wasting valuable time and resources filling out various agency applications.

More broadly, the CRISIS Act will foster better government coordination and strategic planning. ONDC has cross-agency jurisdiction to coordinate the efforts among different agencies, like HHS and DOJ. When agencies work together, the force-multiplying effect can make a huge difference.

We are making progress on the opioid crisis. Bipartisan bills like the CRISIS Act will help win this fight and help the people engage in the fight, like the North Hills of Pittsburgh's Tracy Lawless.

Tracy participated in the President's Commission on Combating Drug Addiction and continues to help find solutions back in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I thank her and everyone else who is making a difference.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the gentleman from Maryland aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I must point out that my Republican colleagues say they want to address the opioid crisis, yet they are standing silent as the Trump administration actively tries to destroy the Affordable Care Act protections for people with pre-existing conditions, which, by the way, includes substance use disorders.

If we aren't going to take available steps to expand access to addiction treatment, at least we should all agree that we shouldn't roll back protections that prevent insurance companies from discriminating against people with substance use disorders. Therefore, we should all be working to protect the Affordable Care Act from the Trump administration's effort to destroy the essential protections it provides.

Again, I remind all of us that ONDCP is a very important entity and it has a job to do, and it must be properly funded.

A lot of people, when they give statistics about opioids and drugs, Mr. Speaker, they find themselves speaking about the dead. Well, I am here to tell you that there are pipelines to death, and those are the people who are addicted now. Those are the ones who are thinking about it, about to start using those drugs. So we must address not only the deaths and the statistics, but we must address treatment that is effective and efficient.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am urging my colleagues to vote for this bill, but I want it to be clear that we should not dust our hands off and say it is done.

It is not done. There is so much more to do.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's support of the bill. In my brief time here, a year and a half, it has become abundantly clear to me that rarely do we get to dust off our hands and say we are done around here.

It has also become clear to me that the debate of the bill rarely stays on the topic of the bill or solely on the topic of the bill. You see, the ACA, the Affordable Care Act, is not the sole approach to addressing healthcare issues in this country, preexisting conditions, or the preexisting conditions that are affected by drug abuse.

I believe when we passed the American Health Care Act in this House, that that addressed preexisting conditions, treatment for substance abuse, and, using the words of my colleague, did so more effectively and efficiently than the Affordable Care Act does now.

We clearly disagree on that. I respect that, and will continue to work on it.

Today, we are dealing with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill, because I believe that H.R. 5925 is an important step not only in reauthorizing the Office of National Drug Control, but also in providing additional resources to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5925, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## OVERDOSE PREVENTION AND PATIENT SAFETY ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 949, I call up the bill (H.R. 6082) to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 949, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–75 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 6082

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

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.***

*This Act may be cited as the ''Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act''.*

***SEC. 2. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS RELATING TO SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.***

*(a) CONFORMING CHANGES RELATING TO SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.—Subsections (a) and (h) of section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2) are each amended by striking ''substance abuse'' and inserting ''substance use disorder''.*

*(b) DISCLOSURES TO COVERED ENTITIES CONSISTENT WITH HIPAA.—Paragraph (2) of section 543(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(D) To a covered entity or to a program or activity described in subsection (a), for the purposes of treatment, payment, and health care operations, so long as such disclosure is made in accordance with HIPAA privacy regulation. Any redisclosure of information so disclosed may only be made in accordance with this section.''.*

*(c) DISCLOSURES OF DE-IDENTIFIED HEALTH INFORMATION TO PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORITIES.—Paragraph (2) of section 543(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2(b)), as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(E) To a public health authority, so long as such content meets the standards established in section 164.514(b) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations) for creating de-identified information.''.*

*(d) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:*

*''(A) COVERED ENTITY.—The term 'covered entity' has the meaning given such term for purposes of HIPAA privacy regulation.*

*''(B) HEALTH CARE OPERATIONS.—The term 'health care operations' has the meaning given such term for purposes of HIPAA privacy regulation.*

''(C) HIPAA PRIVACY REGULATION.—The term 'HIPAA privacy regulation' has the meaning given such term under section 1180(b)(3) of the Social Security Act.

''(D) INDIVIDUALLY IDENTIFIABLE HEALTH INFORMATION.—The term 'individually identifiable health information' has the meaning given such term for purposes of HIPAA privacy regulation.

''(E) PAYMENT.—The term 'payment' has the meaning given such term for purposes of HIPAA privacy regulation.

''(F) PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORITY.—The term 'public health authority' has the meaning given such term for purposes of HIPAA privacy regulation.

''(G) TREATMENT.—The term 'treatment' has the meaning given such term for purposes of HIPAA privacy regulation.''.

(e) USE OF RECORDS IN CRIMINAL, CIVIL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS, ACTIONS, OR PROCEEDINGS.—Subsection (c) of section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) USE OF RECORDS IN CRIMINAL, CIVIL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE CONTEXTS.—Except as otherwise authorized by a court order under subsection (b)(2)(C) or by the consent of the patient, a record referred to in subsection (a) may not—

''(1) be entered into evidence in any criminal prosecution or civil action before a Federal or State court;

''(2) form part of the record for decision or otherwise be taken into account in any proceeding before a Federal agency;

''(3) be used by any Federal, State, or local agency for a law enforcement purpose or to conduct any law enforcement investigation of a patient; or

''(4) be used in any application for a warrant.''.

(f) PENALTIES.—Subsection (f) of section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) PENALTIES.—The provisions of sections 1176 and 1177 of the Social Security Act shall apply to a violation of this section to the extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply to a violation of part C of title XI of such Act. In applying the previous sentence—

''(1) the reference to 'this subsection' in subsection (a)(2) of such section 1176 shall be treated as a reference to 'this subsection (including as applied pursuant to section 543(f) of the Public Health Service Act)'; and

''(2) in subsection (b) of such section 1176—

''(A) each reference to 'a penalty imposed under subsection (a)' shall be treated as a reference to 'a penalty imposed under subsection (a) (including as applied pursuant to section 543(f) of the Public Health Service Act)'; and

''(B) each reference to 'no damages obtained under subsection (d)' shall be treated as a reference to 'no damages obtained under subsection (d) (including as applied pursuant to section 543(f) of the Public Health Service Act)'.''.

(g) ANTIDISCRIMINATION.—Section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ANTIDISCRIMINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No entity shall discriminate against an individual on the basis of information received by such entity pursuant to a disclosure made under subsection (b) in—

''(A) admission or treatment for health care;

''(B) hiring or terms of employment;

''(C) the sale or rental of housing; or

''(D) access to Federal, State, or local courts.

''(2) RECIPIENTS OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—No recipient of Federal funds shall discriminate against an individual on the basis of information received by such recipient pursuant to a disclosure made under subsection (b) in affording access to the services provided with such funds.''.

(h) NOTIFICATION IN CASE OF BREACH.—Section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2), as amended by subsection (g), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) NOTIFICATION IN CASE OF BREACH.—

''(1) APPLICATION OF HITECH NOTIFICATION OF BREACH PROVISIONS.—The provisions of section 13402 of the HITECH Act (42 U.S.C. 17932) shall apply to a program or activity described in subsection (a), in case of a breach of records described in subsection (a), to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply to a covered entity in the case of a breach of unsecured protected health information.

''(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms 'covered entity' and 'unsecured protected health information' have the meanings given to such terms for purposes of such section 13402.''.

(i) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that any person treating a patient through a program or activity with respect to which the confidentiality requirements of section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2) apply should access the applicable State-based prescription drug monitoring program as a precaution against substance use disorder.

(j) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall make such revisions to regulations as may be necessary for implementing and enforcing the amendments made by this section, such that such amendments shall apply with respect to uses and disclosures of information occurring on or after the date that is 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EASILY UNDERSTANDABLE NOTICE OF PRIVACY PRACTICES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with appropriate experts, shall update section 164.520 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, so that covered entities provide notice, written in plain language, of privacy practices regarding patient records referred to in section 543(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2(a)), including—

(A) a statement of the patient's rights, including self-pay patients, with respect to protected health information and a brief description of how the individual may exercise these rights (as required by paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of such section 164.520); and

(B) a description of each purpose for which the covered entity is permitted or required to use or disclose protected health information without the patient's written authorization (as required by paragraph (b)(2) of such section 164.520).

(k) DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION OF MODEL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER PATIENT RECORDS.—

(1) INITIAL PROGRAMS AND MATERIALS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the ''Secretary''), in consultation with appropriate experts, shall identify the following model programs and materials (or if no such programs or materials exist, recognize private or public entities to develop and disseminate such programs and materials):

(A) Model programs and materials for training health care providers (including physicians, emergency medical personnel, psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, therapists, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, behavioral health facilities and clinics, care managers, and hospitals, including individuals such as general counsels or regulatory compliance staff who are responsible for establishing provider privacy policies) concerning the permitted uses and disclosures, consistent with the standards and regulations governing the privacy and security of substance use disorder patient records promulgated by the Secretary under section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2), as amended by this section, for the confidentiality of patient records.

(B) Model programs and materials for training patients and their families regarding their rights to protect and obtain information under the standards and regulations described in subparagraph (A).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The model programs and materials described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall address circumstances under which disclosure of substance use disorder patient records is needed to—

(A) facilitate communication between substance use disorder treatment providers and other health care providers to promote and provide the best possible integrated care;

(B) avoid inappropriate prescribing that can lead to dangerous drug interactions, overdose, or relapse; and

(C) notify and involve families and caregivers when individuals experience an overdose.

(3) PERIODIC UPDATES.—The Secretary shall—

(A) periodically review and update the model programs and materials identified or developed under paragraph (1); and

(B) disseminate such updated programs and materials to the individuals described in paragraph (1)(A).

(4) INPUT OF CERTAIN ENTITIES.—In identifying, reviewing, or updating the model programs and materials under this subsection, the Secretary shall solicit the input of relevant stakeholders.

(l) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to limit—

(1) a patient's right, as described in section 164.522 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, to request a restriction on the use or disclosure of a record referred to in section 543(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2(a)) for purposes of treatment, payment, or health care operations; or

(2) a covered entity's choice, as described in section 164.506 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, to obtain the consent of the individual to use or disclose a record referred to in such section 543(a) to carry out treatment, payment, or health care operation.

(m) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) patients have the right to request a restriction on the use or disclosure of a record referred to in section 543(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2(a)) for treatment, payment, or health care operations; and

(2) covered entities should make every reasonable effort to the extent feasible to comply with a patient's request for a restriction regarding such use or disclosure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 6082.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the past several months, the Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Health held four legislative hearings on bills to address the opioid epidemic and reported 57 bills to the full committee. Of those 57 bills, only one received its own discrete hearing. That bill was H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act, introduced by Representatives MULLIN and BLUMENAUER.

□ 1245

As a physician, I believe it is vital that doctors have all of the appropriate information to determine the proper course of treatment for a patient, ensuring patient safety and privacy, as required by Federal regulation known as HIPAA. The Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act maintains the original intent of the 1970s statute behind 42 CFR part 2 by protecting patients and improving care coordination.

In fact, the bill increases protections for those seeking treatment by more severely penalizing those who illegally share patient data than under the current statute. Current part 2 law does not protect individuals from discrimination based on their treatment records and, to this date, there have been no criminal actions undertaken to enforce part 2.

This bill has a wide range of support from national and State organizations. Since the bill was introduced, the Energy and Commerce Committee has heard from over 100 organizations in its support.

Arguably, the most notable support for this legislation comes from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the Department of Health and Human Services. Dr. Elinore McCance-Katz, the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, wrote to Mr. MULLIN in March, stating that SAMHSA ''is encouraged to see Congress examine the benefits of aligning part 2 with HIPAA. Patient privacy is, of course, critical but so too is patient access to safe, effective, and coordinated treatment.''

I agree with Dr. McCance-Katz that in order to ensure patient safety, physicians must have secure access to patient records, including substance use disorder information. When this information is not provided to healthcare professionals, they may end up prescribing medications that have dangerous drug interactions or may lead a patient who is in recovery to be inappropriately prescribed an opioid and fall back into addiction.

One particular complication driven by 42 CFR part 2 directly impacts the care for pregnant women and their infants. For women who are pregnant, part 2 does not allow redisclosure of substance use disorder medical documentation to the women's OB/GYN doctor, primary care physician, or health home without their written consent. This leads to fragmented care, which opens up the mother and her baby to potential harm.

Centerstone, one of the Nation's largest not-for-profit healthcare organizations, notes that ''mothers who continue to use during pregnancy and who do not wish to sign secondary releases to allow their care providers to treat them comprehensively put their unborn children at risk for addiction.''

Centerstone watches these women and their infants suffer right before their eyes, but, because of part 2, Centerstone cannot share the information to ensure that the mother and baby are getting proper care.

As an OB/GYN physician myself, I cannot imagine having this information withheld. Such a situation would leave me with the inability to treat the whole patient and ensure that the mother is healthy and her baby is not on a path for addiction.

In another situation, a patient was referred to a treatment center following an emergency room visit for an overdose. The patient was not able to give written consent to his providers due to acute intoxication. Due to a lack of written consent and 42 CFR part 2, the treatment facility could not communicate to the ER and learn about the patient's condition or confirm that the patient had, indeed, enrolled in a drug treatment center, further delaying critical care coordination.

There is clear evidence that part 2 is a massive roadblock to providing safe, quality, and coordinated care to individuals suffering from substance use disorder.

The issue of the stigma associated with substance use disorder has been a constant in all of the discussions that we have had, both in our offices and in our hearings. In April, we heard from numerous individuals who were parents of children who died from opioid overdoses. Some noted that their children were afraid to seek help from their families or from healthcare professionals because they were embarrassed or they felt stigmatized.

We should enable physicians to fully care for these patients suffering from substance use disorder as if they had any other disease. The Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act will do just that.

The first step in addressing a problem is admitting that it exists. I would like to pose a question to those who are arguing against this legislation:

If we continue to silo the substance use disorder treatment information of a select group of patients rather than integrating it into our medical records and comprehensive care models, how can we ensure that these patients are, in fact, receiving quality care? How can we really treat substance use disorder like all other complex health conditions?

H.R. 6082 ensures adequate patient data protection in accordance with Federal law, with HIPAA. There are provisions in the language that ensure that the data may only be used for purposes of treatment, payment, or healthcare operations. Substance use disorder data cannot be used in criminal, civil, or administrative investigations, actions, or proceedings without patient consent or a court order.

Additionally, the legislation explicitly prohibits discrimination against an individual on the basis of their patient needs. Currently, part 2 includes no antidiscrimination protections and no protections for individuals if there is a data breach or improper disclosure.

Think about that for a minute, Mr. Speaker. This was a 1970s-era law. There were not data breaches back in the 1970s. 42 CFR part 2 was never intended to protect a patient in the instance of a data breach.

Should any entity or individual share patient data under H.R. 6082, they, in fact, will be severely penalized.

There is a reason why SAMHSA and most of the healthcare stakeholder community is asking for this change. Clearly, there is an issue here that must be addressed. This opioid crisis is devastating our country. Passing the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act will enable greater coordination among healthcare providers in providing quality, effective care for individuals across the country who are battling substance use disorder.

My thanks to Mr. MULLIN on the Energy and Commerce Committee and to Mr. BLUMENAUER for introducing this legislation that is of utmost importance.

I urge strong support for the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act. This legislation would greatly harm our efforts to combat the opioid epidemic. If we really want to turn the tide on this crisis, we must find ways to get more people into treatment for opioid use disorder.

In 2016, there were about 21 million Americans aged 12 or older in need of substance use disorder treatment, but only 4 million of those 21 million actually received treatment. That means 17 million people are going without the treatment they need. Failure to get individuals with opioid use disorder into treatment increases risk of fatal and nonfatal overdoses as people continue to seek out illicit opioids as part of their addiction. The increasing presence of fentanyl in our drug supply only heightens this concern.

Strategies that increase the number of people getting into and remaining in treatment are particularly important because, as these treatment statistics show, major challenges exist to getting people with substance use disorders to enter treatment in the first place. And this House should not—and I stress ''should not''—take any action that puts at risk people seeking treatment for any substance use disorder, but particularly opioid use disorders.

Unfortunately, this bill risks doing just that: reducing the number of people willing to come forward and remain

in treatment because they worry about the negative consequences that seeking treatment can have on their lives. And this is a very real concern.

This bill weakens privacy protections that must be in place for some people to feel comfortable about starting treatment for their substance use disorder. Ensuring strong privacy protections is critical to maintaining an individual's trust in the healthcare system and a willingness to obtain needed health services, and these protections are especially important where very sensitive information is concerned.

The information that may be included in the treatment records of a substance use disorder patient are particularly sensitive because disclosure of substance use disorder information can create tangible vulnerabilities that are not the same as other medical conditions. For example, you are not incarcerated for having a heart attack; you cannot legally be fired for having cancer; and you are not denied visitation to your children due to sleep apnea.

According to SAMHSA, the negative consequences that can result from the disclosure of an individual's substance use disorder treatment record can include loss of employment, loss of housing, loss of child custody, discrimination by medical professionals and insurers, arrest, prosecution, and incarceration. These are real risks that keep people from getting treatment in the first place.

While I understand that the rollback of the existing privacy protections to the HIPAA standard would limit permissible disclosures without patient consent to healthcare organizations, this ignores the reality: It may be illegal for information to be disclosed outside these healthcare organizations, but we know, Mr. Speaker, that information does get out. Breaches do happen.

Remember the recent large-scale Aetna breach that disclosed some of its members' HIV status?

But there are also small-scale breaches that don't make the news that can have devastating consequences for patients trying to recover and get treatment. For example, a recent ProPublica investigation detailed instances where a healthcare organization's employee peeked at the record of a patient 61 times and posted details on Facebook, while another improperly shared a patient's health information with the patient's parole officer. Breaches such as this are very concerning and could occur more often as a result of this legislation.

While I appreciate the sponsor's efforts to alleviate these concerns, I do not believe the potential harm that could be caused by eliminating the patient consent requirement under existing law for treatment, payment, and healthcare operations can be remedied through the measures included in this bill. The inclusion of these provisions cannot compensate for the risk of stigma, discrimination, and negative health and life outcomes for individuals with opioid use disorder that could result from the weakening of the existing privacy protections, and that is why every substance use disorder patient group has come out in opposition to this bill.

According to the Campaign to Protect Patient Privacy Rights, a coalition of more than 100 organizations: ''Using the weaker HIPAA privacy rule standard of allowing disclosure of substance use disorder information without patient consent for treatment, payment, and healthcare operations will contribute to the existing level of discrimination and harm to people living with substance use disorders.''

The Campaign goes on to say: ''This will only result in more people who need substance use disorder treatment being discouraged and afraid to seek the healthcare they need during the Nation's worst opioid crisis.''

This is a risk we simply should not take, and yet the majority is bringing this bill to the floor today, despite the very real concerns of these experts. These groups uniquely understand what is at stake from this legislation because many of their members live with or are in fear of the negative consequences that result from the disclosure of substance use disorder diagnosis and treatment information.

In fact, the negative consequences that will result from the disclosure of someone's substance use disorder would solely affect that individual and their family. They will bear the burden if we get this wrong. They could be at risk of potentially losing custody of their child and their freedom by the increased risk of improper disclosure of their medical record if this bill becomes law.

These risks may simply just keep them from seeking potentially life-saving treatment. That is why substance use disorder treatment providers have also raised concerns.

The South Carolina Association of Opioid Dependence explained: ''Even with the growing awareness that substance use disorders are a disease, the unfortunate truth is that persons with substance use disorder are still actively discriminated against . . . such as a baby being taken away from a new mother because she is on methadone for an opioid use disorder, despite long-standing compliance with her treatment and abstinence from illegal drug use.''

Another provider, Raise the Bottom Addiction Treatment, one of two medical-assisted treatment facilities in Idaho, explained that ''our patients come from every walk of life, including professionals and executives within our community. Their anonymity and privacy is of utmost importance because their careers, families, and livelihood often depend on it.

''Knowing that people may seek treatment without fear of backlash and discrimination is often a deciding factor when considering entering treatment.

''To undo this protection will deeply affect one's ability and willingness to seek help. . . . Not only can the members of our community not afford to lose their right to confidentiality, but we as a nation cannot afford to move backwards in our fight to combat this opiate crisis.''

□ 1300

So again, Mr. Speaker, these are the words of experts on the frontline fighting this epidemic. People who suffer from substance use disorder should be able to decide with whom to share their treatment records from programs and for what purposes. Those rights are taken away from them under this legislation, and I believe that is wrong.

As we face a tragic national drug abuse problem, the scale of which our country has never seen, I believe maintaining the heightened privacy protections under existing law remains vital to ensuring all individuals with substance use disorder can seek treatment for their substance use disorder with confidence that their right to privacy will be protected. To do otherwise at this time is just too great a risk, and I strongly urge my colleagues to listen to the experts on the subject and to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the principal sponsor of the bill and a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of my bill, H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act.

My colleague Mr. BLUMENAUER and I introduced this bill to help physicians fight the opioid epidemic. The Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act allows the flow of information among healthcare providers and health planners for the purpose of treatment, payment, and healthcare operations.

Unfortunately, there is an outdated Federal Government mandate, 42 CFR part 2, which is creating a firewall between doctors and patients.

My bill, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act, will give doctors access to patients' addiction medical information that can integrate their care, prevent tragic overdoses, and improve patient safety.

SAMHSA has stated: ''The practice of requiring substance use disorder information to be any more private than information regarding other chronic illnesses, such as cancer or heart disease, may in itself be stigmatizing. Patients with substance use disorders seeking treatment for any condition have a right to healthcare providers who are fully equipped with the information needed to provide the highest quality care available.''

When a person violates part 2, it is referred to the Justice Department,

and there is only a $50 penalty. There have been zero cases—let me repeat that—there have been zero cases in which part 2 was enforced or any action taken by the Department of Justice or SAMHSA.

The penalties for noncompliance underneath HIPAA are based on the level of negligence and can range from $100 to $50,000 per violation, with a maximum of $1.5 million per year.

There have been 173,472 HIPAA violations since 2003, with 97 percent of those complaints resolved.

Patients, doctors, hospitals, and a broad spectrum of stakeholders agree we need to end this outdated Federal Government mandate helping prevent the private sector's innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. PALLONE's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill. I respect his efforts, and I respect a number of his concerns. But I do think that the work that we have done with Mr. MULLIN, with the committee, and I appreciate the subcommittee's extra efforts to work through these elements, listen to people's objections, and to do it right.

There has been no argument that this provision has cost lives. The failure in emergency rooms, other circumstances, for people to not be able to get the full picture of a patient's condition ends up sometimes with tragic consequences. We have yet to hear any reason why we shouldn't coordinate.

Now, I appreciate concerns about patient privacy, but as Dr. BURGESS and my friend from Oklahoma point out, we are strengthening provisions under this bill for disclosure. People don't want to stigmatize those with substance abuse, we agree. But having a separate system that people have to go through just for substance abuse implies a stigma. People will think there is something wrong with these people. You don't do this for AIDS anymore. This harmonizes with all the other HIPAA provisions.

Candidly, forcing people to go through yet another step probably raises questions about the validity of disclosure, raising questions in the minds of those who go through that.

Mr. Speaker, we have made, I think, tremendous progress dealing with stigma, dealing with patient protection, what we have done for mental health, which has devastating consequences in some cases if people's records were revealed. Think what has happened with HIV/AIDS. There was a time when that would end up with people not just having a stigma but at risk of losing their jobs, being ostracized.

These are the same provisions in this bill that are there for HIV/AIDS or mental health, for everything under HIPAA.

I really do think that we take a step back, understanding that having separate authorizations complicates the coordination and integration of treatment. Oftentimes, behavioral health information doesn't arrive in an orderly fashion. It is another step of complication that could have tragic consequences.

In fact, the subcommittee's record demonstrates that. There have been examples where people have died because the medical providers did not have the full picture of the patient. This legislation will fix it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. BURGESS, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, for his fine leadership on this issue, along with our colleagues, Mr. MULLIN and my friend from Oregon and colleague, Mr. BLUMENAUER, who put a lot of work into this. I commend my colleague from Oregon for his strong statement in support of this legislation.

Combating the opioid epidemic has been a top priority of all of us in this Congress and especially on the Energy and Commerce Committee, which I chair.

We have committed the last year and a half to examining the ways we can respond to save lives, to help people in our communities, and to end this deadly, deadly epidemic.

During that time, I have heard a lot of stories, both at the hearings here in the Nation's Capital and back home in Oregon, where I have held multiple roundtables and meetings in the communities about what we need to do to help the outcome of patients; our neighbors, our friends, in some cases family members, who are dealing with these addictions.

An extraordinary array of people, including patients, parents of those suffering with addiction, the Oregon Hospital Association, Oregon Governor Kate Brown, physicians, and substance use disorder treatment providers, have all told me and our committee that existing Federal confidentiality regulations and statute known as 42 CFR part 2, or simply part 2, are working against—working against—patients and making it harder to effectively treat addiction. There is hardly anyone in the healthcare sector that we have not heard from on this issue.

One story that really comes to mind is that of Brandon McKee. Brandon's brother, Dustin, testified before our Health Subcommittee when we reviewed a near identical version of this legislation back in May.

Tragically, Brandon had died of an opioid overdose at just 36 years of age. He left behind three young children.

Speaking about his passing, his brother Dustin told the subcommittee: ''Brandon's death was preventable. However, in part because of the antiquated provisions contained within 42 CFR part 2, the medical professionals that prescribed him opiate-based pain medications were not able to identify him as a high-risk individual.''

You see, Brandon was prescribed opioids after back surgery on two separate occasions despite his history of substance use disorder. Within a few months of his second surgery, Brandon fatally overdosed on heroin. That is why this bill is so important.

Health records for substance use disorder are the only—only—records that are siloed in this way, preventing physicians from seeing the complete picture of a patient they are treating. The doctors don't know.

All other protected health information for every other disease falls under HIPAA. The Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act will help align Federal privacy standards for substance use disorder treatment information more closely with HIPAA so that our doctors and our addiction specialists can provide the highest and safest level of treatment.

In short, this bill will improve coordination of care for patients suffering from substance use disorder and save lives by helping to prevent overdoses and dangerous drug interactions.

Now, I fully respect and understand the privacy concerns that some still have, and the sensitivities about the idea of making changes to a statute that has been in place since the 1970s, long before HIPAA. That is why Representatives MULLIN and BLUMENAUER worked in a bipartisan fashion to include strong unlawful disclosure penalties, discrimination protections, and breach notification requirements in this bill.

Doing so, H.R. 6082 will actually improve the ability to penalize those who illegally disclose a patient's information. This isn't about using this information for any other purpose than treating that patient safely.

To be clear, there is no legal way for a patient's substance use disorder treatment information to be used against them under this bill. This bill, instead, expands protections for individuals seeking addiction treatment above and beyond existing law, and it will help us turn the tide on the opioid scourge.

I want to thank Mr. MULLIN and Mr. BLUMENAUER once again for their work, and the other Members on the committee. This bipartisan bill will save lives. It is critically importantly to our efforts to combat the opioid crisis, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6082.

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

Mr. Speaker, proponents of this legislation argue that taking away patients' privacy rights related to substance use disorder treatment records is okay because we would be applying the HIPAA standard that applies to other sensitive health conditions like HIV, but I strongly disagree.

Individuals with substance use disorder face risk because of their medical conditions that those with other medical conditions do not. According to SAMHSA, those negative consequences include loss of employment, loss of housing, loss of child custody, discrimination by medical professionals and insurers, arrests, prosecution, and incarceration.

Unlike other medical conditions, including HIV, you can be incarcerated, legally fired, and denied visitation with your children due to your substance use disorder.

So let me paint this picture with a few examples.

A 20-year-old pregnant woman in Wisconsin voluntarily went to a hospital to seek treatment for addiction to the opiate OxyContin. Rather than providing treatment, the hospital called State authorities to report this woman. She was taken into custody and held for several weeks before a judge ordered her released.

Another example provided to the committee from a provider in Maryland explained:

> Some time ago, we had a young lady in our methadone maintenance program who committed suicide. She had turned her life around. She was in college, working full time, owned her own car, was purchasing a house, and was no longer using illicit substances. She had to complete probation for her crimes that she had committed while she was actively using these drugs.
>
> Her mother did not know she was in methadone treatment. She did not want her mother to know because her mother did not agree with methadone, and the judge found out she was in the methadone maintenance program and disclosed it in a court hearing with her mother present.
>
> The judge and her mother insisted that she ''get off that stuff,'' and she complied only because of the pressure from both to do so.
>
> She began abusing illicit substances and participating in illegal activity to obtain those substances. The guilt and shame of returning to what she described as a life of hell led her to write a suicide note and end her life.

□ 1315

Experiences like this, in addition to stories of individuals with substance use disorder who have lost jobs, housing, and child custody because of their substance use disorder, are reasons that some individuals with substance use disorder fear coming forward to enter treatment due to the negative consequences that result. It is why more than 100 groups, including AIDS United, joined the campaign to protect patient privacy rights. They have joined together to fight to protect the heightened privacy protections that exist under existing law.

Further, unlike the proponents of this legislation contend, the existing law is not an anomaly. States like Florida have laws requiring written patient consent for the sharing of a patient's substance use disorder and mental health treatment records, while others like New York, Kentucky, and Texas have such requirements for the sharing of HIV records. Other States have such requirements for reproductive health treatment records.

Further, the existing law is consistent with the confidentiality protections applied to substance use disorder treatment records. In fact, the law governing the confidentiality of VA medical records, 38 U.S.C. 7332, is consistent with and broader than part 2. Unlike that law, the VA cannot share a patient's substance use disorder, HIV, or sickle cell anemia treatment records with another provider without written patient consent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that I do believe that we can learn an important lesson from our response to HIV, particularly during the height of the AIDS epidemic. A critical part of this Nation's response to the AIDS epidemic was increasing the privacy protections applied to HIV medical records. Such action was taken because people were afraid to enter treatment for HIV/AIDS because of the negative consequences that could result.

In the midst of the opioid epidemic, this bill would result in doing just the opposite: lowering the privacy protections applied to substance use disorder medical records despite the fact that, like during the AIDS epidemic, some individuals with substance use disorder remain afraid to enter treatment because of the negative consequences that result. And in many cases, they only do so out of the part 2 assurances that they can control to whom and for what purposes their treatment record is shared.

The increased stigma, discrimination, and criminalization faced by people with substance use disorder support the maintenance of the heightened privacy protections under existing law, in my opinion. And for some individuals, it is these privacy protections that make them feel safe to enter and remain in treatment for their substance use disorder. I am afraid that by passing this bill we could be creating a barrier that will keep people from getting the treatment they need, and that is a risk I am simply not willing to take.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of response before I yield to Dr. BUCSHON.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic story that was just related to us really only reinforces the need to change the statute behind 42 CFR part 2. There are some important facts missing from the description of the situation that occurred.

It appears evident that at least one or both of the parties involved, the judge, and/or the methadone maintenance program, violated existing regulations under both part 2 and HIPAA.

Under part 2, patient records may only be disclosed without patient consent if the disclosure is authorized by an appropriate order of a court of competent jurisdiction. There must be a showing of good cause in which the court must weigh the public interest and need for disclosure against the injury to the patient, the physician-patient relationship, and treatment services. Further, the court must impose appropriate safeguards against unauthorized disclosure.

It is not clear from the description provided in the letter how the judge found out about the patient's participation in a methadone maintenance program. If the information to the judge was provided without an appropriate court order, then the methadone maintenance program likely violated the requirements under part 2 to safeguard the patient's records from such disclosure. If the information was provided as a result of a court order, then it is possible that the judge violated his or her ethical obligations to appropriately weigh the need for the information and safeguard the information once received.

Under HIPAA, there is still an obligation for the parties seeking information to confirm that reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the individual has been given notice of the request for personal health information and the opportunity to object or that reasonable efforts have been made to secure a qualified protective order. Compliance with either of these requirements appears to have been lacking in the situation described in the letter.

All of this suggests that part 2 currently is insufficient to protect patients in these situations. The legislation before us today does not decrease the protections against the use of the records in criminal proceedings that already exist under part 2, but HIPAA makes the protections stronger.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a valuable member of our committee and our subcommittee that has heard the testimony on this legislation.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act. This legislation will improve the ability of medical professionals to properly care for patients by allowing physicians access to a patient's full medical record, including information about substance use disorder treatment, while ensuring robust privacy protections.

As a physician, I know that patients don't always notify their doctors of all the medications they are taking, and not having a complete medical record or knowing a patient's background can result in potentially life-threatening complications related to medical treatment. I have seen this in my own practice, and my wife sees this almost daily in her anesthesia practice.

This is commonsense legislation which will ensure patients receive appropriate healthcare, while also ensuring the medical information remains private. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6082.

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

Mr. Speaker, some of the proponents of this bill also mentioned the opiate use disorder situations in emergency rooms as a justification for the legislation, but I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that the existing law includes an exception to the patient consent requirement. A provider can access a patient's substance use disorder treatment records in the case of an emergency as determined by the provider without patient consent.

Additionally, nothing in the existing law prevents any provider from asking their patient about their substance use disorder history before prescribing any opioid, especially in the midst of the opioid epidemic. Every provider should ask patients about their opioid use disorder history, and, therefore, under the existing law and every other privacy law, the doctor can learn of a patient's opiate use disorder history by simply asking the patient that.

That remains, in my opinion, the optimum way of learning a patient's medical history, because currently our electronic health records aren't interoperable in many cases. Those underlying interoperability issues that prevent information sharing, including the part 2 information in cases where a patient has agreed to share their information with providers, aren't going to be solved by this bill.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be on the floor with my good friend and colleague, the ranking member, Congressman PALLONE. I know his heart is solid and I know he believes that we are challenging some privacy concerns, and I take that in the spirit intended.

As a Republican, I was an early supporter of one of our former colleague's—Sue Myrick's—Mental Health Parity Act. And the whole intent of that, for many of us, was to say mental health illness is an illness and should be accepted as an illness. But what we have done under the Federal code is to separate it. So I think the intent of what we are trying to do is not separate it and make it part of the health records.

We have heard the debate on both sides, but that is the basic premise from which I come. And we have heard the testimony of people for whom the information was not shared with the regular doctor versus the mental health, and then prescriptions occurring and then catastrophic events.

The intent of this legislation is to help patients and to help providers better take care of their patients. This is not about taking away privacy but taking care of people. It is about making sure people have the appropriate level of privacy for the services they are seeking.

We don't create extra privacy barriers so that people with heart disease, HIV, or diabetes can keep their doctors in the dark and withhold critical information relevant to the insurer benefits that they are using. This goes back to, as we have heard today, a 1970-era mandate.

Gary Mendell, the founder of Shatterproof, lost his son Brian, who was recovering from substance use disorder, after he tragically took his own life. Gary said the following about aligning part 2 with HIPAA:

> The solution is not to keep this information out of electronic health records and not available. The solution is to end the stigma and to bring this disease and mental illness into the healthcare system, just like diabetes, cancer, or any other disease.

And I couldn't agree more with Gary. He also said:

> If there's an issue related to unintended consequences, let's fix that.

I think in this piece of legislation, Congressman MULLIN and Congressman BLUMENAUER intended to do that.

Gary also said:

> Let's not keep this out of the healthcare system, unlike diabetes, heart disease, and cancer, because then we just perpetuate the situation that is causing it in the first place.

I will continue. Individuals with opioid use disorder die, on average, a decade sooner than other Americans. This is largely because of the strikingly high incidence of poorly managed, co-occurring chronic diseases, including HIV/AIDS, cardiac conditions, lung disease, and cirrhosis.

Whatever we as a nation are doing to coordinate care for this highly vulnerable population is failing by any reasonable measure.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, an extraordinary array of organizations, hospitals, physicians, patient advocates, and substance use treatment providers have approached this committee to clearly state that existing Federal addiction privacy law is actively interfering with case management and care coordination efforts. Arguing against this legislation preserved a fatal and deadly status quo.

I support this piece of legislation, and I thank my colleague for the time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier the various groups that are opposed to this legislation because of the privacy concerns, and I actually would like to read or go through some sections from this letter that was sent to Chairman WALDEN and me from over 100 groups, including the New Jersey Association of Mental Health and Addiction Agencies.

And they say, Mr. Speaker:

> Dear Chairman Walden and Ranking Member Pallone:
>
> We, the undersigned national, State, and local organizations strongly support maintaining the core protections of the Federal substance use disorder patient confidentiality law and its regulations, referred to collectively as part 2.

And they say:

> We remain concerned that using a weaker HIPAA privacy rule standard of allowing disclosure of substance use disorder information without patient consent or other purposes will contribute to the existing level of discrimination and harm to people living with substance use disorders. This will only result in more people who need substance use disorder treatment being discouraged and afraid to seek the healthcare they need during the Nation's worst opioid crisis.
>
> We strongly support maintaining part 2's current core protections for substance use disorder information instead of those weaker HIPAA privacy standards for the following reasons.

And there are five.

> One, the heightened privacy protections in part 2 are as critical today as they were when they were enacted more than 40 years ago and must be preserved.
>
> Two, in the midst of the worst opioid epidemic in our Nation's history, we must do everything possible to increase, not decrease, the number of people who seek treatment.

□ 1330

> Three, substance use disorder is unique among medical conditions because of its criminal and civil consequences and the rampant discrimination people face.
>
> Four, with so much at stake, patients in substance use disorder treatment should retain the right to consent when and to whom their records are disclosed, as currently found in part 2.
>
> Five, effective integration of substance use disorder treatment with the rest of the healthcare system is critically important, and information exchange in accordance with confidentiality law and current technology is now possible. To facilitate that process, SAMHSA recently amended the part 2 regulations to further promote the integration of confidential substance use disorder information into general health records.

They finally conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying:

> We respectfully request that the House Energy and Commerce Committee maintain the current confidentiality protections of part 2 to support individuals entering and staying in substance use disorder treatment and recovery services.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from these patients.

> CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT PATIENT PRIVACY RIGHTS,
> *June 18, 2018.*
>
> Re Opposition to H.R. 6082—''Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act''.
>
> Representative GREG WALDEN,
> *Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Energy and Commerce Committee, Washington, DC.*
>
> Representative FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
> *Ranking Member of the U.S. House of Representatives Energy and Commerce Committee, Washington, DC.*
>
> DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN AND RANKING MEMBER PALLONE: We, the undersigned national, state, and local organizations strongly support maintaining the core protections of the federal substance use disorder patient confidentiality law (''42 U.S.C. 290dd–2'') and its regulations ''42 CFR Part 2,'' (referred to

collectively as ''Part 2'') to effectively protect the confidentiality of patients' records. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration (''SAMHSA'') recently amended Part 2's patient privacy regulations in 2017 and 2018, which accomplishes the bill's proposed objective of providing coordinated care between substance use disorder (''SUD'') and other health care information.

We remain concerned that using a weaker HIPAA Privacy Rule standard of allowing disclosures of SUD information without patient consent for treatment, payment, health care operations, or other purposes other than those currently allowed by Part 2—will contribute to the existing level of discrimination and harm to people living with substance use disorders. This will only result in more people who need substance use disorder treatment, being discouraged and afraid to seek the health care they need during the nation's worst opioid crisis.

We strongly support maintaining Part 2's current core protections for SUD information, instead of those of a weaker HIPAA Privacy standard as described in H.R. 6082 for the following reasons:

1. The heightened privacy protections in Part 2 are as critical today as they were when they were they were enacted more than 40 years ago, and must be preserved.

2. In the midst of the worst opioid epidemic in our nation's history, we must do everything possible to increase—not decrease—the number of people who seek treatment.

3. SUD is unique among medical conditions because of its criminal and civil consequences and the rampant discrimination people face.

4. With so much at stake, patients in SUD treatment should retain the right to consent when and to whom their records are disclosed, as currently found in Part 2.

5. Effective integration of SUD treatment with the rest of the health care system is critically important, and information exchange in accordance with confidentiality law and current technology is now possible. To facilitate that process, SAMHSA recently amended the Part 2 regulations to further promote the integration of confidential SUD information into general health records.

We respectfully request that the House Energy and Commerce Committee maintain the current confidentiality protections of Part 2 to support individuals entering and staying in SUD treatment and recovery services.

Sincerely,

Campaign to Protect Privacy Rights: A New PATH; Addiction Haven; Addictions Resource Center, Waukesha, WI (ARC, Inc.); Advocates for Recovery Colorado; AIDS United; Alano Club of Portland; Alcohol & Addictions Resource Center, South Bend, IN; American Association for the Treatment of Opioid Dependence (AATOD); American Group Psychotherapy Association; Apricity; Arthur Schut Consulting LLC; Association of Persons Affected by Addiction; Atlantic Prevention Resources; California Consortium of Addiction Programs & Professionals (CCAPP); Capital Area Project Vox—Lansing (MI)'s Voice of Recovery; Center for Recovery and Wellness Resources; CFC Loud N Clear Foundation; Chicago Recovering Communities Coalition; Colorado Behavioral Healthcare Council; Communities for Recovery.

Community Catalyst; Connecticut Community for Addiction Recovery (CCAR); Council on Addiction Recovery Services (CAReS)-Orlean, NY; DarJune Recovery Support Services & Café; Davis Direction Foundation—The Zone; Daystar Center; Delphi Behavioral Health Group—Maryland House Detox; Detroit Recovery Project; The DOOR—DeKalb Open Opportunity for Recovery; Drug and Alcohol Service Providers Organization of Pennsylvania; El Paso Alliance; Faces & Voices of Recovery; Faces and Voices of Recovery (FAVOR)—Grand Strand-SC; Faces and Voices of Recovery (FAVOR)—Greenville, SC; Faces and Voices of Recovery (FAVOR)—Low Country: Charleston, SC; Faces and Voices of Recovery (FAVOR)—Mississippi Recovery Advocacy Project; Faces and Voices of Recovery (FAVOR)—Pee Dee, SC; Faces and Voices of Recovery (FAVOR)—Tri-County: Rock Hill, SC; Facing Addiction; Fellowship Foundation Recovery Community Organization.

Foundation for Recovery; Friends of Recovery—New York; Georgia Council on Substance Abuse; Greater Macomb Project Vox; Harm Reduction Coalition; Home of New Vision; HOPE for New Hampshire Recovery; Jackson Area Recovery Community—Jackson, MI; Latah Recovery Center; Legal Action Center; Lifehouse Recovery Connection; Long Island Recovery Association (LIRA); Lotus Peer Recovery; Maine Alliance for Addiction Recovery; Massachusetts Organization for Addiction Recovery; Message Carriers of Pennsylvania; Mid-Michigan Recovery Services (NCADD Mid-Michigan Affiliate); Minnesota Recovery Connection; Missouri Recovery Network.

National Advocates for Pregnant Women; National Alliance for Medication Assisted Recovery (NAMA Recovery); National Association for Children of Addiction (NACoA); National Association of County Behavioral Health and Developmental Disability Directors (NACBHDD); National Association for Rural Mental Health (NARMH); National Center on Domestic Violence, Trauma & Mental Health; National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Inc. (NCADD); National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence—Central Mississippi Area, Inc.; National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence—Maryland; National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence—Phoenix; National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence—San Fernando Valley; Navigating Recovery of the Lakes Region; New Jersey Association of Mental Health and Addiction Agencies; Northern Ohio Recovery Association; Oklahoma Citizen Advocates for Recovery and Transformation Association (OCARTA); Overcoming Addiction Radio, Inc.; Parent/Professional Advocacy League; Peer Coach Academy Colorado; Pennsylvania Recovery Organizations—Alliance (PRO–A).

People Advocating Recovery (PAR); Pennsylvania Recovery Organization—Achieving Community Together (PRO–ACT); Portland Recovery Community Center; Public Justice Center; REAL—Michigan (Recovery, Education, Advocacy & Leadership); Recover Project/Western MA Training; Recover Wyoming; RecoveryATX; Recovery Alliance of Austin; Recovery Allies of West Michigan; Recovery Cafe; Recovery Communities of North Carolina; Recovery Community of Durham; Recovery Consultants of Atlanta; Recovery Epicenter Foundation, Inc.; Recovery Force of Atlantic County; Recovery is Happening; Recovery Resource Council; Recovery Organization of Support Specialist.

Revive Recovery, Inc.; Rhode Island Cares About Recovery (RICARES); Rochester Community Recovery Center; ROCovery Fitness; Safe Harbor Recovery Center; SMART Recovery (Self-Management and Recovery Training); S.O.S. Recovery Community Organization; SpiritWorks Foundation; Springs Recovery Connection; Tennessee Association of Alcohol, Drug & other Addiction Services (TAADAS); The Bridge Foundation; The Courage Center; The McShin Foundation; The Ohana Center for Recovery; The Serenity House of Flint; The Phoenix; The RASE Project; The Recovery Channel; Tia Hart Community Recovery Program.

Together Our Recovery Center Heals (T.O.R.C.H.), Inc.; Treatment Trends, Inc.; Trilogy Recovery Community; U MARC (United Mental Health and Addictions Recovery Coalition); Utah Support Advocates for Recovery Awareness (USARA); Vermont Recovery Network; Voices of Hope for Cecil County, MD; Voices of Hope Lexington; Voices of Recovery San Mateo County, CA; WAI–IAM, Inc. and RISE Recovery Community; Wisconsin Voices for Recovery; Young People in Recovery.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there are over 100 groups in support of the Partnership to Amend 42 CFR part 2. A letter from that partnership says, in part:

> We are pleased that the bill aligns part 2 with HIPAA's consent requirements for the purposes of treatment, payment and operations, which will allow for the appropriate sharing of substance use disorder records, among covered entities, to ensure persons with opioid use disorder and other substance use disorders receive the integrated care that they need. Additionally, as we do not want patients with substance use disorders to be made vulnerable as a result of seeking treatment for addiction, this legislation strengthens protections and limits the number of institutions that have access to their records.

I am not going to read all of the names on the list, but some of the notable ones are the National Alliance on Mental Illness, Mental Health America, Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, National Governors Association, Healthcare Leadership Council, American Hospital Association, American Society of Addiction Medicine, Centerstone, New Jersey Hospitals, and National Association of Addiction Treatment Providers.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the entire list of all of the groups in favor of the Partnership to Amend 42 CFR.

PARTNERSHIP TO AMEND 42 CFR PART 2—A COALITION OF OVER 40 HEALTH CARE STAKEHOLDERS COMMITTED TO ALIGNING 42 CFR PART 2 (PART 2) WITH HIPAA TO ALLOW APPROPRIATE ACCESS TO PATIENT INFORMATION THAT IS ESSENTIAL FOR PROVIDING WHOLE-PERSON CARE

JUNE 15, 2018.

Hon. MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. EARL BLUMENAUER,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MULLIN AND BLUMENAUER: The undersigned members of the Partnership to Amend 42 CFR Part 2 (Partnership) and additional stakeholder organizations applaud your leadership on the issue of substance use disorder privacy records. We strongly support the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety (OPPS) Act, H.R. 6082, which will align 42 CFR Part 2 (Part 2) with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) for the purposes of health care treatment, payment, and operations (TPO). The Partnership is pleased that the OPPS Act was voted out of the Committee on Energy and Commerce with a bipartisan vote.

The Partnership is a coalition of more than 40 organizations representing stakeholders across the health care spectrum committed to aligning Part 2 with HIPAA to allow appropriate access to patient information that is essential for providing whole-person care.

We are pleased that the bill aligns Part 2 with HIPAA's consent requirements for the purposes of TPO, which will allow for the appropriate sharing of substance use disorder records, among covered entities, to ensure persons with opioid use disorder and other substance use disorders receive the integrated care they need. Additionally, as we do not want patients with substance use disorders to be made vulnerable as a result of seeking treatment for addiction, this legislation strengthens protections and limits the number of institutions that have access to patient records.

Thank you both for your leadership on this issue and we look forward to working with you on helping to address the opioid crisis by passing this important bipartisan legislation on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

PARTNERSHIP TO AMEND 42 CFR PART 2 MEMBERS

Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy; American Association on Health and Disability; American Health Information Management Association; American Hospital Association; American Psychiatric Association; American Society of Addiction Medicine; American Society of Anesthesiologists; America's Essential Hospitals; America's Health Insurance Plans; AMGA; Association for Ambulatory Behavioral Healthcare; Association for Behavioral Health and Wellness; Association for Community Affiliated Plans; BlueCross BlueShield Association; Catholic Health Association of the U.S.; Centerstone; Confidentiality Coalition; Employee Assistance Professionals Association; Global Alliance for Behavioral Health and Social Justice; Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation.

Health IT Now; Healthcare Leadership Council; The Joint Commission; InfoMC; Medicaid Health Plans of America; Mental Health America; National Alliance on Mental Illness; National Association for Behavioral Healthcare; National Association of ACOs; National Association of Counties (NACo); National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors (NASMHPD); Netsmart; OCHIN; Otsuka; Pharmaceutical Care Management Association; Premier Healthcare Alliance.

ADDITIONAL STAKEHOLDER ORGANIZATIONS

ACO Health Partners; Aetna; AMITA Health; Anthem, Inc.; Ascension Health; Avera Health; Banner Health; Baptist Healthcare System; Beacon Health Options; Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; CareSource; Catholic Health Initiatives; Centene Corporation; Change Healthcare; Cigna; College of Healthcare Information Management Executives (CHIME).

Excellus BlueCross BlueShield; Franciscan Sisters of Christian Charity Sponsored Ministries, Inc.; Greater New York Hospital Association; Henry Ford Health System; Howe Home Designers; Johns Hopkins Medicine; Kern Health Systems; Leidos; Lycoming County; Magellan Health; Marshfield Clinic Health System; Mental Health America of Indiana; Mosaic Life Care; NAMI; NAMI DC; NAMI Delaware.

NAMI Greene County Tennessee; NAMI Helena; NAMI of Howard County, MD; NAMI Jefferson County, Washington; NAMI Kaufman County; NAMI Kershaw County; NAMI Lewistown; NAMI Lexington; NAMI of the Pee Dee (South Carolina); NAMI Piedmont Tri-County; NAMI Sarasota County; NAMI South Suburbs of Chicago; NAMI Sussex, Inc.; NAMI Temple Area; NAMI Utah; NAMI Valley of the Sun.

National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) Texas; National Association of Addiction Treatment Providers; New Directions Behavioral Health; OPEN MINDS; Optum; PerformCare; Providence St. Joseph Health; SCAN Health Plan; SSM Health; Texas Health Resources; The Center for Health Affairs/Northeast Ohio Hospital Opioid Consortium; The MetroHealth System; Trinity Health; University of Tennessee Medical Center; Valley Health System; Vizient; Wayne Meriwether.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in conclusion today, that amidst the worst opioid epidemic our country has ever faced, I think it is really important that we not take any action that could result in any individual with an opiate use disorder not seeking or remaining in treatment for this life-threatening condition.

I understand the opinions on both sides, but I do think that if we don't protect the existing privacy and keep the current law with regard to privacy that we will see many individuals not seeking treatment or remaining in treatment. That is why I strongly oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

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

Mr. Speaker, by continuing to segregate substance use disorder records means that we are willing to allow some patients to receive care that is potentially lower quality at a higher cost.

Treating patient substance use disorder in isolation from their medical and mental health conditions—which predominated care in the 1970s—is not the standard for good practice today. There is now overwhelming evidence that patients' substance use disorders cannot be treated in isolation from other healthcare conditions. In the 1970s when part 2 was written, this was not widely accepted, and treatment for addiction was largely separate from treatment for other illnesses.

Mr. Speaker, further, I would say that the problem here is we need to treat addiction just like any other medical illness and improve our outreach to patients who meet the criteria for treatment. Maintaining a decades old, ineffective confidentiality law simply is not going to do that.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill. It is a good bill supported by Mr. MULLIN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 949, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. I am opposed to H.R. 6082.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Pallone moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6082 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike page 1, line 4, through page 8, line 20.

Strike page 11, line 8, through page 12, line 9.

Page 8, line 21, through page 11, line 7, promote subsection (k) to become a section which reads as follows:

**SEC. 2. DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION OF MODEL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER PATIENT RECORDS.**

(a) INITIAL PROGRAMS AND MATERIALS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary''), in consultation with appropriate experts, shall identify the following model programs and materials (or if no such programs or materials exist, recognize private or public entities to develop and disseminate such programs and materials):

(1) Model programs and materials for training health care providers (including physicians, emergency medical personnel, psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, therapists, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, behavioral health facilities and clinics, care managers, and hospitals, including individuals such as general counsels or regulatory compliance staff who are responsible for establishing provider privacy policies) concerning the permitted uses and disclosures, consistent with the standards and regulations governing the privacy and security of substance use disorder patient records promulgated by the Secretary under section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2) for the confidentiality of patient records.

(2) Model programs and materials for training patients and their families regarding their rights to protect and obtain information under the standards and regulations described in paragraph (1).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The model programs and materials described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall address circumstances under which disclosure of substance use disorder patient records is needed to—

(1) facilitate communication between substance use disorder treatment providers and other health care providers to promote and provide the best possible integrated care;

(2) avoid inappropriate prescribing that can lead to dangerous drug interactions, overdose, or relapse; and

(3) notify and involve families and caregivers when individuals experience an overdose.

(c) PERIODIC UPDATES.—The Secretary shall—

(1) periodically review and update the model program and materials identified or developed under subsection (a); and

(2) disseminate such updated programs and materials to the individuals described in subsection (a)(1).

(d) INPUT OF CERTAIN ENTITIES.—In identifying, reviewing, or updating the model programs and materials under this section, the Secretary shall solicit the input of relevant stakeholders.

At the end, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 3. REPORT ON PATIENT EXPERIENCE WITH PART 2.**

(a) REPORT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall conduct or support a study that examines information sharing behaviors of individuals who obtain substance use disorder treatment through a Part 2 program.

(b) TOPICS.—The study pursuant to subsection (a) shall examine the extent to which patients at Part 2 programs agree to share their information, including the following:

(1) Patient understanding regarding their rights to protect and obtain information under Part 2.

(2) Concerns or feelings patients have about sharing their Part 2 treatment records with other health care providers and organizations.

(3) Whether or not patients agree to share their Part 2 medical records.

(4) The extent of providers with which patients agree to share their Part 2 treatment records.

(5) If patients have shared their Part 2 treatment information—

(A) at what point in the treatment relationship with the Part 2 program did the patients choose to do so; and

(B) what prompted the patients to share the information.

(6) What considerations were taken into account by the patient when deciding whether or not and with whom to share their Part 2 treatment information.

(7) How did having the choice to decide to what extent and with whom to share Part 2 treatment records affect patients' decision to uptake or remain in treatment.

(8) Would not having a choice to decide the extent to which to share their treatment records from Part 2 programs affect a patient's decision to participate or stay in treatment.

(c) SCOPE.—The study under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include a nationally representative sample of individuals obtaining treatment at Part 2 programs; and

(2) consider patients of Part 2 programs being treated for various substance use disorders, including opioid use disorder and alcohol use disorder.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress on the results of the study under subsection (a).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Part 2 program'' means a program described in section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2).

(2) The term ''Part 2'' means the program under section 543 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd–2).

Mr. PALLONE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would maintain the privacy rights provided to individuals with substance use disorder. Those patients would retain their right to determine with whom and for what purpose to share their substance use disorder treatment records from part 2 programs.

Rather than strip away patients' privacy rights, my amendment would incorporate section 509 from the bipartisan Alexander-Murray bill, S. 2680, the Opioid Crisis Response Act of 2018, that was reported out of the Senate HELP Committee on a bipartisan basis, and that was incorporated in the underlying legislation.

That provision requires the Secretary to support the development and dissemination of model training programs for substance use disorder treatment records under part 2. It would help ensure that more patients, families, and providers understand how information can be protected and shared under part 2.

My amendment would also help us to better understand the privacy needs of individuals with substance use disorder as well as how to balance those needs with the information needs of our health system to provide the highest quality care.

Specifically, my amendment would require the Secretary to conduct or support a study to better understand the patient experience with part 2 through the examination of information-sharing behaviors of individuals who obtain substance use disorder treatment at part 2 programs.

This study will provide critical insight into the central question under debate today: What is the appropriate level of privacy protections that should be applied to substance use disorder treatment records?

While there are a lot of opinions and persuasive evidence to support both sides of this debate, there is a lack of research on this issue generally or as it specifically relates to part 2. Such information will help us better understand the level of control individuals with substance use disorders need over their medical records to ensure their privacy concerns are not a barrier for such individuals accessing potentially lifesaving treatment.

It would also help us better understand what is the appropriate balance between the needs of these individuals regarding the privacy of their substance use disorder treatment information with the needs of a coordinated healthcare system to best serve its patients.

We know that today, under current law, some patients who receive substance use disorder treatment from part 2 programs choose not to share their treatment records with any provider outside of their substance use disorder treatment provider. On the other hand, there are others who choose to share with only a few of their nonsubstance use disorder treatment providers.

So I just believe it is critical we understand the reasons why such individuals have made these decisions as well as how the right to make such a decision affected their willingness to seek or remain in treatment.

This amendment is consistent with the recent recommendations from the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission. As part of their June 2018 report to Congress, the commission stated that at this time the commission does not recommend alignment of part 2 and HIPAA. Instead, the commission recommends additional subregulatory guidance, education, and training on part 2.

As I have made clear, Mr. Speaker, I have concerns that the underlying bill would hurt our efforts to respond to the opioid epidemic and could increase the odds that fewer individuals with opiate use disorder enter and remain in treatment, a risk I believe too great to take during the worst drug abuse epidemic our country has ever faced.

However, I realize there is another side of this argument as advanced by the proponents of this bill, and we should not be concerned that this bill will affect the uptick of treatment, and, in fact, we should believe that this will only improve treatment.

Rather than undertake the 50–State experiment to see which side is right, we should support the thorough study of this issue before taking any action to weaken the privacy protections provided by part 2. In that way, we can determine the actual effect on taking away from individuals with substance use disorder the ability to decide how their treatment information is shared. That way we would have no doubt on both the intended and unintended consequences of eliminating the patient consent requirement for treatment, payment, and healthcare operation purposes as proposed by the underlying bill.

I think the stakes are too high to get this wrong. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to increase the awareness of patients, families, and providers about how their treatment records are protected and can be shared under part 2 as well as to increase our understanding of the privacy needs of individuals with substance use disorders.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the motion to recommit as it will destroy the intent of the bill.

Eliminating the sharing of records for the purposes of treatment, payment, and healthcare operations completely negates the entire purpose of this initiative.

Aligning 42 CFR part 2 with HIPAA for purposes of treatment, payment, and healthcare operations is the entire purpose of the legislation.

Opponents of this bill have offered no evidence or findings to back up their claim that HIPAA is inadequate to protect sensitive data contained in substance use disorder treatment records.

HIPAA is currently functioning well in protecting sensitive patient information in a number of areas.

Real integration of behavioral health and primary care simply cannot happen until we align 42 CFR part 2 with HIPAA.

The opposition of H.R. 6082 is not based on protecting privacy. It is based on very specific distrust of the healthcare community to properly provide care to people with substance use disorder—the very people whom we are asking to help us with this.

Yet, the ranking member is strongly in favor of numerous bills that seek to expand access to evidence-based medication-assisted treatment, telehealth and integration with mainstream medicine—the very things that demand alignment with HIPAA. So the thinking, Mr. Speaker, to be kind, is incongruous.

Prohibiting the sharing of addiction medical records for treatment, payment, and healthcare operations makes it impossible to prescribe the latest substance use treatment medications safely.

Like most pharmaceuticals, buprenorphine and methadone have drug interactions and interact with other medicines. Adverse events from drug interactions can lead to emergency hospital visits, serious injuries, or death.

We must amend part 2 so we can safely prescribe medication-assisted treatment for patients. Put simply, standard clinical practices like medication reconciliation are not feasible under the current Federal law. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit. Vote ''yes'' on the underlying motion.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICAID DESERVE CARE THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND RESPONSIBLE IN ITS EXECUTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 5797.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 949 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5797.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1345

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5797) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide under Medicaid services for certain individuals with opioid use disorders in institutions for mental diseases, with Mr. BOST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the opioid epidemic is ravaging this Nation. Families have been torn apart; lives have been destroyed; and communities are endangered.

This crisis does not discriminate. Americans from all walks of life in all 50 States are being held hostage by the scourge of opioids.

Tragically, the opioid epidemic claims the lives of 115 Americans on average each day. In my home of Orange County, California, 361 people died from opioid overdoses in 2015. That accounts for a 50 percent increase in overdose deaths since 2006.

According to the OC Health Care Agency's 2017 ''Opioid Overdose and Death in Orange County'' report, the rate of opioid-related emergency room visits increased by more than 140 percent since 2005. Between 2011 and 2015, Orange County emergency rooms treated nearly 7,500 opioid overdose and abuse cases.

We can put an end to these tragic statistics by providing full access to various treatment options to those seeking help with their addictions. While many of these patients may benefit from outpatient help, others need highly specialized inpatient treatment to ensure they are receiving the most clinically appropriate care.

The IMD CARE Act will increase access to care for certain Medicaid beneficiaries with opioid use disorder who need the most intensive care possible: inpatient care.

Current law prohibits the Federal Government from providing Federal Medicaid matching funds to States to provide mental disease care to Medicaid-eligible patients aged 21 to 64 in facilities defined as institutes of mental diseases, commonly known as IMDs. This IMD exclusion means that Federal dollars may not be provided for the care of Medicaid-eligible patients in this age group for substance use disorder treatments at hospitals, nursing facilities, or other institutions with more than 16 beds.

It is time to repeal the IMD exclusion and remove this outdated barrier to inpatient treatment. The IMD CARE Act would allow States to repeal for 5 years the IMD exclusion for adult Medicaid beneficiaries who have an opioid use disorder, which includes heroin and fentanyl.

These beneficiaries would receive treatment in an IMD for up to 30 days over a 12-month period, during which time the beneficiary would be regularly assessed to ensure their treatment and health needs require inpatient care. The bill would also require the IMD to develop an outpatient plan for the individual's ongoing treatment upon discharge.

Throughout the Energy and Commerce Committee's work on the opioid crisis, the IMD exclusion is consistently identified as a significant barrier to care for Medicaid patients. Not every patient needs treatment in an IMD, but those who do are often among the most vulnerable. What once was a well-intended exclusion on Federal Medicaid spending has since prevented individuals from seeking treatment.

In the light of the opioid epidemic, I believe my legislation strikes the right balance. I know some have suggested States continue to seek CMS waivers to allow Medicaid to pay for IMD care. Waivers can be a good option for some States, but not all States want a waiver. In fact, less than half of the States have applied for a waiver. Additionally, a waiver can take a substantial amount of time to develop, review, and approve.

We are losing too many friends and family members to force States to navigate a lengthy and uncertain waiver process. The IMD CARE Act allows

States to act now to ensure patients who are suffering from addiction get the care they need.

The National Governors Association and the American Hospital Association have endorsed this legislation. Other organizations, such as the National Association of State Medicaid Directors and the National Association of State Mental Health Directors, have supported the idea of Congress addressing the IMD.

While the repeal of the IMD exclusion would increase mandatory outlays and add costs to the Medicaid system, the IMD CARE Act is fully paid for by curbing unnecessary Federal and State Medicaid outlays.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN and my colleagues on the House Energy and Commerce Committee for their support of this bill, which will provide much needed care to Americans suffering from opioid use disorder. Through the IMD CARE Act, Congress has a unique opportunity to remove a barrier to care and bring specialized treatment to Medicaid patients who desperately need it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support this important bill today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I stand in opposition to H.R. 5797, the IMD CARE Act.

I think we all agree that we need all the tools available to us to address the opioid crisis. Inpatient treatment centers that focus on the treatment of behavioral health needs of patients with substance use disorder are part of that. Congress must do what we can to ease access to care.

But I believe this legislation, as drafted, is misguided. It is also counterproductive and an ineffective use of scarce Medicaid dollars. But more importantly, it may undermine the ongoing efforts to improve the full continuum of care for people with substance use disorders.

This policy spends more than $1 billion in Medicaid to pay for a policy that is far narrower in both scope and flexibility than what many of our States already have and any State could do through Medicaid substance use disorder waivers.

In addition, as countless data has indicated, there are many gaps in treatment for Medicaid beneficiaries with substance use disorder. Yet this bill does nothing to incentivize States to provide the full continuum of care.

Community-based services are necessary for both people not treated in residential inpatient facilities and also for people who leave residential inpatient treatment and need community-based services to continue their treatment and recovery.

We already face a shortage of community-based care for substance use disorder and should be working with States to increase this capacity. Yet this bill doesn't tie Federal funds for IMD care to improvements in community-based services. Without that connection, States simply will not pursue these needed improvements.

Without incentives to improve access to treatment more broadly, repealing the IMD exclusion to only a narrow population—in this case, opioid use—through legislation may simply encourage greater use of expensive inpatient treatment, including for people for whom it may not be the best option.

We can't push a system where people cycle in and out of institutions. People with substance use disorders need a range of supports to stay well and sober long term, not just a limited stay in an IMD.

Existing guidance from both the Obama and Trump administrations allows States to waive the IMD exclusions if the States also take steps to ensure that people with substance use disorder have access to other care they need, including preventive, treatment and recovery services.

So far, there are 22 States, Mr. Chair, that have waivers approved or pending before the administration. I think these waivers are important to support.

My home State of New Jersey has approval for a waiver right now. Under that waiver, they expanded access to all substance use disorder services in their Medicaid program. We should build on that policy, which emphasizes the full continuum of care, with any bills that repeal the IMD exclusion.

In addition, I have concerns about creating a system in States whereby only some of our Medicaid beneficiaries with substance use disorder have access to the full continuum of care they need.

This bill specifically limits residential treatment to adults with opioid use disorders, with the possible addition of an amendment for cocaine use disorders. But it doesn't help the overwhelming majority of individuals with other substance use disorders, such as alcohol, which is far more commonly abused.

Treatment for substance use disorder, especially in the midst of our opioid crisis, must include a comprehensive approach that addresses the entirety of a patient's medical and psychological conditions. This legislation creates a perverse incentive toward individuals reporting opioid abuse or going out and getting addicted to opioids, for instance, in the hopes of gaining access to the treatment they need.

Expanding access to inpatient residential treatment in a vacuum I think would undermine State efforts to ensure the availability of substance use disorder treatment that meets the needs of all patients in the most appropriate environment.

In the short time this legislation has been publicly available, countless stakeholders have weighed in vehemently on particulars of this bill, echoing my concerns today. In fact, coalitions with more than 300 groups as well as other mental health, substance use, and disability groups have sent letters in opposition. I think we need to work with stakeholders. This issue is too important to get wrong.

For these reasons, Mr. Chair, I oppose H.R. 5797. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Mrs. WALTERS for introducing this legislation.

Throughout this committee's and subcommittee's work on opioids, the IMD exclusion has been consistently identified by many stakeholders in conversations not only in my office but with the subcommittee as a barrier to care for Medicaid patients who need inpatient treatment.

In the face of an epidemic that is taking the lives of 115 Americans on average every day, I believe this policy strikes the right balance. The IMD CARE Act targets limited resources to remove a barrier to care by allowing States to repeal the IMD exclusion for 5 years for Medicaid beneficiaries between the ages of 21 and 64 who have an opioid use disorder. This approach will provide States the flexibility to increase access to institutional care for those who truly need it.

While getting a waiver from CMS for the IMD exclusion is a good option for many States, less than half the States have applied for a waiver. We are losing too many of our friends and neighbors each day to this crisis to ask States to go through what can be a lengthy and uncertain process to secure a waiver.

The IMD CARE Act allows States to act now to ensure their patients who are suffering now from a terrible disease can get the care that they need and get it now.

I ask my fellow Members to join me in support of Mrs. WALTERS' bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I want to speak briefly on a point that I think is being lost here.

This bill presumes that expanding access to residential treatment is the answer, and it is not necessarily. Without any requirement that States address gaps in Medicaid community-based services, I think there is a possibility that we risk more harm than good.

The former director of national drug control policy has reminded us that most of these IMD facilities provide detoxification services. But detoxification is only the first stage of addiction treatment. Indeed, it may increase the potential for overdose if patients do not remain or have any support when released, since, with detoxification, their tolerance for opioids is significantly reduced.

The proposal before the House will likely create an overreliance on institutional treatment and may exacerbate

the dearth of community-based health services.

□ 1400

People with substance use disorder often find themselves unable to access intensive community-based behavioral health services when they need it. Likewise, many cannot access services in the community when they are discharged following a crisis.

Incentivizing inpatient care may actually increase opioid overdose, the very harm that Congress is seeking to prevent. Experts have raised serious concerns with this bill's institutional focus because recent data suggests that inpatient detoxification is an important predictor of overdose, largely because many who receive inpatient care aren't then connected to community-based treatment programs or put on medication, leaving them extremely vulnerable.

Again, I am concerned that we may be contributing to this crisis with this legislation.

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

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleague MIMI WALTERS and those who have worked so closely with her on this really, really important legislation. That is why I am here to support it, H.R. 5797, the IMD CARE Act.

This is really commonsense legislation, and it will make a meaningful change to the way Medicaid covers opioid use disorder for its beneficiaries. In other words, low-income people in America who get their medical assistance through Medicaid are going to get another option and more help to deal with their addiction.

We are discussing this bill because a severely outdated policy limits Medicaid's coverage in an institution for mental disease—that is what an IMD is, institution for mental disease—for just 30 days. It is old. It is antiquated. It doesn't work with today's treatment regimens.

This exclusion has been in place for decades—decades—certainly long before the opioid crisis ever hit our country, and it is now a barrier to critical care for low-income people on Medicaid when this vulnerable population needs help with their addiction the most.

Representative WALTERS' thoughtful bill will allow State Medicaid programs, from 2019 through 2023, to remove this antiquated Federal barrier to treatment for those on Medicaid, age 21 to 64, with an opioid use disorder, through a State plan amendment. In doing so, Medicaid would pay for up to 30 total days of a beneficiary's care in an IMD during a 12-month period, year.

So this is limited in scope. It is in partnership with the States. It is low-income people getting more help from Medicaid to pay for this extraordinarily important treatment.

This bill also collects much-needed data on the process. After taking up this option, States will have to report on the number of individuals with opioid use disorder under this plan, their length of stay, and the type of treatment received upon discharge. This will help inform better programs down the line.

As a Congress, we have been focused on combating the opioid crisis for quite some time. This is not our first legislative attempt to help people not only avoid this addiction, but overcome it. It will not be our last. We will legislate; we will evaluate; we will legislate; we will evaluate, as Republicans and Democrats have been doing for some time.

It is an important step, this bill, that can help get people a vital treatment to which they now don't have access. The American Hospital Association, the National Governors Association, Republicans and Democrats, hospitals and Governors across the country, have said: Please do this. This is a need that is unmet. Please help us change this antiquated Federal law.

Many stakeholder groups, including the National Association of State Medicaid Directors, the people who run the Medicaid programs in States; the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, the people who know what is needed most to overcome these situations; and many others have talked to us in the committee. They have talked to me personally. They are pleading with Congress to get rid of this barrier to care, this outdated law, and to help people get treatment, especially the low-income among us.

We have an opportunity to deliver, to help. We have an opportunity to save lives. It is our responsibility, and we need to pass this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I commend the gentlewoman from California for bringing this issue to the committee and shepherding it through. It is so important to pass this legislation. Let's help these people get the care they need and want.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in closing and in urging opposition to this bill from my colleagues, the reason the IMD exclusion was put in place in the beginning was because of the fear that people who had overdosed, who had opiate problems, would be put into institutions, if you will, and then throw away the key. In other words, they put them in there, maybe they get detoxed, and then they come out. But without any treatment or any followup, community-based treatment, they would just go back to the same thing again; they would overdose again and end up back in the facility.

So the fear was that we would have these large facilities where they go in and, without any kind of continuum of care, the cycle just keeps repeating itself. I just want my colleagues to be mindful of that.

What happened was, during the Obama administration, States had asked for waivers from the IMD exclusion, and the Obama administration decided they would do that if they provided a continuum of care and community-based services so that the problem that led to the IMD exclusion would not repeat itself.

I guess my fear is, today, that this seems like such a simple solution: Okay. We will get rid of the 16-bed exclusion because we need people to go into these institutions.

However, since we are not providing any continuum of care or community care in eliminating this exclusion, it goes back to the same problem, which is we don't want people to just be warehoused to detox, come out again, overdose again, and go back in without any kind of community services.

That is why I am making the argument that the actual waivers that exist now, which I think almost half of the States have, is a much better alternative than just lifting and getting rid of the exclusion. That is why I believe that this bill is misplaced and why I would urge my colleagues to oppose it, because I think it may actually go back to the days where we were just warehousing people and we are not actually giving them the kind of treatment that they need.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to vote against the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, the opioid crisis requires us to act now. The IMD exclusion is consistently identified as a significant barrier to care by State Medicaid directors and numerous other stakeholder groups. We need to pass this bill in order to increase access to acute, short-term inpatient treatment. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and help individuals suffering with opioid addiction.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose H.R. 5797, also known as the "IMD CARE Act."

H.R. 5797 allows states to use Medicaid funds to treat adult patients ages 21–64 with opioid abuse disorders in Institutions for Mental Disease (IMDs) with more than 16 beds. While expanding access to treatment for substance abuse disorders is an admirable goal, H.R. 5797 is not the way to accomplish this goal.

One obvious limitation of H.R. 5797 is that it only applies to opioid and heroin use disorders. It does nothing to expand access to treatment for other types of substance abuse disorders, including alcoholism and the abuse of other illegal drugs like methamphetamine, crack, and other forms of cocaine.

A second problem with this bill is that it only expands access to treatment in inpatient IMD

facilities. It does not provide Medicaid funding for substance abuse treatment services in an outpatient setting, nor does it require states to make such services available. Not all substance abuse patients need to be treated in an institution, and those that do will also need outpatient recovery services after they are released from an IMD.

Currently, states can already use Medicaid funds to treat patients in IMD facilities by means of a waiver from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). In order to qualify for a waiver, states must take steps to ensure that patients are able to obtain substance abuse treatment and services in the community, as well as in institutions. Eleven states already have a waiver for this purpose, and eleven other states have waiver applications pending. Expanding access to inpatient treatment in states that do not provide outpatient services risks forcing patients into treatment that is ineffective and inappropriate for their situation.

Another option that is already available for states that want to expand access to substance abuse treatment services is to expand Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act. Medicaid expansion would ensure that all low-income people, including those with substance abuse disorders, are able to obtain treatment for their medical conditions.

I submitted an amendment that would have required states to expand Medicaid pursuant to the Affordable Care Act as a condition for using Medicaid funds to treat people with opioid abuse disorders in IMD facilities. This amendment would have provided an additional incentive for states to expand Medicaid, which in turn would have expanded access to a broad range of treatment and services for patients with substance abuse disorders.

Expanding access to Medicaid will benefit patients with substance abuse disorders, regardless of the type of addiction from which they suffer and regardless of whether they would be best served by inpatient treatment, outpatient treatment, or a combination of the two.

It is especially ironic that this bill is being considered on the House floor the day after House Republicans unveiled their fiscal year 2019 budget proposal, which would cut $1.5 trillion from Medicaid. If the majority party cares about Americans suffering from an opioid abuse disorder, they would not rob them of the health care services thiey already have.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5797 and support a comprehensive solution to substance abuse disorders that will meet the needs of all people suffering from these tragic medical conditions.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 115–766, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered read.

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

H.R. 5797

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

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.***

*This Act may be cited as the ''Individuals in Medicaid Deserve Care that is Appropriate and Responsible in its Execution Act'' or the ''IMD CARE Act''.*

***SEC. 2. MEDICAID STATE PLAN OPTION TO PROVIDE SERVICES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WITH OPIOID USE DISORDERS IN INSTITUTIONS FOR MENTAL DISEASES.***

*Section 1915 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:*

*''(l) STATE PLAN OPTION TO PROVIDE SERVICES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS IN INSTITUTIONS FOR MENTAL DISEASES.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to calendar quarters beginning during the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending December 31, 2023, a State may elect, through a State plan amendment, to, notwithstanding section 1905(a), provide medical assistance for services furnished in institutions for mental diseases and for other medically necessary services furnished to eligible individuals with opioid use disorders, in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.*

*''(2) PAYMENTS.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts expended under a State plan amendment under paragraph (1) for services described in such paragraph furnished, with respect to a 12-month period, to an eligible individual with an opioid use disorder who is a patient in an institution for mental diseases shall be treated as medical assistance for which payment is made under section 1903(a) but only to the extent that such services are furnished for not more than a period of 30 days (whether or not consecutive) during such 12-month period.*

*''(B) CLARIFICATION.—Payment made under this paragraph for expenditures under a State plan amendment under this subsection with respect to services described in paragraph (1) furnished to an eligible individual with an opioid use disorder shall not affect payment that would otherwise be made under section 1903(a) for expenditures under the State plan (or waiver of such plan) for medical assistance for such individual.*

*''(3) INFORMATION REQUIRED IN STATE PLAN AMENDMENT.—*

*''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State electing to provide medical assistance pursuant to this subsection shall include with the submission of the State plan amendment under paragraph (1) to the Secretary—*

*''(i) a plan on how the State will improve access to outpatient care during the period of the State plan amendment, including a description of—*

*''(I) the process by which eligible individuals with opioid use disorders will make the transition from receiving inpatient services in an institution for mental diseases to appropriate outpatient care; and*

*''(II) the process the State will undertake to ensure individuals with opioid use disorder are provided care in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of the individuals; and*

*''(ii) a description of how the State plan amendment ensures an appropriate clinical screening of eligible individuals with an opioid use disorder, including assessments to determine level of care and length of stay recommendations based upon the multidimensional assessment criteria of the American Society of Addiction Medicine.*

*''(B) REPORT.—Not later than the sooner of December 31, 2024, or one year after the date of the termination of a State plan amendment under this subsection, the State shall submit to the Secretary a report that includes at least—*

*''(i) the number of eligible individuals with opioid use disorders who received services pursuant to such State plan amendment;*

*''(ii) the length of the stay of each such individual in an institution for mental diseases; and*

*''(iii) the type of outpatient treatment, including medication-assisted treatment, each such individual received after being discharged from such institution.*

*''(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:*

*''(A) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL WITH AN OPIOID USE DISORDER.—The term 'eligible individual with an opioid use disorder' means an individual who—*

*''(i) with respect to a State, is enrolled for medical assistance under the State plan (or a waiver of such plan);*

*''(ii) is at least 21 years of age;*

*''(iii) has not attained 65 years of age; and*

*''(iv) has been diagnosed with at least one opioid use disorder.*

*''(B) INSTITUTION FOR MENTAL DISEASES.—The term 'institution for mental diseases' has the meaning given such term in section 1905(i).*

*''(C) OPIOID PRESCRIPTION PAIN RELIEVER.—The term 'opioid prescription pain reliever' includes hydrocodone products, oxycodone products, tramadol products, codeine products, morphine products, fentanyl products, buprenorphine products, oxymorphone products, meperidine products, hydromorphone products, methadone, and any other prescription pain reliever identified by the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use.*

*''(D) OPIOID USE DISORDER.—The term 'opioid use disorder' means a disorder that meets the criteria of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition (or a successor edition), for heroin use disorder or pain reliever use disorder (including with respect to opioid prescription pain relievers).*

*''(E) OTHER MEDICALLY NECESSARY SERVICES.—The term 'other medically necessary services' means, with respect to an eligible individual with an opioid use disorder who is a patient in an institution for mental diseases, items and services that are provided to such individual outside of such institution to the extent that such items and services would be treated as medical assistance for such individual if such individual were not a patient in such institution.''.*

**SEC. 3. PROMOTING VALUE IN MEDICAID MANAGED CARE.**

Section 1903(m) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7)(A) With respect to expenditures described in subparagraph (B) that are incurred by a State for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2020 (and before fiscal year 2025), in determining the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled under subsection (d)(3), the Secretary shall substitute the Federal medical assistance percentage that applies for such fiscal year to the State under section 1905(b) (without regard to any adjustments to such percentage applicable under such section or any other provision of law) for the percentage that applies to such expenditures under section 1905(y).

''(B) Expenditures described in this subparagraph, with respect to a fiscal year to which subparagraph (A) applies, are expenditures incurred by a State for payment for medical assistance provided to individuals described in subclause (VIII) of section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i) by a managed care entity, or other specified entity (as defined in subparagraph (D)(iii)), that are treated as remittances because the State—

''(i) has satisfied the requirement of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), by electing—

''(I) in the case of a State described in subparagraph (C), to apply a minimum medical

loss ratio (as defined in subparagraph (D)(ii)) that is at least 85 percent but not greater than the minimum medical loss ratio (as so defined) that such State applied as of May 31, 2018; or

''(II) in the case of a State not described in subparagraph (C), to apply a minimum medical loss ratio that is equal to 85 percent; and

''(ii) recovered all or a portion of the expenditures as a result of the entity's failure to meet such ratio.

''(C) For purposes of subparagraph (B), a State described in this subparagraph is a State that as of May 31, 2018, applied a minimum medical loss ratio (as calculated under subsection (d) of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 1, 2018)) for payment for services provided by entities described in such subparagraph under the State plan under this title (or a waiver of the plan) that is equal to or greater than 85 percent.

''(D) For purposes of this paragraph:

''(i) The term 'managed care entity' means a medicaid managed care organization described in section 1932(a)(1)(B)(i).

''(ii) The term 'minimum medical loss ratio' means, with respect to a State, a minimum medical loss ratio (as calculated under subsection (d) of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 1, 2018)) for payment for services provided by entities described in subparagraph (B) under the State plan under this title (or a waiver of the plan).

''(iii) The term 'other specified entity' means—

''(I) a prepaid inpatient health plan, as defined in section 438.2 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

''(II) a prepaid ambulatory health plan, as defined in such section (or any successor regulation).''.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of House Report 115–766. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part D of House Report 115–766.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 2, strike ''**INDIVIDUALS WITH OPIOID USE DISORDERS**'' and insert ''**INDIVIDUALS WITH TARGETED SUDS**''.

In the subsection (l) proposed to be added by section 2 of the bill to section 1915 of the Social Security Act, strike ''eligible individuals with opioid use disorders'' each place it appears and insert ''eligible individuals with targeted SUDs'' each such place.

In the subsection (l) proposed to be added by section 2 of the bill to section 1915 of the Social Security Act, strike ''eligible individual with an opioid use disorder'' each place it appears and insert ''eligible individual with a targeted SUD'' each such place.

Page 5, beginning on line 19, strike ''individuals with opioid use disorder'' and insert ''eligible individuals with targeted SUDs''.

Page 6, beginning on line 1, strike ''eligible individuals with an opioid use disorder'' and insert ''eligible individuals with targeted SUDs''.

Page 6, line 7, insert before the period the following: ''and to determine the appropriate setting for such care''.

Page 7, line 12, strike ''opioid use disorder'' and insert ''targeted SUD''.

In the subsection (l)(4) proposed to be added by section 2 of the bill to section 1915 of the Social Security Act, strike subparagraph (D), redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D), and add at the end the following:

''(E) TARGETED SUD.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'targeted SUD' means an opioid use disorder or a cocaine use disorder.

''(ii) COCAINE USE DISORDER.—The term 'cocaine use disorder' means a disorder that meets the criteria of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition (or a successor edition), for either dependence or abuse for cocaine, including cocaine base (commonly referred to as 'crack cocaine').

''(iii) OPIOID USE DISORDER.—The term 'opioid use disorder' means a disorder that meets the criteria of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition (or a successor edition), for heroin use disorder or pain reliever use disorder (including with respect to opioid prescription pain relievers).''.

Strike all that follows after section 2 and insert the following:

**SEC. 3. PROMOTING VALUE IN MEDICAID MANAGED CARE.**

Section 1903(m) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7)(A) With respect to expenditures described in subparagraph (B) that are incurred by a State for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2020 (and before fiscal year 2024), in determining the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled under subsection (d)(3), the Secretary shall substitute the Federal medical assistance percentage that applies for such fiscal year to the State under section 1905(b) (without regard to any adjustments to such percentage applicable under such section or any other provision of law) for the percentage that applies to such expenditures under section 1905(y).

''(B) Expenditures described in this subparagraph, with respect to a fiscal year to which subparagraph (A) applies, are expenditures incurred by a State for payment for medical assistance provided to individuals described in subclause (VIII) of section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i) by a managed care entity, or other specified entity (as defined in subparagraph (D)(iii)), that are treated as remittances because the State—

''(i) has satisfied the requirement of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), by electing—

''(I) in the case of a State described in subparagraph (C), to apply a minimum medical loss ratio (as defined in subparagraph (D)(ii)) that is at least 85 percent but not greater than the minimum medical loss ratio (as so defined) that such State applied as of May 31, 2018; or

''(II) in the case of a State not described in subparagraph (C), to apply a minimum medical loss ratio that is equal to 85 percent; and

''(ii) recovered all or a portion of the expenditures as a result of the entity's failure to meet such ratio.

''(C) For purposes of subparagraph (B), a State described in this subparagraph is a State that as of May 31, 2018, applied a minimum medical loss ratio (as calculated under subsection (d) of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 1, 2018)) for payment for services provided by entities described in such subparagraph under the State plan under this title (or a waiver of the plan) that is equal to or greater than 85 percent.

''(D) For purposes of this paragraph:

''(i) The term 'managed care entity' means a medicaid managed care organization described in section 1932(a)(1)(B)(i).

''(ii) The term 'minimum medical loss ratio' means, with respect to a State, a minimum medical loss ratio (as calculated under subsection (d) of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 1, 2018)) for payment for services provided by entities described in subparagraph (B) under the State plan under this title (or a waiver of the plan).

''(iii) The term 'other specified entity' means—

''(I) a prepaid inpatient health plan, as defined in section 438.2 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

''(II) a prepaid ambulatory health plan, as defined in such section (or any successor regulation).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 949, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment that finally addresses a longstanding and discriminatory gap in coverage and expands treatment options for those suffering from addiction.

This House, Mr. Chairman, should be commended for its work on opioid addiction, but let us not forget that we have insidiously ignored another pervasive and catastrophically destructive addiction that is known as crack cocaine.

To remedy this, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would expand the bill to include those individuals suffering from cocaine use disorder and explicitly clarifies the inclusion of cocaine base, more commonly known as crack cocaine, which, along with opiates, is a double-barrel cause of drug-related deaths in communities like mine all across this Nation.

Too often, Mr. Chairman, this House seems to only have focused on issues when they have affected the majority, the White population. This leaves vulnerable, non-White, minority Americans without any chance to escape from their illness and their resulting suffering.

Too often, Mr. Chairman, the government's response to minority Americans has been mass incarceration instead of treatment. Too often, Mr. Chairman, crises that impact the African American communities are seen as a criminal justice problem, while those that affect the White community are seen as a public health problem. That phenomenon changes today.

I know opponents of this amendment will say that we should be expanding coverage to all those suffering from addiction. I wholeheartedly agree, Mr. Chairman, with that statement. However, while more remains to be done, today's action is a step in the right direction.

This is an important moment for those who have been addicted to crack and have been denied such access to treatment. Today they will finally get relief as we make historic progress in the fight against addiction and the injustice that continues to tear communities apart.

For this reason, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this worthwhile and meaningful amendment.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Rush amendment to H.R. 5797, the IMD CARE Act. Earlier today, I spoke in support of the underlying bill. It will make a meaningful change to the way Medicaid covers opioid use disorder for its beneficiaries.

The amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Illinois, Representative BOBBY RUSH, will expand on that definition. It will allow Medicaid to provide coverage for individuals seeking treatment from cocaine and crack cocaine usage.

Looking at just 2016, opioids and cocaine caused 82 percent of all drug overdose deaths in the United States. Cocaine alone kills more than 10,000 Americans a year. News outlets have also reported fentanyl being mixed in with cocaine, further complicating this tragic opioid crisis.

This is an issue that Mr. RUSH has passionately led on in the committee, on the floor, and at home in his community.

□ 1415

We discussed it in the hearing room and at length in private while working to fine-tune this legislation so that the best possible version can become law.

So I want to thank Mr. RUSH for this amendment, and I want people to know that it really will improve and expand the scope of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and support the underlying bill, which will dramatically aid in our response to the opioid epidemic for all Americans, wherever they live.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking Democrat on the committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support Mr. RUSH's amendment, but I remain in strong opposition to the underlying bill. I support my colleague's, Mr. RUSH's, work to add cocaine use disorder.

As Mr. RUSH noted in our committee, cocaine use claims more African American lives than opioid use and has been a larger problem than opioid use disorder for more than 20 years, yet incarceration, not treatment, is far too often the response.

Unfortunately, adding a single additional drug does not make this legislation whole. Nearly half of all States already reimburse for IMDs for all individuals with substance use disorder. We can and should build on that policy and strengthen the full continuum of care with any IMD policy this body passes.

There is no good reason, policy or otherwise, for us to leave the overwhelming majority of Medicaid beneficiaries out in the cold because they have the misfortunate to be addicted to, for instance, alcohol or meth instead of cocaine or opioids.

So, again, I support the amendment, but I remain in strong opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I conclude my comments by expressing my disappointment that I have yet to persuade my friend from New Jersey to support the underlying bill, although I appreciate his support of the Rush amendment.

We know that our Governors, we know that our State Medicaid directors, and we know those most involved in helping those with addiction have pled with us to change this antiquated law so that people of all colors, of all backgrounds, from anywhere in this country, especially the low-income, can get access to meaningful, modern, and helpful assistance to overcome their addiction. That is what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I encourage them to support the underlying bill.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, before I close, I want to, in a most sincere and humble way, thank Chairman WALDEN for his outstanding leadership on this matter, and for his breadth of understanding of the difficulties that my constituents have as a result of the omission from treatments for crack cocaine and other similar addictions.

I do understand the ranking member on the full committee's problems and concerns. I do understand, and I accept it. But, Mr. Chairman, we have to go forward on this particular amendment and on final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman WALDEN, and all of the staffs, for working with my staff on this critically important issue.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part D of House Report 115–766.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 19, strike ''and''.

Page 6, line 23, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

Page 6, after line 23, insert the following:

''(iv) the number of eligible individuals with any co-occuring disorders who received services pursuant to such State plan amendment and the co-occuring disorders from which they suffer; and

''(v) information regarding the effects of a State plan amendment on access to community care for individuals suffering from a mental disease other than substance use disorder.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 949, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, this legislation requires States to submit a report on the number of patients served for opioid use disorder at institutions for mental diseases, their length of stay, and the care they received after they were discharged. My amendment would add two requirements to that report.

The first additional element addresses co-occurring disorders. My amendment would require that States include information on the number of individuals suffering from these disorders, as well as the type of specific disorders from which they suffer.

Co-occurring disorders are a terrible situation in which a person is simultaneously experiencing a mental illness and a substance use issue. This is especially prevalent in our veteran population, with the VA estimating that about one-third of veterans seeking treatment for substance use disorder also meet the criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder.

Co-occurring disorders can be especially difficult for doctors to diagnose because of how complex symptoms can be, with one often masking the symptoms of the other.

As of 2016, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration estimates that more than 8 million

adults in the U.S. had co-occurring disorders. Half of them did not receive proper treatment, and around one-third received no care for mental illness or substance use disorder.

If we are going to get these individuals the help they need and deserve, we are going to need to know what care is needed and how large the existing treatment gap really is. My amendment will help to provide that data.

The second element of my amendment requires information on access to community care for individuals suffering from a mental illness other than substance use disorder.

For decades, our country has shifted mental healthcare services away from institutional care into community health providers. That is substantial progress that we certainly don't want to reverse or endanger.

Make no mistake, passing this legislation will have a direct effect on access to community care for people with mental diseases. We should know how much and to what extent that is the case. My amendment will provide Congress with the data on whether that access is increasing or, as a result of this potential legislation, decreasing.

We should not, in efforts to combat this epidemic, inadvertently create uncertainty or greater harm for other groups of people, especially such vulnerable groups as those with mental illness. My amendment will provide Congress with greater information for us to know if we are doing just that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), my colleague, for offering this amendment to H.R. 5797.

This amendment seeks to add several components to a State report that is included in H.R. 5797. I appreciate Mr. KILDEE's work on this amendment. I think that this information would be valuable, and I am happy to accept the amendment. However, I want to note that we will need to talk to States about the information this amendment would have, and then report. Changes may have to be made, depending on that feedback.

I am committed to working out the technical details of the amendment as we move into conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support my colleague's, Representative KILDEE's, amendment to this legislation. It is certainly important to require States to report information on individuals with co-occurring disorders and what disorders are suffered, and it is equally important to have information on access to community care for individuals suffering from a behavioral health issue other than a substance use disorder.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stress that this information is important, but the underlying problem with the IMD CARE Act continues. I believe this bill is, at best, an ineffective use of scarce Medicaid dollars. More importantly, it may undermine ongoing efforts to improve the full continuum of care for people with substance use disorders.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of both of my colleagues.

This is an effort to make sure that, as we take on this epidemic, whatever path we may take, we do so in a way that gets us the best information we can to determine whether or not we are making the progress that this intends. We have our thoughts about that. This legislation, and this particular amendment, would ensure that Congress has the information it needs.

I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part D of House Report 115–766.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 7, insert before the period the following: ''or criteria established or endorsed by the State agency identified by the State pursuant to section 1932(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Public Health Service Act''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 949, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to withdraw the amendment, but I want to take a moment to highlight an issue of critical importance to my home State of Pennsylvania where communities across the Commonwealth have been suffering from the scourge of the opioid crisis.

First, I want to thank the committee for tackling the IMD exclusion problem. We must ensure access to treatment to get people suffering with addiction on the road to recovery. Going forward, we must ensure that States have the flexibility that they need to provide access to treatment and not unintentionally create obstacles or bureaucratic barriers to care.

This is exactly what I had in mind when I introduced my Road to Recovery Act last year. I worked with various stakeholders across the Nation and in Pennsylvania, including Pennsylvania State Representative Gene DiGirolamo and Deb Beck, the head of the Drug and Alcohol Service Providers Organization of Pennsylvania.

I determined that States deliberately tailoring criteria to meet their unique situation, whether it be specific local realities or socioeconomic factors, need flexibility and should not be bound solely to the proprietary criteria of one organization—which, in fact, endorsed my Road to Recovery Act that included this same State flexibility criteria provision.

I am concerned for Pennsylvania and other similarly situated States that could be left behind, especially in the public patient and residential treatment context.

For instance, in Pennsylvania, we currently use the Pennsylvania client placement criteria tool for determining the appropriate level of care for an individual seeking treatment or already within Pennsylvania's treatment system. And there are simply differences between the ASAM standard specified in this bill and the criteria used by my home State of Pennsylvania.

Additionally, in States that may be transitioning to the ASAM guidelines, much work is needed to implement these changes. So, States need the flexibility and assurances to be able to address facility needs during this transition period. This would ensure access to care if the State sees a necessity for it.

Furthermore, the CMS guidance for the States applying for 1115 waivers already gives the ability to use either the ASAM criteria or other patient placement assessment tools.

A manual published by SAMHSA discusses the ASAM criteria and notes the following: ''. . . The ASAM criteria were not as applicable to publicly funded programs as to hospitals, practices of private practitioners, group practices, or other medical settings. Therefore, some States supplemented or adapted ASAM criteria.''

The same manual goes on to say that several States have adopted variations of the ASAM criteria to fit their systems and that many States have made significant improvements in the ASAM criteria to make them more appropriate to their systems and easier to use.

□ 1430

So as you can see, Mr. Chairman, one size, or, in this case, one criteria, might not fit all for States that need

to tailor their criteria for their specific public health needs.

I look forward to working with the committee and with the Senate in conference to ensure that States have the flexibility that they need to provide access to care.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. FITZPATRICK and his team for agreeing to work with us on this issue. Unfortunately, this well-thought-out amendment would significantly alter the quality standards we have built into the base bill, and such a change would require more substantial vetting with key stakeholders than we have time for at this point.

Because of that, we are not in position of being able to accept the amendment at this time. However, we do feel that Mr. FITZPATRICK has made a good start, so I will have our team do a comprehensive vetting of the language and work with stakeholders to see if this is something we could add as we move into conference with the Senate.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his work and I look forward to continuing to work with him on this and other issues and with the Senate as we continue work on this legislation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the remarks from the chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5797) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide under Medicaid services for certain individuals with opioid use disorders in institutions for mental diseases, and, pursuant to House Resolution 949, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Castor of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5797 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all that follows after section 1 and insert the following:

**SEC. 2. MEDICAID STATE PLAN OPTION TO PROVIDE SERVICES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WITH SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS IN QUALIFIED INSTITUTIONS FOR MENTAL DISEASES.**

Section 1915 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) STATE PLAN OPTION TO PROVIDE SERVICES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS IN QUALIFIED INSTITUTIONS FOR MENTAL DISEASES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to calendar quarters beginning during the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending December 31, 2023, a State may elect, through a State plan amendment, to, notwithstanding section 1905(a), provide medical assistance for addiction treatment services and other medically necessary services furnished to eligible individuals with substance use disorders who are patients in qualified institutions for mental diseases, in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

''(2) PAYMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), amounts expended under a State plan amendment under paragraph (1) for services described in such paragraph furnished, with respect to a 12-month period, to an eligible individual with a substance use disorder who is a patient in a qualified institution for mental diseases shall be treated as medical assistance for which payment is made under section 1903(a) but only to the extent that such services are furnished for not more than a period of 30 days (whether or not consecutive) during such 12-month period.

''(B) CONDITIONS.—As a condition of receiving payment under this paragraph, a State shall satisfy each of the following:

''(i) COVERAGE OF CONTINUUM OF CARE RECOMMENDED BY ASAM.—Provide medical assistance under the State plan for all nine levels of the continuum of care recommended, as of the date of the enactment of this section, by the American Society of Addiction Medicine.

''(ii) COVERAGE OF NEWLY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—Provide for making medical assistance available under the State plan to all individuals described in subclause (VIII) of section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i).

''(C) CLARIFICATION.—Payment made under this paragraph for expenditures under a State plan amendment under this subsection with respect to services described in paragraph (1) furnished to an eligible individual with a substance use disorder shall not affect payment that would otherwise be made under section 1903(a) for expenditures under the State plan (or waiver of such plan) for medical assistance for such individual.

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

''(A) ADDICTION TREATMENT SERVICES.—The term 'addiction treatment services' means, with respect to a State and eligible individuals with substance use disorders who are patients in qualified institutions for mental diseases, services that are offered as part of a full continuum of evidence-based treatment services under the State plan (or a waiver of such plan), including residential, non-residential, and community-based care, for such individuals.

''(B) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL WITH A SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.—The term 'eligible individual with a substance use disorder' means an individual who—

''(i) with respect to a State, is enrolled for medical assistance under the State plan (or a waiver of such plan);

''(ii) is at least 21 years of age;

''(iii) has not attained 65 years of age; and

''(iv) has been diagnosed with at least one substance use disorder.

''(C) QUALIFIED INSTITUTION FOR MENTAL DISEASES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified institution for mental diseases' means an institution described in section 1905(i) that—

''(I) has fewer than 40 beds;

''(II) is accredited for the treatment of substance use disorders by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities, the Council on Accreditation, or any other accrediting agency that the Secretary deems appropriate as necessary to ensure nationwide applicability, including qualified national organizations and State-level accrediting agencies; and

''(III) employs at least one provider who, for purposes of treating eligible individuals with a substance use disorder—

''(aa) is licensed to prescribe at least one form of each type of medication-assisted treatment specified in clause (ii);

''(bb) provides, with respect to the prescription of any such medication-assisted treatment, counseling services and behavioral therapy; and

''(cc) can discuss with any such individual the risks, benefits, and alternatives of any such medication-assisted treatment so prescribed.

''(ii) TYPES OF MEDICATION-ASSISTED TREATMENT SPECIFIED.—For purposes of clause (i), the types of medication-assisted treatment specified in this clause are each of the following:

''(I) Methadone.

''(II) Buprenorphine.

''(III) Naltrexone.

''(D) OTHER MEDICALLY NECESSARY SERVICES.—The term 'other medically necessary services' means, with respect to an eligible individual with a substance use disorder who is a patient in a qualified institution for mental diseases, items and services that are provided to such individual outside of such institution to the extent that such items and services would be treated as medical assistance for such individual if such individual were not a patient in such institution.''.

**SEC. 3. PROMOTING VALUE IN MEDICAID MANAGED CARE.**

Section 1903(m) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7)(A) With respect to expenditures described in subparagraph (B) that are incurred by a State for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2020 (and before fiscal year 2025), in determining the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled under subsection (d)(3), the Secretary shall substitute the Federal medical assistance percentage that applies for such fiscal year to the State under section 1905(b) (without regard to any adjustments to such percentage applicable under such section or any other provision of law) for the percentage that applies to such expenditures under section 1905(y).

''(B) Expenditures described in this subparagraph, with respect to a fiscal year to

which subparagraph (A) applies, are expenditures incurred by a State for payment for medical assistance provided to individuals described in subclause (VIII) of section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i) by a managed care entity, or other specified entity (as defined in subparagraph (D)(iii)), that are treated as remittances because the State—

''(i) has satisfied the requirement of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), by electing—

''(I) in the case of a State described in subparagraph (C), to apply a minimum medical loss ratio (as defined in subparagraph (D)(ii)) that is at least 85 percent but not greater than the minimum medical loss ratio (as so defined) that such State applied as of May 31, 2018; or

''(II) in the case of a State not described in subparagraph (C), to apply a minimum medical loss ratio that is equal to 85 percent; and

''(ii) recovered all or a portion of the expenditures as a result of the entity's failure to meet such ratio.

''(C) For purposes of subparagraph (B), a State described in this subparagraph is a State that as of May 31, 2018, applied a minimum medical loss ratio (as calculated under subsection (d) of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 1, 2018)) for payment for services provided by entities described in such subparagraph under the State plan under this title (or a waiver of the plan) that is equal to or greater than 85 percent.

''(D) For purposes of this paragraph:

''(i) The term 'managed care entity' means a medicaid managed care organization described in section 1932(a)(1)(B)(i).

''(ii) The term 'minimum medical loss ratio' means, with respect to a State, a minimum medical loss ratio (as calculated under subsection (d) of section 438.8 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on June 1, 2018)) for payment for services provided by entities described in subparagraph (B) under the State plan under this title (or a waiver of the plan).

''(iii) The term 'other specified entity' means—

''(I) a prepaid inpatient health plan, as defined in section 438.2 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

''(II) a prepaid ambulatory health plan, as defined in such section (or any successor regulation).''.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House has been debating legislation to combat the opioid epidemic. While many of the bills we heard last week and this week are fine, together they fail to meet the challenge of this very serious public health crisis where in America today, we are losing about 40,000 lives a year due to opioid addiction.

Now, in the Energy and Commerce Committee over the past few months, we have had numerous hearings and heard from all sorts of experts and families and the DEA and health providers. And then back home, families have been educating us on the challenges of dealing with opioid addiction.

Families and public health experts and the medical community, they have reached a consensus that we need a more comprehensive approach to tackle the opioid epidemic that includes prevention, community-based treatment, and integrated recovery plans. But it is very difficult for us to be proactive in a meaningful way on the opioid crisis when the Republicans and the White House continue to press us backwards when it comes to access to affordable healthcare.

Just last week, the Trump administration launched a new attack on Americans with preexisting conditions, and that includes families struggling with opioid addiction. President Trump and the GOP asked a Federal court to strike down the protection that prevents insurance companies from denying coverage or charging more for a preexisting condition.

This would be a devastating blow to those suffering from addiction, not to mention cancer or diabetes or a heart condition or more. This would leave more families without insurance and more families without addiction treatment.

President Trump and the GOP were not successful last year in ripping health coverage away from families across this country through legislation, so now they are trying to do this through the court system: take away the guarantee of health coverage for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions. This is wrong and it will make the opioid epidemic worse. Instead, we should be working together to develop and fund a comprehensive robust plan to combat and treat addiction.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I am proposing an amendment to strengthen the underlying bill. My amendment, most importantly, makes the 5-year limited repeal of the IMD exclusion for individuals with substance use disorders contingent on the State expanding Medicaid. It is based on the most up-to-date research and everything we know about how important Medicaid and Medicaid expansion is to treating opioid addiction.

Mr. Speaker, Medicaid is central to treating addiction, because families can get early intervention and treatment, including the important medical-assisted treatment. In fact, Medicaid serves four out of ten of nonelderly adults with opioid addiction.

According to a 2016 study by the National Council on Behavioral Health, about 1.6 million people with substance use disorders now have coverage because they live in one of the 31 States at the time that expanded Medicaid. So they are more likely to receive treatment, including access to naloxone and other drugs that help them stay off the opioids.

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality highlighted the importance of Medicaid expansion in increasing insurance coverage among people with opioid use disorders just recently. They found that the share of hospitalizations in which the patient was uninsured fell dramatically in States that had expanded Medicaid, from over 13 percent in 2013 to just 2.9 percent 2 years later after those States expanded Medicaid. The steep decline indicates that many uninsured people coping with opioid addiction gained coverage through Medicaid expansion.

Medicaid is part of the solution to the opioid crisis, and Republicans should not irresponsibly press to cut millions of Americans, take away their lifeline as they propose massive cuts again to Medicaid.

The Republican budget came out just yesterday. Surprise, surprise. Again, they go after families who rely on Medicaid, not just Medicaid expansion that has been so important to treating folks who suffer from addiction, but families, children, our neighbors with disabilities, folks that rely on skilled nursing care, the Republican budget released yesterday says $1.5 trillion in cuts to those families. That is not going to help solve the opioid epidemic.

Republicans in Congress cannot, on one hand, say we are facing up to the addiction crisis, and on the other say we are taking away your healthcare, whether it is Medicaid or preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of my motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Commerce Committee has worked hard to make this monumental first step in removing a decades-old barrier.

Currently the law prohibits Medicaid beneficiaries aged 21 to 64 from receiving care in an institution for mental disease, or IMD. This prohibition was set into law in the 1960s, long before the opioid crisis, and the time to repeal it in a targeted manner is now.

Now is the time, because 115 Americans are dying each day from opioid-related deaths. Now is the time, because

on average, 1,000 people are treated in emergency rooms for opioid misuse.

I am happy to work with my colleagues on expanding addiction treatment services, but that should not distract from what we are considering today: increasing access to specialized inpatient treatment for the most vulnerable in society who are struggling with an opioid addiction.

We are helping to ensure that people get the care they need in the midst of this crisis, and most importantly, it will save lives.

A recent MACPAC report clearly stated that the Medicaid IMD exclusion acts as a barrier for individuals with an opioid use disorder and is one of the few instances in Medicaid where Federal financial participation cannot be used for medically necessary and otherwise covered services for a specific Medicaid enrollee population receiving treatment in a specific setting.

The IMD CARE Act is vital to helping our communities end the opioid epidemic by removing that barrier. This bill provides for a targeted repeal of the IMD prohibition. The bill gives States a quicker alternative than Medicaid waivers to provide this much needed care. This bill was carefully crafted to ensure that patients are not being held in IMDs for longer than necessary and the bill also includes an offset.

For these reasons, the National Governors Association and the American Hospital Association support the bill.

Numerous stakeholder groups have identified the IMD exclusion repeal as one of the most significant reforms we can make to end the opioid crisis.

This is such a critical first step.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and to vote ''yes'' on final passage.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1545

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 5797;

The question on passage of H.R. 5797, if ordered;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 6082;

The question on passage of H.R. 6082, if ordered; and

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

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

## INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICAID DESERVE CARE THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND RESPONSIBLE IN ITS EXECUTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 5797) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide under Medicaid services for certain individuals with opioid use disorders in institutions for mental diseases, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 226, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

YEAS—190

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

NAYS—226

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

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Black
Blum
Collins (GA)
Duffy
Ellison
Emmer
Graves (MO)
Lewis (MN)
McCarthy
Polis
Vela

□ 1612

Messrs. MARCHANT, GALLAGHER, WALKER, BRADY of Texas, FLORES, BANKS of Indiana, MULLIN, KING of New York, CULBERSON, BILIRAKIS, and COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 155, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—261

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallagher
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lesko
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—155

Adams
Amash
Barragán
Beatty
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garrett
Gohmert
Gomez
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hoyer
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
King (IA)
Krishnamoorthi
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Black
Blum
Collins (GA)
Duffy
Ellison
Emmer
Graves (MO)
Lewis (MN)
McCarthy
Polis
Vela

□ 1620

Mses. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and LEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCING 10TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to be able to join my sisters on Team Congress for the 10th annual Congressional Women's Softball Game tonight. Many of you know that our game started in 2009, after our former colleague, Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson, and I came together and hatched a plan that—unlike the men, whom we love and respect and cheer on in the baseball game—women, being the more collegial sex, would come together and play on a bipartisan team against the common enemy: the press corps.

Those of you who were here will remember that we lost our minds in the first year and actually thought that we might be able to take on our political staff at the DNC, the RNC, the NRCC, the DCCC, and other assorted alphabet political organizations, and it didn't go so well. So the next year, we thought better of it and came together to take on the press corps.

Through those years, we have had a hearty record where the Members have won three of the nine contests that we have engaged in. But most importantly, we have always played for the Young Survival Coalition to raise awareness and put a spotlight on the millions of young women who are under 40 years old who are diagnosed with breast cancer every year.

Many of you know that I am a breast cancer survivor now of 10 years. I am very thrilled to be able to stand in front of you. Back then, I told you that I was so fearful of not being able to see the special events in my children's lives: their bar and bat mitzvahs, their high school graduations. I have been to all three of their bar and bat mitzvahs, two high school graduations, and one more to go in a few years.

We want to make sure that young women all across this country pay attention to their breast health and know what is normal for them so they know when something feels different.

I am proud to tell you that, this year, we will have reached a milestone where we have raised $1.4 million for the Young Survival Coalition.

So, my sisters, come out and join us tonight at the Watkins Recreation Center, 420 Twelfth Street SE, at 7 p.m.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just want to say that each of the gentlewomen here all play for an individual who is a survivor or a fighter.

I have a colleague who I have served on the city council with in Montgomery, Alabama, for 7 years whose 18-year-old daughter, Courtney, was recently diagnosed with leukemia. So I want all of my colleagues to know that these are the faces and the individuals whom we are playing for on the field tonight. I hope that each of my colleagues will come out.

Go, Congress. Beat the press.

## OVERDOSE PREVENTION AND PATIENT SAFETY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 6082) to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 240, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—175

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

NAYS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Black
Blum
Collins (GA)
Denham
Duffy
Ellison
Emmer
Graves (MO)
Lewis (MN)
McCarthy
Polis
Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1633

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 57, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

YEAS—357

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lesko
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—57

Amash
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Clarke (NY)
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Engel
Espaillat
Garrett
Gohmert
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kuster (NH)
Labrador
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Pallone
Pascrell
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sires
Speier
Vargas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta
Black
Blum
Collins (GA)
Denham
Duffy
Ellison
Emmer
Graves (MO)
Lewis (MN)
McCarthy
Polis
Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1644

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Messrs. GARRETT, and RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and CROWLEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIION

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes due to an extraordinary circumstances. Had I been present, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcall No. 277 and "Yea" on rollcall No. 278.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

## REPORT ON H.R. 6157, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Ms. GRANGER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–769) on the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

## HIGHLIGHTING OPPORTUNITY ZONES IN NORTH CAROLINA'S FIFTH DISTRICT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the recently designated opportunity zones in North Carolina's Fifth District. Last month, the U.S. Treasury approved 22 opportunity zones in North Carolina's Fifth District as part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Referring to areas with untapped economic potential, The New York Times called the provision ''the first new substantial Federal attempt to aid those communities in more than a decade.''

With new incentives for long-term capital investment, opportunity zones allow State and local governments to facilitate increased economic development in rural and suburban areas often overlooked for new investments as companies are drawn to thriving metropolitan areas.

Thanks to the tax cuts and regulatory relief delivered by this united Republican government, the American economy is booming, and opportunity zones will spread that prosperity to communities in need of new capital to create wealth and grow.

## ZTE POSES A THREAT TO OUR SECURITY

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, ZTE, the Chinese telecom corporation, poses a clear threat to our security. The Pentagon has banned the sale of ZTE devices on U.S. bases, saying they ''may pose an unacceptable risk to the Department's personnel, information, and mission.''

Similarly, there is no dispute that ZTE violated sanctions designed to pressure Iran and North Korea. In April, the Department of Commerce instituted appropriate penalties.

Now, for transparently political reasons, President Trump has reversed those penalties, giving ZTE a new lease on life.

As elected officials, one of our most basic responsibilities is to keep Americans safe. In granting ZTE an undeserved reprieve, the President did just the opposite. The failure is dangerous and unacceptable.

Last week, the Senate approved a bipartisan NDAA amendment to restore the penalties President Trump revoked. I am pleased by their success, and I will strongly support efforts to maintain that language in the coming NDAA conference. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Politics needs to stop at the water's edge. Congress can and must do what the President will not.

## PAKISTAN IS NO ALLY OF THE USA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Lieutenant General Austin Miller, the nominee to lead our forces in Afghanistan, testified before the Senate that the biggest obstacle to success in Afghanistan is Pakistan.

He echoes the same frustrations the President expressed earlier this year and what others in this Chamber, including myself, have said for years,

that Pakistan is providing safe havens for terrorists and playing both sides. Terrorist leaders even arrogantly make public appearances in Pakistan, with the knowledge of the government.

When we take action against terrorists in Pakistan, Pakistan officials typically condemn us, rather than take steps to improve counterterrorism efforts.

President Trump and the incoming commander for U.S. forces in Afghanistan hold a realistic view of Pakistan. Pakistan is the problem with success in Afghanistan.

There should be no American money sent to Pakistan until they stop their treacherous ways. Otherwise, the 17-year-old war in Afghanistan may never end.

And that is just the way it is.

## STOP SEPARATING FAMILIES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, there are babies being ripped away from their parents at the southern border in the name of the American people. Make no mistake, this is part of an evil plot by the Trump administration, and it has to stop.

What I want to know is how the Trump administration is keeping track of these children. My triplets didn't carry identification around when they were little babies. That was my wife's and my job, to be able to identify them and speak for them. We were with our kids, and we could identify them.

If these babies don't have identification, how will they be reunited with their parents? How will they be reunited with their families?

The American people demand answers, Mr. Speaker. The American people demand an end to this evil, to this new GOP nonprofit, ''Cage the Children.''

## SIX MONTHS OF TAX REFORM

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to reflect on the past 6 months in this country.

On December 20, 2017, Republicans in Congress passed the most historic tax reform in three decades, known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. That day will long be remembered as a time when American families and businesses were once again made a priority.

As a small-business owner myself, I have spent my time in Congress fighting for tax cuts that would allow Main Street to breathe again.

Small business optimism is at an all-time high across Texas' 25th District. Employers are increasing their workforce and raising wages.

Tax reform has created more than 1 million jobs, which has brought unemployment down to 3.8 percent. That is incredible.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is great, but I want the American people to know that we are not done yet. Congress is not done yet. I am continuing to work to strengthen the economy and make tax cuts permanent.

We will fight year after year to make America more competitive, keep our Tax Code simpler, flatter, and fairer. Business is simply good.

In God we trust.

## LGBT PRIDE MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize LGBT Pride Month, a time to celebrate the diversity of the LGBT community and honor the strength and courage of LGBT people throughout history.

I was thrilled to attend the annual LGBT Pride Fest this past weekend in my home State of Rhode Island, a wonderful celebration that illustrated just how far we have come in the fight for equality.

But the struggle isn't over, Mr. Speaker, and it is more important than ever that we stay strong and vocal. We, as a society, cannot and should not accept that LGBT people face discrimination in this country every day, whether they are in a cake shop, the armed services, or in a school bathroom.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Equality Act, which was introduced by my good friend and colleague from the Ocean State, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, and is cosponsored by 196 of my colleagues.

Discrimination is never justified. Let's celebrate our diversity and promote a culture of tolerance and acceptance, not only during Pride, but every day of the year.

## EMERALD COAST WILDLIFE REFUGE

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the outstanding work of the leadership and volunteers at the Emerald Coast Wildlife Refuge in my district. The wildlife refuge services thousands of animals each year from Escambia, Santa Rosa, Walton, and Bay Counties. They provide services through rescue, rehab, and environmental outreach.

Our community leaders and volunteers have shown overwhelming support for this incredible mission that includes educational outreach so that young people can learn more about our environment and the fantastic critters that we share the planet with.

I am so proud of the wildlife refuge's accomplishments over the past decade, and I look forward to the future impact that they will have on their new home in the Navarre community and throughout the great northwest Florida.

## STOP THE BARBARIC TACTICS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last night, Ohio was subjected to another Trump administration ICE worker raid involving rounding up 146 workers at meat processing plants in Salem, Canton, and Massillon, Ohio, making Ohio among the top States in the union where these workers have been poached.

Again, Detroit-based ICE agents swooped into Ohio, fully armed, to round up dozens of workers who toil in one of the least attractive jobs in our Nation, cold, bloody, slippery, and, yes, dangerous, hard jobs in the meat processing industry, jobs U.S. citizens don't want.

My message to President Trump: Stop the barbaric tactics. Stop breaking up working families.

If we don't fix this system, these agricultural jobs will be offshored, and we will be importing even more of our food. Let us set up a dependable system to regularize the hiring of workers. Heartland States like Ohio are capable of creating a level playing field for businesses and workers from our country and abroad.

To take the crime out of seeking employment in the Americas requires amending NAFTA and CAFTA by updating those accords to address continental employment standards.

The President campaigned on reforming NAFTA. Well, Mr. President, we are making you an offer you shouldn't refuse. Show our workers and our companies some respect. We will meet you at any time, at any place to broker a better deal for Ohio and heartland workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

## HONORING COACH SAM HARRELL

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the new head football coach at Ennis High School, Coach Sam Harrell.

Coach Sam Harrell was born in 1975 in Seminole, Texas. He went to high school in Brownwood, Texas, where he was valedictorian. He became, the first time, the high school coach at Ennis back in 1994. Over the next 15 or 16 years, he won three State championships, went to the semifinals twice, was Texas High School Coach of the Year in 1999, became head of the Texas High School Coaches Association, and was in

the Texas High School Football Hall of Fame.

But in 2005, he came down with multiple sclerosis, which was not treatable by conventional therapy. He had to go out of the country for some stem cell treatments. Those were successful. He moved back to this country, continued to live in Ennis, Texas, and stayed active in the community. And about 2 weeks ago, the school board and school superintendent named him, again, to be the head football coach at Ennis High School.

He is a very great coach, but he is also a greater man. He is very Christian. He is good with the kids. He is just an absolute stellar individual.

Congratulations to Coach Sam Harrell, who is, once again, head football coach for the Ennis Lions, who have five State championships in their history.

□ 1700

## WE ARE FAILING TO LIVE UP TO OUR CORE VALUES

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, America is keeping kids in cages. America is keeping kids in cages.

Many people across our country have risen to say that this is not who we are. It doesn't represent our values, our ideals, or our Constitution.

But the sad reality is that today, this is who we are. You are an American. I am an American. It is fellow Americans who are ripping toddlers from their mothers and fathers and guarding them in steel cages.

And in truth, we have done this before. We herded American Indians into reservations. We turned our backs on Jews fleeing for their lives from the Holocaust. We ripped children from their parents when we sold them as slaves.

But we all thought we had learned our lessons, moved past those hateful times. We have been on a march to grow into a country with the courage to live up to our values and serve as a beacon of hope for the world, not repeat the darkest parts of our history.

The families in these detention centers aren't fleeing to the U.S. to take our jobs, they are running for their lives. They are fleeing a world of racism, ransom, murder, where their sons are being forced into violent gangs, and their daughters are being stolen on their way to school and prostituted as sex slaves.

A nation that fails to learn the lessons of history, that fails to live up to its core values, that can't abide by the rights enshrined in its own Constitution, is not strong, Mr. Speaker, it is weak.

Today, we are stealing kids from their parents and we are weak.

And although it is this administration's policy that is directly responsible for this disgusting practice, we are all guilty as fellow Americans so long as it goes on.

Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These are our core values. Let's live up to them today.

## MEMORIALIZING MARTIN MARTINEZ

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to memorialize Martin Martinez and to draw attention to his story and his struggle.

Martin lived for over 30 years here in the United States. He worked hard, paid taxes, learned English. He had two beautiful American children, one of them, Maria, worked for the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and for me.

Martin was a good American, but he was also an undocumented immigrant, and even though he was putting himself at risk and he knew it, he and his wife self-reported to the government to declare their status. They followed every instruction they were given, and they stayed out of any kind of trouble, but they were still deported.

Soon after the deportation, Martin paid the ultimate price and lost his life on February 27.

Now, he had existing heart problems, but his daughter, Maria, will tell you, ''This administration separated my family and my dad died of a broken heart.''

Maria and her brother are now forced to grieve alone, for their mother was also deported and has been barred from reentering the United States for a decade.

Maria and the rest of the Martinez family are forced to suffer the real human cost of this administration's policies. And it is stories like Martin's that so clearly demonstrate the need for comprehensive immigration reform.

Martin's story is the story of millions of immigrants. It is our story. And it is our responsibility to learn from it and to act. We can't bring back Martin Martinez, but we can do something to heal our country.

## I AM STANDING FOR THE CHILDREN

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, America is listening to the pain of so many of the Members, my colleagues, as we have experienced the devastation of watching families torn apart from their babies, their toddlers, their young children.

I spent my Sunday and Monday, Father's Day, looking at those who just simply wanted an opportunity, holding baby Roger in my hands, whose mother had died and whose sister was ripped away from him and prosecuted criminally for entering the United States. Or baby Leah, who was 1 year old and was obviously fussy and had been in such a way that she was experiencing trauma.

And yet, we now have this executive order that looks as if the President has done something that he could not have done a few hours ago, which is picking up the telephone and telling the people at the border to cease and desist.

Those are good people who work there. They are only following orders. But this is a tragic executive order—it has no heart to it—because what it does is, yes, it keeps the families together in a criminal posture and houses them in the same conditions, now on military bases, rather than allowing them to proceed through court proceedings. In my southern district of Texas we have 50,000 cases in backlog because, as I go to the Budget Committee, this administration refuses to give us more judges.

Well, they are trying to open one of these places in my congressional district. And I want to congratulate Houston, because Houston is standing for humanity; it is standing, as the Pope has said, because everyone deserves dignity.

This executive order is not worth the paper it is written on because it could have been a phone call, not a demand that it is all of Congress' fault.

But I am standing for the children, and we are going to save them.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF NATURAL GAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this House Energy and Commerce Special Order is to talk about America's energy dominance, especially with natural gas.

This conversation is very important today because the World Gas Conference happens in this town, Washington, D.C., next week. What a difference a decade makes.

When I joined Texas Senator Phil Gramm's office in 1998, one ugly word described American oil and natural gas. That word was peak.

Experts, here and around the world, said America had peaked in our production of oil and natural gas.

Every year, we would buy more oil and gas from foreign sources, and we had to buy oil from some companies that didn't like us very much and hurt us by taking oil away.

No one cared about a group called OPEC until they stopped the flow of oil that they had and that we needed.

OPEC was led by Arab nations who were upset that we resupplied our best ally ever, Israel, when they were invaded by their neighbors. It happened

in 1973. It happened again in 1979. Gas prices doubled overnight.

In 1979, I had just gotten my driver's license. My job was to take our family cars and fill them with gas that had gotten down to a quarter of a gallon in the tank. I got in line for 45 minutes or maybe as long as an hour. We could only purchase 20 gallons of gasoline. We could only buy that gasoline on days per your license plate. If the last number was odd, buy gas on an odd day. Even, even day.

Heck, a guy on a lawn mower was behind me getting gas one day. That is how bad it was just one decade ago.

But thanks to the American private sector and our ingenuity, hydraulic fracturing and directional drilling, America has a whole new world order for energy. We have global energy dominance, and that is what we are here to talk about today, that special happening right now in America.

Right now, our country, America, is the number one producer of oil and gas in the entire world. Our natural gas increasingly powers our homes and our businesses, making our air cleaner and our economy stronger, especially on the Gulf Coast, where I am from.

OPEC knows their days of controlling the market and punishing people for bad actions they perceive are over. They have right now, as we speak, flooded the market with oil to try to keep prices low and stop America's newfound energy dominance. They have tried and they have failed.

We had more oil and gas than they had. We have that gas, and now we are letting the free market take over, and we have a lot more who can tap that in a moment's notice.

And this doesn't just mean affordable power and gasoline at home. It also means American jobs.

One study last year said over 800,000 jobs in the gas and oil industry came to our country for this renaissance. This renaissance, this dominance, has allowed us to export natural gas and oil for the first time since 1975. Over 40 years not on the market.

We are going from basically zero exports of natural gas to 10 billion cubic feet per day in exports.

It wasn't long ago we were building terminals to import natural gas, and now we are reversing them to export natural gas. That is what American energy dominance looks like.

And as we say in Texas, there is a new sheriff in the global natural gas market, and that sheriff's name is Uncle Sam.

And these huge exports of natural gas are helping America export liquid freedom to friends we want to help, and hurt those who use energy as a weapon to control other countries.

For too long, a former KGB spy and Russia's de facto dictator, Vladimir Putin, has controlled nations that escaped the Iron Curtain when the Berlin Wall fell in 1991. Nations like Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, and Ukraine were still beholden to what TED POE calls the Napoleon of Siberia, Mr. Putin.

If they did not do what Mr. Putin wanted, they lost all power. Summers were scorching; winters were bitter cold. Comply or punish. You are not free.

America, right now, is taking these weapons away from Mr. Putin. Cheap natural gas takes away the hooks of tyranny.

This is important even for countries that don't buy our gas because our gas is making the market a true market with competition and lower prices. That market puts a lid on bad actors and what they can charge.

But sadly, this explosion, this dominance, caught the previous administration by surprise and we were way behind the curve in getting our natural gas on the global market.

Good news: The Energy and Commerce Committee stepped up in this Congress to make sure we get these exports going and these projects approved quickly.

□ 1715

We made sure they are safe, great for our environment, with minimal impacts, and we take all of the local concerns into account. But red tape and these silly delays hurt us. We have stopped that and have got a free market going in so many important ways.

In this Congress, the 115th Congress, we are using this new opportunity to expand our Nation's energy dominance with natural gas. This means, for the whole world, cheaper, cleaner power, the jobs that come with that, and it brings American jobs back home from overseas.

Right now, America is exporting freedom to friends and allies and taking away a monopoly from bad actors. Get ready, world. Uncle Sam is coming to your neighborhood, your hometown.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas, the vice chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, who has just been a real leader on energy issues across the country and around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk about the shale revolution and what it has really meant not only for jobs and growth in America, but energy worldwide. The shale revolution and the dramatic increase in domestic oil and natural production has really been remarkable. American innovation did this. Technological advancements did this. It transformed the United States from an importer of natural gas to a major exporter.

The positive effects, the enormous effects are being felt around the globe. OPEC and the established gas suppliers like Russia, they all bet against the United States. And guess what. They have lost.

Now, as American energy exports reach world markets, they are losing their stranglehold on supply and prices. U.S. LNG exports are going to markets across Asia, North America, Europe, and, yes, to even some of our allies in the Middle East.

The rise of the U.S. as a global energy superpower means that energy markets are more open. They are more transparent and competitive than ever before. And we are creating great American jobs here. We really are. If you look at these regions where these finds have been discovered and now are being developed, people are getting good wages, good jobs. They are building out, and it makes us stronger.

President Trump didn't want to say, ''We want to be energy independent''; he wanted to say, ''America is going to be energy dominant.'' And that is what we are becoming. That is a good thing.

By the way, as we find this new natural gas and we build out more generating facilities, we are also reducing our carbon emissions. We are below the 1995 levels. I don't think there is a country on the planet that has reduced emissions more than the United States during this period, so we are making progress there, too.

The increase in LNG exports around the globe over the past 2 years will help us and is the result of continuing expansion in the U.S. LNG export capacity. Two LNG projects, Sabine Pass in Louisiana and Cove Point in Maryland, have been online since 2016. That has increased the U.S. LNG export to 3.6 billion—that is with a B—cubic feet per day.

There are four more projects scheduled to come online in the next couple of years: Elba Island LNG in Georgia and Cameron LNG in Louisiana in 2018, and Freeport LNG and Corpus Christi LNG in Texas in 2019. Once completed, U.S. LNG export capacity is expected to reach 9.6 billion cubic feet per day by the end of 2019. That is the end of next year.

Meanwhile, in my home State of Oregon, work continues on the Jordan Cove LNG export facility in Coos Bay.

As export capacity continues to increase, the United States is projected to become the third largest LNG exporter in the world by 2020, following closely behind Australia and Qatar.

As chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have prioritized a progrowth, proconsumer, all-of-the-above, and, frankly, all-of-the-below approach to energy that includes a focus on natural gas. We have held a number of hearings.

We have looked into the overall impacts of natural gas development, the enormous number of new jobs, good family wages, middle class jobs and economic growth, the increased use of natural gas for power generation, the reduction in carbon emissions, the need for new infrastructure, and the advantages for domestic manufacturing and global competitiveness.

We have looked at all of that in the Energy and Commerce Committee, and my colleagues, many of whom you will

hear from tonight, Mr. Speaker, have really led on this. My colleague from Texas (Mr. OLSON) has really been a fine leader on the Energy Subcommittee.

I encouraged our Members to work across the aisle. Growing American energy and great-paying jobs should be a bipartisan effort. We need to improve the regulatory process so we can solve some of the challenges that may prevent us from reaching our full American potential.

This is our century. This is the American century, and we are seeing great progress. We cut taxes. We are growing a million jobs and have the lowest unemployment rate in decades. We have more job openings than people to fill them, and a lot of that has to do with energy.

For example, members of the Energy and Commerce Committee have introduced and the House has passed legislation that would modernize the permitting processes for interstate and cross-border natural gas pipelines and LNG export facilities. These bills all passed the House on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats getting together, getting things done. I am encouraged by the support they are receiving in the Senate, too.

While these bills have not yet been signed into law, the Trump administration is very receptive to our approach to improve coordination and permit reviews and dedicate a single Federal lead agency. Part of the swamp back here is there are so many people, so many agencies, and so many duplicative processes that have been accumulating for decades.

And if you are the innovator who wants to do something new, if you want to grow jobs in your community, your State, your region, you have got to navigate this morass of red tape and regulation and permitting. About the time you think you have got it done, some other agency shows up, and then somebody else and then somebody else, and your enormous investment languishes out there for years and years and years.

We can do better than that. You can maintain all of the important environmental law, but if we have a lead agency, we can find some efficiency.

I think the vice chairman would agree that we might be able to find efficiency in the Federal Government. I think it is possible. And I think with the lead agency, we can.

This one-agency, one-decision process is now being rolled out because of the Trump administration, with a goal to cut down permitting time to 2 years or less. I think you can probably do it faster than that, but, hey, we will take 2 years or less. That is a big win.

Our energy security is stronger today than at any point in America's history, due in large part to natural gas. Natural gas has contributed to jobs and economic development both here in America, here at home, and it is improving the efficiency of our power generation fleet. It is increasing the competitiveness of our manufacturers who use it as both a fuel and a feedstock. It is strengthening our hand diplomatically, and it is creating jobs, jobs, jobs, good-paying jobs. It is a win-win across the board.

And so I appreciate the vice chairman's leadership on this special time for us to come to the House floor and share the great progress of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the country, the bipartisan work we are doing, and the great innovative future that lies before us.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALDEN for his comments to remind the American people and the entire world that this American dominance of natural gas has made America's air cleaner for global emissions.

As the chairman knows, America has reduced gas emissions 11 percent in the last decade. I told that to people in India this past March and they were stunned.

How did you guys do that? Our air is so dirty? What should we do?

It is simple: Buy American liquified natural gas.

And they are doing that right now.

The next speaker is a good friend from Ohio, a man who Mr. Putin fears because he has control of what is called the Utica shale play in Ohio.

A man from India, Prime Minister Modi from India, loves BILL JOHNSON from the great State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Representative PETE OLSON, for partnering with me to colead this Special Order tonight on the benefits of natural gas and liquified natural gas exports, especially as the United States prepares to hold the World Gas Conference next week.

I am honored to share this floor time with Mr. OLSON to talk about this very important topic, and I also want to thank many of my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for participating in this Special Order tonight to talk about this important topic.

I represent rural eastern and southeastern Ohio, which is no stranger to the benefits of natural gas. My district sits on top of, as Representative OLSON just mentioned, the Utica and the Marcellus shale plays, which have led to a growing interest in new and exciting manufacturing opportunities like ethane cracker plants and ethane storage opportunities.

In fact, one recent report led by Shale Crescent USA and IHS Markit forecasts that this region will supply 37 percent of the Nation's natural gas production by 2040. This same report forecasts that natural gas liquid production from these two plays will increase from 0.53 million barrels per day in 2017 to 1.37 million barrels per day in 2040, an increase of over 150 percent. Other studies predict that the region has sufficient ethane feedstock to support up to five ethane cracker plants.

These opportunities are huge. These are massive construction projects, putting upwards of 10,000 construction workers to work over a 6-year period, with upwards of 1,000 permanent employees once those plants go operational.

Additionally, ethylene projects within the region will have a comparative advantage because of the access to ample supplies of locally produced, low-cost ethane and because of the fact that the region is in close proximity to over two-thirds of U.S. polyethylene consumption. And that is only half the story.

The economic and geopolitical benefits of exporting our excess gas are equally exciting as these benefits are helping to encourage oil and gas activity throughout Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

As you will hear from multiple colleagues tonight, the U.S. is now the world's leading producer of oil and natural gas, and we are projected to become a net energy exporter by 2026. Natural gas production is at an all-time high, and reserves are so large that they are predicted to meet domestic demand for almost a century.

Ohio alone reached new heights in October of 2017 as natural gas production reached 5.5 billion cubic feet per day. Simply put, we must do everything we can to take complete advantage of this abundance, and that includes LNG exports.

However, the window of opportunity for American LNG exports will not remain open indefinitely. The U.S. is in fierce competition with other LNG-exporting nations, and if America misses our opportunity to get into these international markets in a big way, our share of the global gas market could be greatly reduced. Subsequently, opportunities to support our national security and strengthen the energy security of our allies through American LNG will diminish as well.

So we must continue to elevate and promote the United States as a reliable source of natural gas onto the world market, which will diversify our friends' and allies' energy sources, greatly reduce their vulnerability to a single monopolistic supplier, and change the conversation at the table with the likes of Russia's Vladimir Putin.

Additionally, studies have found that LNG exports support thousands of American jobs, many of them within manufacturing. ICF International, Inc., estimates that these jobs will occur across the entire value chain, translating into millions of dollars in new wages for American workers.

In fact, the Department of Energy once again highlighted the benefits of LNG exports with a study it released just this past week. This study, which is in addition to four other studies commissioned by DOE since 2012, presented data that demonstrates just

how LNG exports are a net benefit to our economy.

Additionally, these exports increase our GDP. They lower the trade deficit. And it is for those reasons, these reasons, that I have led the effort to ensure the U.S. does all it can to take advantage of our ability to export natural gas.

Most recently, the Energy and Commerce Committee passed H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act, out of committee in a bipartisan fashion. I was proud to author this bill, which seeks to codify the Department of Energy's recent efforts to encourage exports of small volumes of natural gas.

There is a significant interest in potential for U.S. natural gas in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America, although not in the quantities that the current large-scale domestic exporting facilities were built to address via conventional liquefied natural gas tankers. H.R. 4606 will help the U.S. to act on these interests through greater regulatory certainty and a reduction in administrative regulatory burdens.

□ 1730

Now, when I first came to Congress in 2011, I worked hard to advance the idea that energy independence and security are the next great frontiers for America.

Today, energy independence and security have been replaced by a new concept. Mr. Speaker, you have heard Representative OLSON mention it, and you have heard Chairman WALDEN mention it. It is called energy dominance; and with it, all the global economic and geopolitical implications that come with being the king of the energy hill.

Such an energy vision that harnesses America's innovative exceptionalism will lead to new discoveries and technologies around domestic energy production, storage, distribution, and usage; and will lead us to greater economic prosperity and job growth.

I am excited to help further that vision which includes natural gas and LNG exports. I am excited for all the great opportunities that lie ahead for our country, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on those benefits tonight.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Ohio. I also thank my dear friend for reminding me that Utica is the Marcellus in your district. It also reminded me over and over of the benefits the gentleman has had in Ohio. Rough parts in the country had some bad years, some down times. We have something that Texas called the Eagle Ford shale play that goes down from basically San Antonio to Laredo, a rough part of Texas, not very much growth there. When Zavala happened back home—I was down there about 3 years ago—a man got his first royalty check. He was thrilled. He goes to his bank to deposit, in his Sunday best suit, and says to the guy there: Put this in my account.

His banker said: Great, I got it.

He puts it in his account. He comes back and says: Okay, that is 100,000—whoa, whoa, whoa—100,000? I thought it was 1,000.

His mind could not see the zeros, the periods, and the commas. We changed his world with American ingenuity.

The next person up is the former leader of this committee, the chairman, a proud Texas Aggie, and the single most strongest force to get the crude export ban lifted that was installed in 1975, Chairman JOE BARTON from Ennis, Texas.

Mr. BARTON. I thank Congressman OLSON for his leadership as vice chairman of the subcommittee and a tireless leader on behalf of energy in this country.

Also, I want to thank Congressman JOHNSON for his strong efforts and also compliment him on his playing in last week's Congressional Baseball Game. Congressman DUNCAN was also on the team and played well as shortstop.

Oil was discovered in Pennsylvania back in the mid-1800s. As the oil industry began to develop, they more and more would run into what we would today call associated gas. Every now and then while drilling for oil they would hit a well that didn't have any oil, but all it had was what today we call natural gas.

They didn't know what to do with it. They used the oil to make kerosene, lubricants, and home heating oil and things like that, but they didn't have a real purpose for natural gas. So they would just flare it, just literally in the field, light a match, put a flare pipe up and flare it. As time went on, they discovered that it had a fairly high Btu energy content, and they discovered a way to contain it, to store it, and to transport it through pipelines. Because it was a gas, it was not a liquid in its natural state, so while it was not as valuable as oil, it had enough value that it was worth looking for and worth keeping.

You rock along and you rock along, and in the 1950s and 1960s, we began to set price controls on natural gas in interstate commerce. The Federal Government would regulate the price and as a consequence people stopped looking for it, because it wasn't economic to find it unless you could find a well that you could sell in intrastate commerce, within the State.

When I ran for Congress in 1984, I ran on the platform of repealing what was called the Natural Gas Price Act of 1978 where Congress had set a price control on interstate natural gas in some cases as low as 2 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. Gas in the intrastate market, deep gas, was selling as high as $15 per 1,000 cubic feet. There is a big difference between $15 and 2 cents.

One of my first accomplishments in Congress under President George Herbert Bush, the first President Bush, was to see the NGPA repealed. The Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 was repealed, and it was my amendment that did that. So I was very proud of that.

Rock along a few more years, and in 2005, I was chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and we were doing a major energy bill, the Natural Gas Policy Act of 2005. We did a lot of things in that bill. We felt at that time that there was going to be a shortage of natural gas in this country. Some of the States, States like Massachusetts, California, and New York, were trying to prohibit import terminals for natural gas, for liquefied natural gas, LNG, being built. The States would not give the permits.

So in the infinite wisdom of the Congress, we passed, as a part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, a section, an amendment to the bill, that gave ultimate decisionmaking authority to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. Because we thought we were going to need to build these import terminals to import natural gas and the States were going to try to thwart it, we required a consultation with the States. The States had to be involved in the process, but the ultimate decision would be made by the Federal Government under the auspices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

A funny thing happened, Mr. Speaker. Some oil producers and gas producers down in Texas—one of them was a Texas Aggie, a guy named George Mitchell—decided that you had all these shale formations, and there were hydrocarbons in them, but they were like rock. Literally, if you look at a core sample of some of these shale formations, which you all had mentioned today in this Special Order, it is just like solid—it is solid rock.

George Mitchell and others decided, by golly, we can get natural gas out of that if we fracture the rock under pressure and create tiny little cracks where natural gas can escape from. Come to find out it worked. Then they also decided: Do you know what? Instead of drilling the classic vertical well, what if we bent the drill bit at a 90-degree angle and drilled horizontally?

Son of a gun if that didn't work too.

So the combination of hydraulic fracturing with horizontal drilling made all of these shale formations economic, and the result was an absolute bonanza of natural gas available at economically recoverable prices in the United States of America.

Congressman JOHNSON has mentioned some of the formations up in his part of the country, the Marcellus and the Utica. Of course, Mr. OLSON talked about the Eagle Ford shale down in Texas, the Barnett shale in my part of Texas. All over this country—Pennsylvania, even in New York, California, Colorado, Texas, New Mexico, Louisiana, Arkansas, Ohio, and Kansas—there are shale formations—literally almost everywhere in the United States—and in most of those shale formations, it is economically recoverable

to drill for natural gas—and in some cases for oil also—but tonight we are talking about natural gas.

Funny things happened. We didn't need to import natural gas. We had so much of it, we could export it. We used that provision we put in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to begin to license, not import terminals but export terminals. Congressman OLSON, Congressman JOHNSON, and Chairman WALDEN have talked—and I am sure Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. DUNCAN will talk later—about the economic consequences of that. We are exporting or going to export about 2 billion cubic feet a day this year of liquified natural gas.

We are going to quadruple that in the next few years. If you look at the economic value of that, if you assume that you are selling it overseas about $4 per 1,000 cubic feet, this year we will export three-quarters of a trillion dollars—a trillion dollars is a thousand billion. And not in the near future, we are going to be exporting several trillion dollars worth of natural gas every year, hundreds of thousands of jobs, just an economic—I don't know what you would call it—a bonanza. It is not a windfall because it is not luck. It is hard work. It is American ingenuity and American technology. It is revolutionizing the energy markets.

As has been pointed out, we are also beginning to export oil as a consequence of the ban being repealed for crude oil exports. That is a story for another Special Order.

The future for natural gas in this country as a source of fuel is unlimited. The economic benefits are obvious, but there is another benefit, and it is the ability to export freedom. When we export our natural gas, in many cases we are exchanging the source of the supply from a totalitarian—not quite totalitarian, but certainly not a totally democratic country like Russia—with a free country like the United States.

Now, it has been mentioned that Qatar, Algeria, and Saudi Arabia are also large exporters of natural gas, and they are allies of the United States, friends of the United States. But they don't have, as of yet, the purely democratic institutions, the totally free markets, and the free market capitalistic system that we have here.

So when we send our natural gas overseas, we are also sending to the countries that use it, economic, and in some cases, political freedom. They cannot be held hostage to sources of supply that don't have the same democratic values that we do.

So, as Congressman JOHNSON pointed out earlier, the World Natural Gas Conference is here in Washington next week. A number of us will participate in that conference. It is really a tribute to the natural gas industry in the United States that they have used the American innovative spirit and American technology to create a product which brings benefits economically not only here but overseas, and it really helps, in my opinion, put freedom in the driver's seat.

So this is a great Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman OLSON for leading it and the other members of the Energy and Commerce Committee for participating. I am proud to be a part of this group.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Texas. I want to thank my dear friend for also saying the name of George Mitchell. As you know, George Mitchell revolutionized our energy with hydraulic fracturing, directional drilling of the Barnett shale play by Fort Worth. It took Mr. Mitchell 35 or 36 wells to drill before the first one came back viable.

□ 1745

That money was private sector money, not money from D.C. The private sector made this revolution possible. I thank the gentleman for reminding us about what happened.

By the way, people think the gentleman's car may be there, the Corvette convertible, in the background. It looks like a 1959, maybe a 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a good friend and also a doctor

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. OLSON and Mr. JOHNSON for hosting this Special Order.

Manufacturing is a key industry that helps drive Indiana's strong economy. According to the National Association of Manufacturers, Indiana manufacturers exported $33.78 billion in goods and employed 16.8 percent of the Hoosier workforce in 2016. Much of the credit for such a strong manufacturing presence in Indiana is its relationship with natural gas.

In 2016, a comprehensive study was released detailing the positive effects that domestic natural gas brought to communities across the Nation. The study prepared by the National Association of Manufacturers provides examples of how natural gas is increasing the industrial strength and worldwide competitiveness of American companies.

Among the findings, the study said that the natural gas industry has added nearly 1.9 million total jobs to the economy and saved working American families an average of $1,300 in disposable income in a single year through the production and use of shale gas.

According to the study, the U.S. supply of natural gas is projected to increase by 48 percent throughout the course of the next decade, resulting from the growing demand for this energy source.

During periods of high commodity prices, companies that rely on a high volume of natural gas to manufacture products can find it difficult to maintain a competitive advantage in an increasingly global market. However, an abundant supply of domestic natural gas has led to a reduction in natural gas prices. In turn, this increased affordability is allowing these companies to increase their manufacturing output.

Further, the transportation of natural gas through an expanding national pipeline network means that this clean-burning natural resource is also becoming more accessible for American companies and presents a growing number of manufacturing opportunities.

Through the increased production of domestic shale gas alone, more than a million American jobs were created to help meet the demand for the energy source.

Additionally, the need for the manufacturing of new natural gas transmission pipelines across the Nation added several hundred thousand jobs on top of that. This surge in new jobs, coupled with the monetary profits gained from additional natural gas production, has led to a GDP hike of $190 billion. Ultimately, this translates into more disposable income in the pockets of hardworking Americans.

Finally, the use of natural gas, both as a fuel source and a raw material, has resulted in environmental benefits as well, and we should not lose sight of that.

With the International World Gas Conference just 1 week away, I am proud of the continued growth and success of our domestic natural gas industry, which is helping to power this country's economic and manufacturing growth.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), my cohost, to follow up the comments of Dr. BUCSHON as we transition to going overseas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas mentioned it; Chairman WALDEN mentioned it; Mr. BARTON mentioned it. We should be celebrating, and that is what we are doing here tonight. All America should be celebrating the good fortune that we have to be blessed with such an abundance of natural gas.

In my home State of Ohio, and many other areas in the Midwest and Appalachia, the production of natural gas and its valuable liquid byproducts is providing a much-needed boost to our local economies.

Let me give you some figures. From 2011 to the end of May 2018, we had drops in unemployment in the counties that comprise my 18-county district by more than 48 percent. Some of those counties, especially the ones that have the heavy shale plays, have seen drops of unemployment upward of 60 percent. It is unbelievable.

In addition to the direct benefits, the natural gas industry also supports hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs across the country and supplies our industries with a reliable and affordable source of domestic energy.

Next week, as thousands of visitors and dignitaries from around the world arrive here in D.C. to attend the World Gas Conference, we should reflect on

our country's energy dominance—you have heard that term several times—and how that affects our standing on the world stage.

According to the Energy Information Administration, the United States has remained the world's top producer of natural gas ever since 2009, when we surpassed Russia in production levels.

Additionally, last year, we set a record in natural gas production, with gross withdrawals reaching almost 91 billion cubic feet per day.

I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, this is a big deal for America. It is charting the way for a new future of energy dominance and leverage not only in the economic energy markets, but also on the international stage.

So there are a lot of reasons to be optimistic about where America is going on the energy front because of natural gas.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), from the home of William Barret Travis, the commander of the Alamo.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order and for recognizing South Carolina's role in helping the Republic of Texas.

You heard the words from the gentleman from Ohio about the economic impact on his State, and on America, with America's energy independence and the renaissance that we are experiencing.

In a tax reform committee hearing today, Chairman WALDEN talked about the economic benefits of tax reform on the energy sector, but also on America.

We are blessed in this country with natural resources. We have an abundance of natural gas.

What does an abundance of natural gas mean? That means that, last year, for the first time since 1957, we are an exporter of natural gas.

Now what does that mean not only for American producers that are providing the natural gas and the LNG terminals that are being built along the coastal regions in Houston and Louisiana—and, hopefully, one day in South Carolina, we will have an LNG terminal to help us play a part in that—but what does that mean for our allies and friends around the world? Well, just think about it.

Mexico is a huge importer of U.S. LNG. Not only are they importing natural gas through a pipeline from the plays down in Eagle Ford and Barnett in Texas, but they are also importing LNG.

We all know the situation in Venezuela. Venezuela is imploding. So many countries in South America, Latin America, are relying on Venezuelan energy. The Caribbean nations are relying on Venezuelan energy. South American countries are relying on that.

If we can provide, through LNG exports, sustainable, reliable energy sources for the Caribbean nations, that is a game changer for them, the Panama Canal being a distribution hub for U.S. LNG to be distributed all through Latin America.

I was in Spain recently and talked with the Spanish folks. They want to be the LNG importer of American LNG so they can distribute across Western Europe so that Western Europe can be less reliant on Russian gas.

Europe is reliant on Russian gas, and Russia definitely has used the spigot for energy sources as a political tool against Europe. In fact, the Lithuanian President recently said this: ''U.S. gas imports to Lithuania and other European countries is a game changer in the European gas market. This is an opportunity for Europe to end its addiction to Russian gas and ensure a secure, competitive, and diversified supply.''

American LNG exported to our friends and allies around the world is a game changer for the geopolitics of energy. We can provide abundant natural gas that we have produced in this country to folks around the world and lessen their dependence on less reliable sources. American businesses will benefit from that, and our neighbors and friends will benefit from that. That is why it is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order tonight and for allowing me to speak about something I am very passionate about and that is using the abundant resources we have in this country to change lives around the globe.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, since I have known the gentleman, he has been a champion for American energy independence. Drill, baby, drill. Frack, baby, frack.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be here tonight to talk about something that we have talked about quite a bit. I am glad to see the gentleman has, obviously, the LNG terminal and the Lithuanian-flagged Independence. I also brought it down.

I don't have to be as complete in my comments, because I have heard the comments of easing and helping Europeans be independent of imported Russian natural gas.

Lithuania is on the Baltic Sea. I am the chairman of the Baltic Caucus. We have Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. I have spent a lot of time watching them and encouraging them in their actual leadership of Eastern Europe. They set out in 2014 to become independent of Russian gas. So they went through the process of getting the LNG terminal.

I love the name. It is called the Independence so they can be independent and free. They have a history of being extorted by the Russians in the crude oil department. There is a refinery there called Mazeikiu Nafta, which a U.S. company bought and then the Russians turned off the oil.

So those are the extortions and the concerns. Now what they have is the ability to compete in the open market. They had their first LNG gas come from the United States earlier in 2017. They now have an ability to negotiate for the best price, which helps a lot.

First of all, it helps their citizens. It helps, obviously, their businesses. It also helps the allies in surrounding countries. What they have now been able to do is negotiate through the Baltic region of pipelines and storage, and we have had talks, as you know, on smaller export LNG vessels to be able to get to smaller communities.

We are a party of all-of-the-above technology. We believe in having the energy resources compete for lower prices. I am glad the gentleman from Texas came down here and is expounding the virtues of freedom it has provided for the Baltic countries, and I look forward to continuing shipping U.S. liquefied natural gas, which helps our balance of trades and creates jobs in America, to our allies and friends around the globe.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, this was not coordinated. We came together with pictures of the Independence. But my friend knows this better than I do. How many people turn out—those are ordinary people—to watch a tanker come into port? Why are they coming out to watch that tanker? It is because they know that tanker is their freedom from Mr. Putin and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

This is really about creating jobs on American soil, creating opportunities, literally, for our families to be able to have better prospects for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to be able to talk about, not only America, but the world's energy future. In my district of Colorado, we benefit from vast energy resources. In 2016, we learned that one of these resources, natural gas, has even greater potential than initially thought.

□ 1800

The U.S. Geological Survey announced that the Mancos shale formation in Piceance Basin had the potential to be the second largest natural gas deposit in the United States. The abundance of natural gas in western Colorado puts us in the unique position to be able to create jobs here at home and also to supply American allies with reliable sources of energy well into the future.

For too long, our Nation's adversaries have supplied America's allies with energy resources. We cannot let countries like Russia lead in the global energy market when the U.S. has the resources to be able to supply countries in Europe and Asia with affordable and reliable energy.

Last year I called on the administration to examine a project that would allow for the U.S. to send LNG to Asian markets. The proposed Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline would transfer the natural gas from Piceance Basin in western Colorado to the Jordan Cove terminal in Coos Bay, Oregon.

The Jordan Cove terminal is estimated to have the capacity to be able to transport 7.8 million metric tons of LNG annually to the Pacific Northwest and Asia. Unfortunately, under the previous administration, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission denied the application for the Jordan Cove project, citing a lack of global demand. Not long after the application was denied, Jordan Cove procured an agreement for 75 percent of the pipeline's capacity, proving that there is demand for U.S. LNG in Asia.

It is my hope that FERC will soon approve the resubmitted application for the Jordan Cove project and we can bring good-paying jobs to western Colorado and send clean, affordable, and reliable energy to Asia.

As the U.S. works to advance technologies that decrease the environmental footprint of energy production, it cannot be ignored that countries like China and India continue to be some of the world's top polluters. We can responsibly develop U.S. natural gas resources to be able to benefit communities across our Nation and by transporting our energy resources to countries around the globe. The United States can have a measurable impact on the economies and environmental health of communities overseas.

The United States cannot sit back and let other countries lead the world into the energy future. The time for responsible development of natural gas is now and to be able to create jobs here at home.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for his comments. The gentleman is always welcome here. I thank my friend for pointing out the fact that, we think oil and gas in America, we think the coasts: the Gulf Coast, Pacific Coast, Atlantic Coast.

But my friend enlightened us. It is not just the coasts. It is the heart and soul of America, the interior, States like Colorado, Wyoming, North Dakota. All these States have shale plays. All these States are booming now with American energy production.

I would like to close with a couple comments and maybe take a tour of the world as it stands today.

We started exporting our natural gas less than 2 years ago. Right now, 29 countries have received American liquified natural gas. Those countries are Argentina, the Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, China, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Russia, South Korea, Spain, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, UAE, and the UK.

American energy has touched the entire world. They are feeling our dominance in a very healthy and great way. We are giving them their freedom. Liquid American freedom is on the market right now.

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

## ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my Republican friends for pointing out the advantages of natural gas.

I might add that we had, in the last Congress, a hearing about what was the world's largest solar plant. This wasn't a plant that had solar panels. It had thousands of mirrors pointing to three different towers that would superheat the water, which would turn to steam and would drive turbines to produce electricity.

I have one article here. This was from February 2014. It talked about the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, sprawling across roughly 5 square miles of Federal land; that is Mojave Desert area near the California-Nevada border. It had opened, and it was glorified. There was $1.6 billion in Federal loans, $600-some-odd million in grants to help them make their payments. Years later they paid 7 million—well, 2 years ago, they had paid back, I think they said, $7 million of the $2.2 billion.

Anyway, this article was about the world's largest solar plant scorching birds in the Nevada desert. From testimony we heard, apparently this solar plant, as birds would fly through the superheated sunlight, it would cause them to explode in flames, which is why the locals called them flamers.

Originally, they were not expecting to have to spend a lot of money cleaning mirrors with water. They thought it would just be dust. They didn't anticipate all the flaming bird debris—some of them endangered species, I am quite sure.

In a period of February through June, there were 290 of those flamers that exploded in flames and scattered their bird debris. Anyway, that was the solar side of it.

Since they had a contract to provide all this electricity and they had used up their $2.2 billion, what do you do when you don't have $2.2 billion and the ability to burn up endangered species and you don't have that kind of government grant? Well, you take just a little bit of money and you do what they did: you use natural gas—very environmentally friendly.

You can create a natural gas electrical plant very, very cheaply and make up for what the fire, the flaming birds, and all the other things did to slow down this great solar-powered plant. So there is a lot to be said for natural gas.

We did have a hearing yesterday, and one of the things I did not get to point out that I had highlighted but just didn't have enough time to ask the inspector general about, since his conclusion was, even though there were hundreds of pages that clearly reflected not just bias, but angry, hateful animus against Donald Trump, Republicans—but certainly Donald Trump—the IG, it seemed very clear to me, with hundreds of pages documenting the overwhelming bias among those who were supposed to be fair and impartial, figuratively depicting justice being blind, well, it was as if IG Horowitz decided: Well, we have got all this overwhelming bias, so that will make the Republicans happy. But I have got so many Democratic friends, I don't want to get them permanently upset with me, so I will just conclude that there is no evidence that bias affected the investigation at all.

Yet, in his own report, IG Horowitz said, and this is in the executive summary, page 9: ''Most of the text messages raising such questions pertained to the Russia investigation, and the implication in some of these text messages, particularly Strzok's August 8 text message ('we'll stop' Candidate Trump from being elected) was that Strzok might be willing to take official action to impact a Presidential candidate's electoral prospects. Under these circumstances, we did not have confidence that Strzok's decision to prioritize the Russia investigation over following up on the Midyear''—the Hillary Clinton—''related investigative lead discovered on the Weiner laptop was free from bias.''

Boy, is that an understatement. Here it is established beyond any reasonable doubt Strzok not only hated Trump, was trying to impress his mistress, but clearly, things he did showed their bias; and it is IG Horowitz's own words that it was Strzok's decision, heading up this investigation into Hillary Clinton's emails. Here they had tens or hundreds of thousands of emails that were found on the Anthony Weiner laptop, and it was Strzok's decision.

He had the authority to decide, and he did decide: We are not going to really investigate that. We are not going to make that a priority. We are going to push that aside and, instead, go after this so-called Russia investigation involving Trump.

That, even standing alone, is overwhelming evidence of bias that affected the investigation. I know Mr. Horowitz apparently was just trying to keep from making all of his Democratic friends mad, so he threw them this little gift: Clearly, there was all kinds of bias, but I will say in my conclusions that I couldn't find that bias affected

the investigation where clearly it did. He said it in his own words it was Strzok's decision, and he decided not to follow up on that.

In fact, with all of my friends across the aisle who continue to repeat the mantra that Comey's October press conference cost Hillary Clinton the election, despite the evidence that she was not a good candidate, she didn't do what was needed to honestly and openly win an election, when it came to these emails that needed to be investigated, it sounds a whole lot more like what happened was that even Comey calling that October press conference was a cover for Hillary Clinton, because the alternative—kept hearing from sources, I believe, that there were FBI agents who had found all these emails of Hillary Clinton's that were supposed to be gone. They didn't have them. They were destroyed. They were unavailable because she had obstructed justice. She had obstructed justice by destroying evidence.

They thought all these emails were gone, and all of a sudden FBI agents are in possession of these massive number of Clinton emails. And so Comey sat on them.

If Comey had not called that press conference, then it appears what was likely going to happen, you were either going to have FBI agents who learned from Comey how you go about leaking—and we saw the information from IG Horowitz that apparently there were agents at the top who were quite good at leaking information, even getting tickets and different things in return for their leaking, that those agents would have leaked that information.

And when it came out that they knew they had found all these missing Clinton emails and Comey was sitting on it, he was obstructing justice, then that would have doomed the Clinton campaign. She would have lost by a whole lot bigger once it came out that Comey was blocking, obstructing, not allowing them to investigate these newfound—well, they had been found for a month. They were sitting on them.

We found out at the hearing yesterday that, actually, Rosenstein made the decision not to allow Congress to have those for the last month. Who knows how long he may have known about them.

He really does need to be fired. He needs to go. Clearly, he has obstructed Congress' investigation. The question is how much obstruction of justice did Rosenstein do back in 2016. We don't know. But we do know there was obstruction.

Apparently, according to Horowitz, it was Strzok who had the authority to decide are we going to dig into these newly found or month-long found emails from Hillary Clinton or are we just going to set those aside because they might hurt Hillary Clinton's election and, instead, go after this Russia investigation—totally bogus—based on purchases by the Clinton campaign.

□ 1815

And Strzok—his decision—he decided, I am not going to pursue this evidence that actually blows Hillary Clinton's claims out of the water. Instead, we are going to pursue Trump.

That is one overwhelming piece of evidence where the bias affected the investigation. It could have blown the campaign out of the water where it wouldn't have even been close.

But rather than Comey allowing it to leak out, there were also rumors—and, like I say, I had good sources and others had good sources and indications that we might even have one or more FBI agents resign over Comey and Strzok obstructing the Clinton email being investigated. If FBI agents had either resigned and had a press conference and disclosed how Strzok and Comey were obstructing justice and preventing the investigation into Hillary's emails that had been in their possession for a month, that would have devastated the Clinton campaign far worse.

So Comey, not wanting to hurt the Clinton campaign, preferring to hurt Trump, called a press conference. As I said in some interview back in October when I was asked about whether or not this was a serious investigation, I said: Well, if he comes back in 2 or 3 days and says there is nothing there, then we will know for certain that this was simply an effort to protect Hillary Clinton, because, clearly, they could not properly investigate all of those emails in such a short period of 2 or 3 days.

Sure enough, just a couple of days later, Comey comes out of a press conference: Gee, we have investigated this massive number of emails, and Hillary Clinton is clean.

So, rather than destroying her campaign, Comey's action, it appears—more likely, actually—saved her campaign and allowed it to be closer.

So that is just a little bit of information that I didn't get to yesterday.

Now, it is absolutely incredible what has gone on, not on our southern border—that is amazing enough—but all of the mayhem that has been raised by the media. All of the outrage that has been expressed by Democrats is really extraordinary when we look at the facts about what has been going on since 1997—not new laws, not terribly new laws that this administration is working with. Unlike the Obama administration, this administration has not seen fit to just speak new laws into existence.

Like with DACA, President Obama, like any good totalitarian monarch, spoke that he wanted this law. He didn't even sign the new royal edict; he just spoke it into law. Then Jeh Johnson, head of Homeland Security, drafted some memos to create it. Now, it overruled existing law, overruled law that had been passed by bipartisan efforts here in the House and Senate, signed by people like Bill Clinton and others. But, anyway, he spoke it into law.

Here we have an administration that really does want to follow the law. I had been down on the border all hours of the night and day as well. But during the Obama Presidency, I had been down on our border. I had seen children separated from the adults they were with talking to Border Patrol agents.

We have heard from ICE. Of course, what is being thrown figuratively and literally at ICE agents is really outrageous. What is being hurled in the way of both words and actions toward people simply following the law that even Democrats helped create is really outrageous.

There is an article here by Michelle Mark dated June 19 from Business Insider: ''Several former Obama administration officials took to social media and news outlets last month to explain a gallery of years-old photos that showed immigrant children sleeping in shoddy conditions at a government-run holding facility in Arizona.

''The images, which the Associated Press first published in 2014, resurfaced recently for reasons that remain unclear, and quickly prompted viral outrage on Twitter. One particularly disturbing image showed two children sleeping on mattresses on the floor inside what appeared to be a cage.''

That was the Obama administration, the very thing that people are going nuts about, screaming and hollering.

''A number of prominent liberals—and even a former Obama administration official—shared the photos, mistakenly believing they depicted the Trump administration's treatment of immigrant children who were forcibly separated from their parents.''

Obviously, these former Obama officials did not realize that this was what they did to children. And then to be holier-than-thou with an administration that simply is enforcing the law the Obama administration often violated when they were guilty of actually following the law themselves? They could have made better conditions.

I am happy to report that the conditions I see under the Trump administration down on our southern border are much better than they were under the Obama administration. The facilities for children are much, much better. I mean, there were some really terrible situations that the Obama administration created down on our border during President Obama's terms, especially the second term. It was a bit shocking what was happening to children then.

It has been amazing. There was one child holding on to a fence, and that was used to show how terrible it was for this sweet little child. It turns out that was part of an immigration protest. This kid wasn't in any kind of cage. In fact, the other pictures that have now been discovered show that it was apparently some adult figure who was part of the protest and dragged the kid there, but it certainly was not someone caged by the Trump administration.

But this goes on to say: ''Jon Favreau, who worked as a speechwriter for former President Barack Obama, tweeted, 'This is happening right now, and the only debate that matters is how we force our government to get these kids back to their families as fast as humanly possible.'

''Favreau said he later deleted the tweet after social media users pointed out that the photos were taken during the Obama administration. But by that point, critics had already rushed to accuse him of concealing Obama's own harsh immigration tactics while condemning Trump's.

''Favreau said in a series of tweets that he made a 'mistake' by not checking the date of the photos before sharing them on Twitter. He explained that the photos were taken in 2014, when the Obama administration faced 'an influx of unaccompanied minors who showed up at the border, fleeing violence from Central America.' ''

Well, I can tell you, there were many of these people I saw all hours of the night that weren't fleeing violence, but they had heard they had opportunities. I have been there when small children were being passed among—well, the Border Patrol is at one end of the group of people that had come in illegally asking questions, and they are shuffling around trying to decide who is going to claim this child. And then, on some occasions, they say: Oh, no, no, no, not with me, not with them. No, they are by themselves.

Well, I watched you just walk up here taking care of this child.

No, they were unaccompanied.

It is also interesting, with all of the outrage about the 12,000 children that were being so well taken care of, 10,000 of the 12,000 came unaccompanied, was the claim, and 40 percent of those coming are teenage males of gang age. We know, it turns out, many of them are gang members.

We know, just recently, there was an MS–13 member claiming a child. It may have been his child. But that child did not need to be with a MS–13 gang member.

We know, during the Obama administration, during the George W. Bush administration, and during the Clinton administration, it was not uncommon to separate children from a parent if they believed the parent might not be in the best interest of the child, may be a threat to the child.

Again, for heaven's sake, these children, whether accompanied or unaccompanied, were placed by their parents in a position to cross deadly territory, be subjected to sex trafficking themselves, be subjected to becoming drug traffickers. If those things happen in this country, I have seen it as a judge when there were hearings—I didn't do juvenile law, but I saw it. I had seen hearings.

You have parents, if they let their child here in Texas, in America, do the things that parents from other countries allowed their children to go through, there is a good chance, at least in Texas, Child Protective Services would have grabbed that child and said: This is an unfit parent to let them go across a desert, to let them be in the hands of gang members, or to let them be subjected to sex trafficking and drug trafficking.

I have also been there when the Border Patrol has asked—it wasn't on their list—but frequently they would ask: How much do you pay to the gang or the drug cartel to bring you in?

$5,000, $6,000, $7,000, $8,000.

Where did you get that kind of money? You didn't have that kind of money.

Often, the final answer, after, $1,000 or $1,500 here, or $2,000 there, or somebody from America sent this: Well, where did you get the rest? Often the final answer was: They are going to let me work that off when I get to where we are going.

Well, how do you work it off?

It is either drug trafficking or sex trafficking is the way that normally got worked off. Any parent that would subject their children to that—like I say, 10,000 out of 12,000 were unaccompanied who are down there right now when they are trying to figure out what is to be done.

The outrage ought to be with parents that would allow that to happen, and the outrage ought to be with a political party or with any political people that would hang out a shiny object of a great life here—free benefits, welfare—if you will just come across a desert, risk sex trafficking, risk drug trafficking, come on.

Now, the border has to be secure. That is the humane thing to do. If we stop the $80 billion or so in drugs that came across our border, estimated last year by some, then the corruption in Mexico and Central America dries up to next to nothing. Those people would end up with a better economy, a better life, and better jobs. That is what we would do if we were a true caring, loving neighbor. We would make sure that our wall made a good neighbor stop the drug trafficking.

And these poor people who made to be drug mules, made to be drug traffickers, they are poisoning Americans. I mean, it is a matter of national security.

Donald Trump is exactly right to be so concerned and to want a zero-tolerance policy, and so is Jeff Sessions.

□ 1830

We can deal with this issue, but it is a very small percentage that are actual parents that are being separated from children. And there were parents being separated from children in the prior administration, even though the Dallas Morning News obviously either doesn't want to admit it or wants to remain in total blissful ignorance. So these things have happened, and the Trump administration is trying to fix them and do things correctly.

Now, it turns out that when our Homeland Security Secretary Nielsen was at a Mexican restaurant Tuesday night, she had people screaming at her trying to ruin her dinner and accusing her of doing what others in the Obama administration had done. It turns out one of those was an employee at the Department of Justice.

Some would say, but, again, political beliefs shouldn't adversely affect a job with the government.

Well, it should when that job is enforcing the law. When you work for the Department of Justice and you are going to scream at people because they are following the law, then you should not be at the Department of Justice.

This person that was screaming and becoming a nuisance and creating problems and screaming out in ignorance should not be working at the Department of Justice, just as anybody who is biased for Hillary Clinton or against Hillary Clinton should not have been investigating Hillary Clinton. Anybody biased for or against Donald Trump should not have been investigating Donald Trump. It does matter.

I guarantee you Democratic criminal defense attorneys, even though there was some expressed feigned outrage, if they had a client who had run for office that was on trial for a criminal charge, that criminal defense attorney would want to know which jurors supported their client and which were totally opposed to their client in the last election. They would want to know that. Maybe you do that in chambers, maybe you do that at the bench, but I have a feeling—I have heard those claims from defense attorneys about the right to know about things. Sometimes it is very personal information, but if it tells a defense attorney about someone's bias or prejudice within a potential juror, that defense attorney really does have a right to know in order to protect their client and to ensure that justice is done by fair and impartial arbiters.

But we have got people at the Justice Department still that are not fair, they are not impartial.

There is a new record here, according to Paul Bedard's article yesterday from the Washington Examiner, ''New Record, 99 Percent of Seized Border Kids From Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador.''

Obama prosecuted nearly half a million illegal aliens. He did. I think in those situations, they were trying to follow the law.

The only reason I bring that up is the feigned outrage. For some people, it is not feigned; they are really outraged, because they really don't realize what has gone on before. Some of us have seen it.

Now, a 100 percent no-tolerance policy, that is much stricter than the Obama administration. But President Obama and Hillary Clinton are both on video talking about how they were going to do those type of things to discourage people from coming in illegally. And now they really are feigning outrage, and it needs to stop.

Let's work together for a solution.

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

## AMERICAN IMMIGRATION IS AN AMERICAN PROBLEM, NOT AN IMMIGRANT PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Russell) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kevin Portteus, professor at Hillsdale College, made an interesting observation in his excellent study, ''Immigration and the American Founding'':

> America's immigration problem is not with immigrants, but with Americans. In order for the Founders' policies to be intelligible and effective, America must return to the Founders' principles of justice. If America is not based on those principles, then it is like the other nations, and the idea of America as an asylum becomes muddled and incoherent. If we accept feudal obligation and its modern incarnation, birthright citizenship, then the ideas of government by consent and the right to emigrate become obscured. If we forget that consent is reciprocal and that the purpose of government is to protect the inalienable natural rights of its citizens, then the right and duty to restrict immigration and naturalization becomes nothing but an expression of racism and nativism. If we forget our heritage as a refuge for the virtuous and oppressed of the world, then we lose a significant part of what makes America exceptional.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an immigration expert. I do, however, know and love the history of our great Republic. I speak before America, not as a member of any party, but as an American who has nearly given my life on multiple battlefields in defense of her Constitution. As such, I am disturbed at the abandonment of principle by both sides of the aisle, the acceptance of sound bites in lieu of facts, and the framing of popular, even if opposing sentiments that are used to leverage political power.

In our national immigration debate, we suffer much bitter contention, with political power being used to divide America on her foundations in the hopes that one side may force the other into its will. But what of it? What if we had no respect for the law? What if we closed the door to the poor and wretched masses? What if we had no security on our borders? What if we allowed privileged classes to have distinction in immigration? Either side prevailing on such a course would end the great experiment of liberty and equality among mankind as embodied in the very fabric of our Nation.

And with all the critique about the use of Biblical passages to support various views on immigration, how about this one from Proverbs 29:12 that can be leveled against both sides of our national government:

> If a ruler pays attention to lies, all his servants become wicked.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Portteus is correct that America's immigration problem is not with immigrants, but with Americans. We should take his counsel to examine how a people bound by liberty and equality, rather than birthright and obligation, should govern themselves and accommodate those seeking the same.

Our Founders were driven by the premise that all are created equal, endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In that vein, they categorically rejected the notion of obligation to government or servitude to landholders simply by the happenstance of one's birth.

Washington framed it simply, but effectively: ''The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct, they appear to merit the enjoyment.''

Thomas Jefferson conveyed it along these lines:

If an individual chooses to depart from the regime of his birth and to associate with a new one, he has an inherent right to do so.

Jefferson, in his first address to Congress, put it this way: ''Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress . . . hospitality . . . ? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? . . . Might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to every one manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently with us.''

To redress the dilemma of various States creating a patchwork of standards for who should be allowed or not allowed as immigrants, the framers of the Constitution settled the issue by granting Congress the power to ''establish an uniform naturalization rule.''

Enjoying the fruit of such immigration policy, the French-born immigrant J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, in his ''Letters from an American Farmer'' praised the political liberty and economic prosperity of America, saying: ''Europe contains hardly any other distinctions but lords and tenants; this fair country alone is settled by freeholders, the possessors of the soil they cultivate, members of the government they obey, and the framers of their own laws, by means of their representatives . . . It is here that the idle may be employed, the useless become useful, and the poor become rich.''

The first Federal naturalization law passed by this Congress under the Constitution required 2 years' residency in the United States, 1 year's residency in the State he was applying for citizenship, an oath of loyalty, and as an indication of the times, rather than many of the framers' expressed wishes, that the applicant be a free white person. Subsequent statutes increased the length of time to as much as 14 years, but by 1802, Congress settled on the 5-year residency requirement that persists to this day. No other restrictions were imposed. No incentives or encouragements by class were instituted.

Later, Congress abolished the immigration slave trade in 1808 and further eliminated the notion of class structure with the Passenger Act of 1819 to end indentured servitude immigration. It would take another 50 years to secure the rights of all men under the law, but the steady efforts of many were realized without any alteration of the framers' original principles. After the Civil War, the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Amendments simply and rightly applied those principles to all Americans, naturally born, freed, or naturalized.

American anathema to class distinction guided her well in the first century, culminating with the Civil War, as all men truly became equal under the law along the framework of the Founders' principles. Rejected was an obligation to government by birth, but rather, the American ideal was to voluntarily consent to government by choice. This ideal in its purist sense was upheld until the 1898 Supreme Court decision United States v. Wong Kim Ark which somewhat returned the feudalistic citizenship by birthright contrary to the views of many of the Founders. While doing good in securing certain rights for certain individuals, it also set up the construct to eliminate the rights of those not naturally born who wished to associate as law abiding immigrants by choice.

American immigration historically has largely been driven by world events. Prior to the Great Depression and World War II, annual immigration comprised .64 of 1 percent of the United States population, with spikes as high as 1.61 percent. Immigrants expanded the country, cultivated the fields, spiked the railroads, and laid the cities across the Nation. By the time we entered the First World War in 1917, fully one-third of the Nation's population had been born overseas or had a parent who was an immigrant. A full 20 percent of the doughboys we sent to France in World War I were not even born in the United States, fighting to secure our liberty and also a new place in the world in what became an American century.

Immigration dropped sharply due to economics, fear, and war with the Great Depression and World War II, but migrant workers still came by the hundreds of thousands during the war. Laborers from Mexico and Central America entered the agricultural fields and farms as we fed our armies and ourselves.

An inseparable bond between agriculture and the guest worker resulted in demand for farm workers and industrial labor during the war. The United States Government recognized this with the Bracero accord that allowed for these workers to come annually to

meet a crisis during the war and a vibrant economic growth thereafter.

Succumbing to fears about uncapped workers in our fields and farms or on our machines at home, this Congress ended the Bracero accord in 1964. And with the institution of new immigration caps in 1965, an almost immediate spike in illegal immigration rose as seasonal workers, with no guarantee that they would make the next season's quota, stayed instead. The problem became so bad, that Congress again struggled with what to do and by 1986, took a stab at accommodating those that some argued would have likely been citizens at normal immigration rates in exchange for strengthening our southern border. We only got the immigrants when both were sorely needed.

Now we are here today. Only .32 percent of our population are immigrants arriving annually. That is markedly lower than when we were fighting the Civil War. While the agricultural industry and the housing and construction industries are symbiotically entwined, we instead address immigration issues separate from what used to be handled under the Bracero accord.

□ 1845

And while the economic drivers are pulling immigrants to seek a better life in our country, we, in turn, will restrict already small percentages of our population to even smaller ones, despite the fact that our unemployment numbers are lower than our job openings for the first time in American history.

What could we do? Some low-hanging fruit would be to secure our border and to provide some type of permanent residency for minors known as DACA recipients to address the immediate need. A bipartisan majority could readily vote for such a clean measure. Then, once that is done, we can establish a uniform naturalization rule to address further issues.

Yet the solutions offered to us this week, instead, are to demonize family migration, accommodate only those with some station in life or those able to pay a million bucks to get a permanent residency and, thus, end the hopes of those wishing to come here legally with an already reduced system.

We have many claims floating around these august Chambers. Here are some of them:

Immigrants are taking our jobs;

Immigrants are destroying our American way of life with chain migration;

We are flooded by a wave of illegal and legal immigration unlike any time in our Nation's history.

Here's the reality: The percentage of native-born workers to fuel our construction and agricultural economies do not exist. We can either import workers or we can import our food.

In a study published in 2013, economist Michael Clemens did a 15-year analysis of data on North Carolina's farm labor market, concluding there is virtually no supply of native manual farm laborers in the State. This was true even in the depths of a severe recession.

In 2011, with 6,500 available farm jobs in the State, only 268 of nearly half a million unemployed North Carolinians applied for those jobs. More than 90 percent of them—a whopping 245 people—of those applying, were hired, but just 163 even showed up for the first day's work. Only seven native workers completed the entire growing season, filling only one-tenth of 1 percent of the open farm jobs.

This is not an abnormality. Since World War II, migrant workers have fueled America as the breadbasket of the globe. That may change. As I stated, we can either import workers or we can import food.

The problem with the workforce may be even deeper than we know. In 2017, according to the Centers for Disease Control, there were about 60 births per 1,000 women ages 15 to 44, which is 3 percent lower than the rate in 2016 and the lowest recorded rate of birth since the government started tracking birth rates in 1909.

Our actual birth rate is now 1.84. A nation must have at least a 2.1 birth rate to sustain itself. Plus, we abort about 1.2 to 1.5 million children a year. We immigrate approximately 1 million people a year, and many of those have children. If one were to subtract the 39 million immigrants in our population since Roe v. Wade, our actual birth rate would even be lower. As in the past, immigrants are sustaining our national growth in spite of ourselves, and just barely.

The issue of family immigration, now demonized as chain migration, was originally conceived as a way to ensure immigrants arriving had a support base structure, negating or reducing the need for government assistance. It has largely achieved that aim. Now, if current proposals become law, instead of acquiring a more stable and skilled workforce, the opposite is likely to occur, as it did before family migration was instituted.

And what of this dastardly diversity lottery? Is it the ''diversity'' name that offends us?

The reality is the diversity lottery visas ensure immigrants come from a wide spectrum of nations rather than just those south of the border.

Further, a study published just a couple of months ago showed that diversity lottery recipients and family migrants, far from being unskilled and ignorant, are actually better educated than naturally born citizens. The study showed that 47 percent had a college degree or higher, as compared to 29 percent of the naturally born American population.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we could use more of this type of ignorance and lack of skill.

Americans of all generations have had concerns about immigrants: Irish, Dutch, German, Chinese, Eastern European, Mexican, Vietnamese, Persian, Lebanese, Syrian. We fret over language, even though studies show second-generation Americans are fully engaged lingually, and third-generation Americans speak virtually nothing of their old tongue.

In our current national debate, immigrants south of the border carry such worrisome traits as strong in their faith, close-knit families, hardworking, and small business entrepreneurs. As a conservative, it sounds a lot like the things that I stand for. As an American, it sounds a lot like the America I fought for.

Immigrants of all stripes have defended this country with their lives. Forty percent of the soldiers I lost in Iraq were immigrants or had immigrating parents. One was not even a citizen but earned his citizenship posthumously.

While our Nation has ever been sustained by immigrants defending their newfound freedom along with ours, we must reject a dangerous proposal creeping into the immigration measures on this floor, namely, that nonpermanent residents can earn a residency by military service.

Now, we have long accommodated permanent residents to earn their citizenship, but to place people with no status or allegiance into uniform makes us no better than a foreign legion or, worse, a Roman legion.

The Statue of Liberty does not wear a blindfold. That is reserved for Lady Justice. Ms. Justice must continue to hold her scales in balance, with the laws of Americans on one hand balanced by those seeking citizenship to also, themselves, be law-abiding in pursuit of a new citizenship.

Americans are not flooded by immigrants. We are well below the norm, historically. We are, however, starved by restrictive, unaccommodating policy that meets neither the lamp lit by our Founders nor the economic engines needing hands to turn them.

Lady Liberty must continue to raise her arm and keep her torch burning brightly rather than exchange it for a stiff arm and a middle finger. The words inscribed at her base must not say ''Send me only your physicians, your scientists, and your Nobel laureates.''

If we use our passions, anger, and fear to snuff out liberty's flame by xenophobic and knee-jerk policies, the enemies of liberty win, and what makes America exceptional dies, period.

We have so lost our way on immigration that we even have those across our land rejecting those fleeing tyranny. I want you to listen carefully to these statements by Members of Congress in response to a refugee bill—not illegals, not permanent residents, but refugees, people fleeing for their lives. Listen to these statements by Members of Congress:

Fighting immigration is ''the best vote-getting argument . . . The politician can beat his breast and proclaim his loyalty to America.''

''He can tell the unemployed man he is out of work because some alien has his job.''

Here's another one. Congress must ''protect the youth of America from this foreign invasion.''

And how about this one? ''American children have first claim to America's charity.''

There are many more, but these quotes were from 1939. The refugee bill was not for Muslim and Christian Syrians or Iraqi Muslims, Christians, and Yazidis. It was for German and Eastern European Jews. Namely, it was for 20,000 children whom they were trying to receive into the country.

Not only could we not allow 20,000 Jewish children to enter our country in 1939, that same Congress, with the same speech and rhetoric I am hearing in recent days in this august Chamber, passed hurdle after hurdle to make it more difficult for those refugees and immigrants to enter our country.

See the gap during that time? They were, unfortunately, successful.

Mr. Speaker, America protects her liberty and defends her shores not by punishing those who would be free. She does it by guarding liberty with her life. Americans need to sacrifice and wake up. We must not become enemies of the very liberty in the fabric of our Republic. The enemies of liberty win if we give up who we are and, even more so, without a fight.

We guard our way of life by vigilance. We must be watchful. We have to have each other's back as Americans, not as Republicans and Democrats. By maintaining who we are amidst the threat, amidst the hatred, amidst the trials, we win.

Patrick Henry did not say: ''Give me safety and economy or give me death.'' He said: ''Give me liberty.''

We have defended our way of life for roughly 240 years. Now we as Americans must defend it again. We must defend it when the critic sitting on the couch eating his bag of cheese puffs is pecking out hatred and vitriol. We must defend it and have courage when voters are caught up with sincere passion, demanding security that might kill our liberty based on facts that are not true. We must defend it with our warriors who have worked hard to keep the fight for freedom off of our shores.

We will always have threats to security and economy, but liberty, when lost, takes generations, if ever, to regain.

Will and Ariel Durant, those epic recorders of human history, wrote this warning: ''Civilization is not inherited; it has to be learned and earned by each generation anew; if the transmission should be interrupted . . . civilization would die, and we should be savages again.''

I am asking all Americans to please pray for this Congress and specifically for our President. How much time have we really spent on our knees at home for our leaders, regardless of what we think of them? How much counsel have we sought from the Almighty?

It is God who has given us the spark of freedom. It is God we must return to. He will take us and guide us in times of crisis if only we ask Him and humble ourselves and seek His face as a nation.

The Apostle James instructs us:

> If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask of God, who gives to all liberally and without reproach, and it will be given to him.

Mr. Speaker, maybe our lack of doing that is how we got here in the first place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2230

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4760, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–770) on the resolution (H. Res. 952) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6136, BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–771) on the resolution (H. Res. 953) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4760, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–772) on the resolution (H. Res. 954) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 21, 2018, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5231. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the Department's Inventory of Contracted Services FY 2017 final report is expected to be submitted to Congress by the end of September 2018, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a(c)(1); Public Law 107-107, Sec. 801(c)(1) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, Sec. 812); (130 Stat. 2269); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5232. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report to Congress on Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials for Fiscal Year 2019, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2228(e)(1); Public Law 107-314, Sec. 1067(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, Sec 954(a)(1)); (130 Stat. 2376); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5233. A letter from the Chairman, Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council's 2017 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3332(a)(5); Public Law 101-73, Sec. 1103 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1473(b)); (124 Stat. 2190); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5234. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Cross References to Previously Removed Appendices and Subpart [Docket No.: FR-6102-F-01] (RIN: 2501-AD88) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5235. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision to the Manual of Regulations and Procedures for Federal Radio Frequency Management [Docket No.: 180131107-8107-01] (RIN: 0660-AA35) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5236. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Unexploded Ordnance Detonation, Gulf of Mexico, Pensacola, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0531] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5237. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received June 18, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5238. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Coordination of Protection Systems for Performance During Faults and Specific Training for Personnel Reliability Standards [Docket No.: RM16-22-000; Order No.: 847] received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5239. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5240. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-105, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5241. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-055, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5242. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to the Congress from the Office of Inspector General, covering the prior 6-month period ending March 31, 2018, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-452); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5243. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's FY 2017 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5244. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5245. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's FY 2016 Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program Report to Congress, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7201 and 5 C.F.R. Part 720 Subpart B; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5246. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Tred Avon River, between Bellevue, MD and Oxford, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0088] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5247. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Columbia River, The Dalles, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0536] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5248. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lewis River, Ridgefield, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0535] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5249. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Corpus Christi Bay, Corpus Christi, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0458] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5250. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River, mile marker 27.8 to mile marker 28.2, Vanport, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0308] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5251. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Blazing Paddles 2018 SUP Race; Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0242] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5252. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Appomattox River, Hopewell, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2018-0330] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5253. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lake Pontchartrain, Mandeville, LA [Docket Number USCG-2018-0529] (RIN: 1625-0529) received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5254. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Guidance to grantors and contributors of tax-exempt organizations on deductibility and reliance issues [Rev. Proc. 2018-32] received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5255. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only — Credit for Indian Coal Production and Inflation Adjustment Factor for Calendar Year 2017 [Notice 2018-36] received June 19, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5256. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2016 annual Report to Congress on Defense Environmental Programs, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2711(a); Public Law 112-81, Sec. 317(a); (125 Stat. 1359); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

5257. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 27th Actuarial Valuation of the railroad retirement system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f-1; Public Law 98-76, Sec. 502 (as amended by Public Law 104-66, Sec. 2221(a)); (109 Stat. 733) and 45 U.S.C. 231u(a)(1); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 22(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-90, Sec. 108(a)); (115 Stat. 890); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

5258. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 2018 annual report on the financial status of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance System, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; Public Law 100-647, Sec. 7105; (102 Stat. 3772); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5925. A bill to codify provisions relating to the Office of National Drug Control, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–767, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3392. A bill to provide for stability of title to certain land in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. GRANGER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 6157. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 952. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–770). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 953. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–771). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 954. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–772). Referred to the House Calendar.

### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEES

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Appropriations discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5925 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 6156. A bill to prohibit States from suspending, revoking, or denying State-issued professional licenses or issuing penalties due to student default; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 6158. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to exclude affiliates and subsidiaries of insured depository institutions in the definition of deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6159. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study about the impact of electronic logging devices and report the findings to Congress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6160. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the sources of the authority to issue regulations regarding certifications and other criteria applicable to legislative branch employees under Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 6161. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to waive fees for Purple Heart recipients serving on active duty for loans guaranteed under the home loan program of Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 6162. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to exempt certain small entities dealing in foreign exchange that serve small- and medium-sized businesses from certain capital and margin requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 6163. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to reform the Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund and to prohibit the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection from serving as the administrator of redress payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6164. A bill to prohibit the National Endowment for the Arts to make grants for housing; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 6165. A bill to improve the treatment of opioids under the pharmacy benefits program of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H.R. 6166. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to develop a solar workforce training course for certain members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BOST, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 6167. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5707 South Cass Avenue in Westmont, Illinois, as the ''James William Robinson Jr. Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 6168. A bill to assist aviation-impacted communities in mitigating the noise burden that they face and to increase Federal Aviation Administration engagement and responsiveness to communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 6169. A bill to establish a pilot program for long-term rental assistance for families affected by major disasters in 2017; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 6170. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a demonstration program to adapt the successful practices of providing foreign aid to underdeveloped economies to the provision of Federal economic development assistance to Native communities in similarly situated remote areas in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should resume normal diplomatic relations with Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H. Res. 951. A resolution expressing concern with respect to the Government of Turkey's anticipated purchase of Russian S-400 surface-to-air missile batteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Res. 955. A resolution affirming United States support to the nations of Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova in their effort to retain political sovereignty and territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. CICILLINE introduced a bill (H.R. 6171) to authorize the Coast Guard to issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel Oliver Hazard Perry, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 6156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, To make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 6157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 6160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 6161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 6162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 6163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NORMAN:
H.R. 6164.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 7
By Mr. O'HALLERAN:
H.R. 6165.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. ROSEN:
H.R. 6166.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clauses 1, 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. ROSKAM:
H.R. 6167.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 {Page H2755}
By Mr. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 6168.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 Clause 3—''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes.''
Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18—''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. SOTO:
H.R. 6169.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 6170.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
Ms. CICILLINE:
H.R. 6171.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 154: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 184: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 448: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 519: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 754: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 786: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 809: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 852: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 858: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 936: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 959: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1150: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1171: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1204: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1225: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1450: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1566: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1587: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1651: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1661: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1676: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1953: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2043: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2101: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROYCE of California, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2309: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 2358: Mr. KILMER and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2366: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2418: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2572: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2584: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2598: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2651: Ms. TITUS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2902: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2917: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2918: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 2944: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3124: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3148: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3207: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 3222: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3459: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3626: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 3645: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3713: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3742: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3875: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3945: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4099: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 4328: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.
H.R. 4382: Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 4734: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4843: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 4846: Mr. COOK and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4886: Mr. HURD.
H.R. 4915: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 5031: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 5060: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5105: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 5147: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5191: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 5222: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 5232: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5241: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 5248: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 5324: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 5358: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 5385: Mr. COSTA and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 5410: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5414: Mr. FOSTER and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 5564: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 5638: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5658: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5671: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 5693: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 5697: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5732: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 5747: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5765: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 5771: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5794: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5814: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 5900: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 5950: Mr. POLIS, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 5988: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 6016: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 6031: Mr. TROTT and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6048: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 6073: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 6079: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 6081: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 6084: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 6103: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 6111: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 6134: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BUDD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 6135: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 6136: Mr. MESSER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KATKO, Mr. BACON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 6142: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 673: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 697: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H. Res. 750: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 870: Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 915: Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 927: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 930: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

## CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 4760 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4760 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 4760 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. FOXX

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H .R. 4760, Securing America's Future Act of 2018, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.R. 4760 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 4760 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions of H.R. 4760 (Securing America's Future Act of 2018) within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

The provisions of H.R. 4760, the Securing America's Future Act, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House Rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Armed Services in H.R. 4760 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 6136 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 6136 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 6136 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. GOWDY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in H.R. 6136 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 6136 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions of H.R. 6136 (Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018) within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

The provisions of H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House Rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Armed Services in H.R. 6136 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 6136 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. WOMACK

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2018 No. 103

# Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

## PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who has created humanity in Your image, look upon us and hear our prayers. Today, give our lawmakers the desire to do Your will and the energy to complete the tasks that will glorify Your Name. That which they don't know, reveal it. That which they lack, supply it. And that which they doubt, verify it. Keep them blameless in Your service, so that their lives will be living letters that will cause people to exalt Your Name. Strengthen their minds for Your service, so that Your wisdom will permeate their every endeavor. Remind them to not forget the lost, the lonely, the least, the last, and the left out.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

## APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, DC, June 20, 2018.*

*To the Senate:*

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. PAUL 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.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

## ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5895, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby amendment No. 2910, in the nature of a substitute.

Alexander amendment No. 2911 (to amendment No. 2910), to make a technical correction.

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 2943 (to amendment No. 2910), to increase funds for a nuclear demonstration program.

McConnell (for Baldwin/Portman) amendment No. 2985 (to amendment No. 2910), to set aside funds for cooperative agreements and laboratory support to accelerate the domestic production of Molybdenum-99.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as I discussed on the floor yesterday, returning to regular order in the appropriations process is at the forefront of the Senate's agenda.

Thanks to the bipartisan work of the Appropriations Committee, led by Chairman SHELBY, Ranking Member LEAHY, and the subcommittee chairmen, it is actually becoming a reality. Their efforts have already produced thoughtful legislation for the full Senate to consider, beginning this week with the combined measures for the Legislative Branch, for Energy and Water, and for Military Construction and the Veterans Administration. It is those last components I would like to discuss this morning.

This year, 2018, has already brought significant legislative progress for America's men and women in uniform. Earlier this year, Congress and the President did away with arbitrary funding limits that had eroded our forces' comparative advantage. We delivered the largest year-on-year increase in funding for our troops in 15 years. Now, with the Military Construction-VA funding bill before us this week, the Senate can keep the ball rolling.

The committee's package would deliver mission-critical maintenance and improvements that are needed on installations both at home and abroad. It would support Active-Duty personnel, as well as National Guard and Reserve units. It would allocate significant resources for projects that reinforce key alliances and extend our influence around the world.

In my home State of Kentucky, it would mean major improvements to training facilities at both Fort Knox—home of the Army Cadet, Human Resources, and Recruiting Commands—and at Fort Campbell, where the 101st Airborne Division and Special Operations forces prepare for evolving missions.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

But while underpinning the ongoing missions of our Active Forces, the legislation before us would also take critical steps to meet the individual needs of America's warfighters and their families here at home. It would allocate over $1.5 billion to operate and maintain military family housing facilities. It would provide for vital safety updates at overseas American military schools, part of a system that serves more than 66,000 children. Hundreds of millions in additional funding would go to build and improve the network of military medical facilities, which provide care to nearly 10 million servicemembers and military families.

Finally, within the Military Construction legislation is important funding to support our veterans. In addition to funding the maintenance and upkeep of VA health facilities, it goes further in allocating targeted resources to address the system's shortcomings.

Especially when we talk about access to prompt, quality care, the status quo is simply not good enough for America's veterans. For the more than 300,000 Kentucky veterans and for the millions of veterans nationwide, we can and we must do better. That is why this bill includes billions of dollars to improve claims processing and to cut down on backlogs. There is funding for treatment, mental health services, and preventing opioid misuse.

There are plenty of good reasons to support this appropriations package, but one of the most compelling is the support it will deliver to our all-volunteer military and those who have served our country in uniform. So let's keep this legislation moving this week.

RESCISSIONS BILL

On another matter, Mr. President, speaking of government spending, we will soon have an opportunity to save some of the money taxpayers entrust to us. Thanks to the hard work of Members, including Senator LEE and Chairman ENZI, we will soon turn to a House-passed bill that acts on the President's request to rescind nearly $15 billion in previously appropriated money that has gone unspent. This modest belt-tightening would in no way infringe on the bipartisan spending deal that Senators on both sides agreed to earlier this year. This savings package is 100 percent unrelated to that agreement.

Let me say that again. This savings package is 100 percent unrelated to the bipartisan agreement we reached earlier this year. It is totally separate. It simply pulls back a small amount of unspent funds from a variety of government accounts. If we, the people's elected representatives, want to speak seriously about stewarding taxpayer money, surely we can vote to recapture these unspent funds that are not even currently in use.

The President's modest rescissions request is entirely reasonable. It should be without controversy. I look forward to voting for it myself, and I urge my fellow Members to do the same.

TAX REFORM

Now, on one final matter, Mr. President, today marks 6 months since the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act passed Congress. On Friday, it will be 6 months since the President signed it into law. What a 6 months it has been.

Already, Americans have seen their paychecks grow as the IRS withholds less of what they earned. Already, families are reaping the fruits of a new business tax code that gives American employers more ability to increase pay and create jobs. Six months in, these tax cuts have already led employers to issue tax reform bonuses, raises, and new benefits to 4 million workers and counting. That is welcome relief for middle-class families. But what about the long term?

Republicans know that enduring prosperity needs thriving businesses competing to hire American workers. So we designed tax reform to flip the Obama-era script and make America a more attractive place to invest, expand, and create jobs.

For large companies, capital investment might mean breaking ground on new locations or purchasing state-of-the-art technology. If you are a midsized employer, it might mean filling your factory floor with new equipment. If you are a Main Street family business, it could mean expanding into the vacant storefront next door or buying new tools that will transform your day-to-day operations.

In every case, you are placing a bet on your community and on your country. You are betting on American land, American equipment, and, most importantly, the future of the American workforce. You are putting down roots here instead of shipping jobs overseas. This is precisely what we have seen in the past 6 months.

Earlier this year, Apple announced plans to make $30 billion in capital investments over the next 5 years—new facilities, new data centers, and more than 20,000 new jobs.

Chipotle Mexican Grill announced a $50 million investment in upgrading and refurbishing their restaurants.

Carpenter Technology is using tax reform to speed up a new $100 million facility in Redding, PA. Their new state-of-the-art mill will allow them to compete in precision electronics manufacturing. New equipment can't be easily outsourced; neither can the jobs it will create. Sure enough, Carpenter is partnering with a local community college to train a 21st century workforce.

Remember, these businesses aren't just creating new opportunities themselves. These projects also mean prosperity for American contractors and construction crews, and it is not just the big guys.

In West Palm Beach, FL, tax reform means new kitchen appliances for the Don Ramon Restaurant. In my home State of Kentucky, at Glier's Meats, tax reform meant a new quarter-million-dollar machine to speed up production of their famous sausages. For a small business with fewer than 30 employees, that is a noteworthy opportunity. Everywhere you turn, businesses large and small are going all in on the future of the United States.

There is one more interesting thing the last 6 months have revealed: just how impossible it is for our Democratic colleagues to set aside their outdated, tax-and-spend ideology. Every Democrat in the House and in the Senate voted on party lines to block tax reform. They insisted the law wouldn't help American workers one bit. They said that it would be a disaster. Of course, the facts have debunked those predictions. But are our Democratic friends admitting they were wrong? No. They are doubling down on this silliness.

By now, we are all familiar with the House Democratic leader's comments from January. She laughed at the four-figure bonuses that working families were celebrating and called them ''crumbs.'' Earlier this month, she doubled down:

> Hip, hip hooray, unemployment is down. But what does that mean for me?

Well, my Democratic friends seem hopeful they can convince Americans that tax cuts, bonuses, and a stellar job market are nothing to celebrate. Talk about a tall order.

But while those rhetorical gymnastics keep them busy, Republicans will keep up the fight for middle-class families.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in whatever order you choose, Senators CRAPO, BALDWIN, and WHITEHOUSE each be given a minute, then I be allowed to speak in leader time, and the vote come immediately after that.

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

The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 2943, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in a few minutes we are going to vote on the Crapo-Whitehouse amendment. I stand to support that amendment and encourage my colleagues all to vote in favor of it.

I first want to thank my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE. He and I have worked together on a number of issues, building bipartisan support to advance our ability to utilize nuclear energy in the United States.

I also thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senator FEINSTEIN for their work to complete this Omnibus appropriations bill and to continue to push to bring our appropriations process to regular order.

Our amendment focuses on the development of fuel sources for our advanced nuclear reactors. The United States currently lacks both the supply of high assay low-enriched uranium, called HALEU, and a process to make HALEU for advanced reactor designs.

Advanced reactor startup cores require a high assay low-enriched uranium containing less than 20 percent fissile content. At the end of naval fuel's life, it contains highly enriched uranium with an average enrichment of 80 percent. Current operating naval reactors have the potential to create a total of 100,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel, and the Department of Energy estimates disposal of this spent nuclear fuel will cost about $100 billion.

However, advanced nuclear reactors have the potential to reuse this spent nuclear fuel and to reduce the overall disposal cost. HEU repurposing, from materials like spent naval fuel, can be done using hybrid processes that use advanced dry head-end technologies followed by material recovery, which creates the fuel for our new advanced reactors. Repurposing this spent fuel has the potential of reducing waste that would otherwise be disposed of at taxpayer expense, and approximately 1 metric ton of HEU can create 4 useable tons for our new reactors.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, first, let me say what a pleasure it has been to work with Senator CRAPO on these issues.

Our situation is pretty simple. We have a U.S. Navy that generates spent nuclear fuel through its operations; we have a U.S. industry of next-generation nuclear technology that needs that spent fuel in order to test those innovative technologies; and we have extraordinary National Labs with world-class expertise in handling that nuclear material and supporting that innovation.

This amendment brings those three together. It allows the U.S. Navy's spent fuel to be delivered to National Labs so that pursuant to a law we just passed in the Senate recently, the cooperation between the National Labs and the nuclear innovation community can move forward. We have already passed that bill. I hope we will pass this bill.

I will close by saying there is something else in this that I think is worth our consideration. We have an enormous national liability with respect to our existing stockpiles of nuclear waste. Presently, we have no realistic plan for dealing with that. There is a prospect—it is definitely a maybe; I don't want to overpromise anything—there is definitely a prospect and it is the intention of some of these next-generation technologies that we will be able to develop nuclear technologies that will go through our nuclear waste stockpile and turn that into productive electricity generation. If we can get there, that would be a terrific Holy Grail. In the meantime, this is a smart and efficient way to support American innovation in these technologies.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes. I, again, appreciate Senator CRAPO's leadership on this and the extraordinary National Lab that he has in his home State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 2985

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my bipartisan amendment regarding an essential medical isotope. This amendment that I have introduced, along with Senator PORTMAN, would achieve three simple goals: It would safeguard and improve patient access to critical health screenings, it would promote medical innovations needed for cutting-edge diagnostics and new treatments, and it would move us away from our dependence on foreign sources of medical isotopes, while supporting America's medical innovation industry.

Let me explain quickly why my amendment is needed. The United States does not currently produce the medical isotope our healthcare system uses the most. This isotope is used in medical screenings and helps 50,000 patients per day in the United States by providing early detection and enabling treatment of cancer and heart disease.

U.S. patients are currently relying on supplies of this key isotope that come from Canada, the Netherlands, and South Africa. This raises costs and risks supply disruptions. Mind you, this isotope only lasts for 3 days.

For security in the healthcare system and certainty in patient access to essential medical tests, which are often needed in urgent situations, we must develop a domestic supply of these isotopes. The Department of Energy has been working diligently with the private sector to develop sources that are made in America, and this amendment would dedicate $20 million to ensure that work continues so we can secure domestic production as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this important and bipartisan amendment.

I yield back.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am on leader time.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. President, as the purposeful, cynical, and shameful humanitarian crisis of family separation at the border continues to unfold, the vast majority of Americans are looking to President Trump's administration, which started this practice, to end it.

The Associated Press recently reported that the Trump administration has been sending babies and young children to what they call tender age facilities. It is unconscionable—unconscionable—that the Government of the United States is warehousing babies and toddlers alone in an institutional setting.

The crisis was willfully and purposefully created by this President through his zero tolerance policy at the border. It can and should be ended by the same mechanism. With the simple flick of a pen, the President can end this policy. If the President wants to borrow my pen, he can have it. He can do it quickly and easily if he wants to. It is on his back.

The administration must end this gratuitously cruel and counterproductive policy that has brought such pain to innocent children and so much shame on this Nation. No law requires the separation of children from their families, no law says you must send babies to detention facilities, and no law is required to end it.

Nineteen Republicans in the Senate have already called on the Trump administration to reverse or suspend this policy administratively, without any congressional action. If our Republican colleagues and the Republican leadership in particular want to solve this problem, they ought to be directing their attention to the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue, to the White House, because that is where it can get done, done well, and get done quickly. This is at the administration's doorstep to stop or sustain. This is President Trump's responsibility. He could fix it this morning if he actually wanted to fix it. Instead, he points fingers of blame, he prevaricates, and he makes things up because he doesn't even want to own this policy. He knows how unpopular it is with the American people, but at the same time, he sort of wants to tell his base: I am with you. I am with you.

It is awful.

There is this idea that Congress could step in and pass legislation to deal with family separation. That is highly, highly dubious and unlikely. When has this Congress ever successfully passed immigration legislation in the last few years? Never. It is an illusion. Color us dubious that Congress—the House and Senate, with Republican majorities and strong rightwing elements who hate any change in immigration—could successfully pass legislation. Here are the problems:

First, would Speaker RYAN agree to pass and put on the floor a narrow bill that just deals with this issue? Has he ever done that before? Never. Never. Even if the Senate passed something, in the House, it would be dragged into a morass.

Second, would the President sign something that—it was reported in the newspaper that Sarah Huckabee Sanders said he would not sign the bill that Senator CRUZ is talking about. So what is the point? We want to solve this problem.

Third, will both Republican leaders, House and Senate, guarantee that a narrow bill will not have poison pill riders that are unacceptable to large percentages of this body added to any legislation?

Let's get those guarantees—no poison pill riders, Senate leadership and House leadership agree, and Speaker

RYAN has the votes to pass something before we move on a legislative path, when there is such an easy alternative path available, which is the President taking his pen and undoing what he has done.

The bottom line, my colleagues, is that there is only one real solution, as much as we would dream for another; that is, for the President to solve this problem. The odds of any legislation being able to pass—without poison pill riders—the House and Senate and be signed by the President is just about zero, while the percentage that the President could solve this problem if he wants to is just about 100 percent.

I have to say one other thing. TED CRUZ—a leading anti-immigration advocate—must be feeling the heat. He has never been for modifying our immigration laws in any way that helps immigrants. Read some of his past statements.

I ask the question, Is something cynical going on with some people? They want to get this off their backs because they feel the heat, but they really don't want to solve the problem, because if they did, Senator CRUZ and the others would do what 19 Republicans have correctly done: Ask the President to solve the problem himself.

TRADE

Mr. President, on a different subject entirely, our trade relationship with China. For too long, China has taken advantage of America's unwillingness to strongly confront its rapacious trade policies. For too long, China has dumped artificially cheap products into our markets, stolen the intellectual property of blue-chip American companies, and denied our most profitable companies access to its markets.

I am heartened that President Trump, after making a debacle of a deal on ZTE, has taken a tougher approach to China in recent days. His instincts to be tough on China are right on the money.

President Trump needs to stay strong. If he backs off at the first sign of trouble, after the first company calls to complain, after President Xi calls to complain, then China will know we are weak and unserious.

China is waiting to see if it can ride this out. We need to show China that America means business because the stakes are too high.

Business relocations to China have costs too many American jobs. The theft of our intellectual property has been called ''the greatest transfer of wealth in history'' by a four-star general and commander of U.S. Cyber Command. The lifeblood of the American economy is on the line. I urge President Trump to stay strong on China.

Don't mistake my support on this issue for what the President is doing with our allies. The tariffs leveled against Canada and our European allies are misguided and counterproductive. China is the real threat. And China should be the President's focus.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. President, 6 months ago today, the Republican majority jammed through a partisan tax bill that lavished tax cuts on big corporations and the wealthiest few. It is an appropriate time to look back on how the tax bill is fairing.

While the Republican leader, on a daily basis, celebrates vague statistics about business confidence, here are some cold, hard facts.

Since the beginning of 2018, corporations have announced plans to repurchase more than $475 billion in stock buybacks—a record pace. Meanwhile, the Bureau of Labor statistics report that real average hourly earnings have dropped by 0.1 percent.

According to a recent analysis by Just Capital, only 6 percent of the capital allocated by companies from the tax bill's savings has gone to employees, while nearly 60 percent has gone to shareholders.

Remember, President Trump promised that the Republican tax bill would give a $4,000 raise for the average American family. In reality, American families are not seeing close to that figure. A recent Washington Post headline sums it up best: ''The Republican tax bill's promises of higher wages and more jobs haven't materialized.''

The truth is, the tax law has failed to deliver for American workers and American families. Corporations are reaping record profits as a result of the tax bill and are refusing to pass much of those savings onto their workers. And whatever benefits American families are getting from the tax bill—if they are getting benefits at all—are starting to get wiped out by skyrocketing health care costs, the result of Republican sabotage.

All in all, that is why that today, 6 months since it passed, the Republicans' signature legislative accomplishment remains deeply unpopular.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2943, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to Crapo amendment No. 2943, as modified.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—87

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Gardner | Murray |
| Baldwin | Graham | Nelson |
| Barrasso | Grassley | Paul |
| Bennet | Hassan | Perdue |
| Blumenthal | Hatch | Peters |
| Blunt | Heinrich | Portman |
| Booker | Heitkamp | Reed |
| Boozman | Heller | Risch |
| Brown | Hirono | Roberts |
| Burr | Hoeven | Rounds |
| Cantwell | Hyde-Smith | Rubio |
| Capito | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Carper | Isakson | Schatz |
| Casey | Johnson | Schumer |
| Cassidy | Jones | Scott |
| Collins | Kaine | Shelby |
| Coons | Kennedy | Smith |
| Corker | King | Stabenow |
| Cornyn | Klobuchar | Sullivan |
| Cortez Masto | Lankford | Tester |
| Cotton | Leahy | Thune |
| Crapo | Lee | Tillis |
| Cruz | Manchin | Toomey |
| Daines | McCaskill | Udall |
| Donnelly | McConnell | Van Hollen |
| Durbin | Menendez | Warner |
| Enzi | Moran | Whitehouse |
| Ernst | Murkowski | Wicker |
| Fischer | Murphy | Young |

NAYS—9

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Feinstein | Harris | Sanders |
| Flake | Markey | Warren |
| Gillibrand | Merkley | Wyden |

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|---|---|
| Cardin | McCain |
| Duckworth | Shaheen |

The amendment (No. 2943), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2985

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on the Baldwin amendment No. 2985.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds on the Baldwin-Portman amendment.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, Senator BALDWIN spoke a moment ago about this amendment we are about to vote on.

It is $20 million to the National Nuclear Security Administration's domestic isotope program. This is something this body voted for back in 2012. CBO says it has no budget authority impact. It is really important because we are getting this all from overseas. We have no domestic source. We want to get away from using highly enriched uranium for national security reasons.

I encourage you to all vote for this.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH)

and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 133 Leg.]

YEAS—95

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Gillibrand | Murray |
| Baldwin | Graham | Nelson |
| Barrasso | Grassley | Perdue |
| Bennet | Harris | Peters |
| Blumenthal | Hassan | Portman |
| Blunt | Hatch | Reed |
| Booker | Heinrich | Risch |
| Boozman | Heitkamp | Roberts |
| Brown | Heller | Rounds |
| Burr | Hirono | Rubio |
| Cantwell | Hoeven | Sanders |
| Capito | Hyde-Smith | Sasse |
| Cardin | Inhofe | Schatz |
| Carper | Isakson | Schumer |
| Casey | Johnson | Scott |
| Cassidy | Jones | Shelby |
| Collins | Kaine | Smith |
| Coons | Kennedy | Stabenow |
| Corker | King | Sullivan |
| Cornyn | Klobuchar | Tester |
| Cortez Masto | Lankford | Thune |
| Cotton | Leahy | Tillis |
| Crapo | Lee | Toomey |
| Cruz | Manchin | Udall |
| Daines | Markey | Van Hollen |
| Donnelly | McCaskill | Warner |
| Durbin | McConnell | Warren |
| Enzi | Menendez | Whitehouse |
| Ernst | Merkley | Wicker |
| Feinstein | Moran | Wyden |
| Fischer | Murkowski | Young |
| Gardner | Murphy | |

NAYS—2

| | |
|---|---|
| Flake | Paul |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Duckworth | McCain | Shaheen |

The amendment (No. 2985) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I have just returned from South Florida where I went to a detention facility in Homestead, FL. There are 1,000 children in this detention facility, and 94 of 1,000 are children who have been separated from their families.

Despite being the senior Senator of Florida, despite having oversight responsibility of the Department of HHS, despite the fact that in that oversight capacity, we have the funding responsibility for the Department of HHS and one of its components, the Office of Refugee Resettlement—these children separated from their families are handled by that office—despite all of that, the Deputy Secretary of the Department of HHS refused to allow me to enter this facility and said that it was the Department's policy that you have to fill out a form, which we had done, but you have to wait 2 weeks before being allowed to enter the facility.

The question is, Why do they not want the Senator from Florida to get into this detention facility where there are children who have been separated from their parents? It must be that not only is this Department policy, but this is being directed by the President in the White House. They don't want me to see it because they don't want us to know what is going on in there.

I have subsequently found out that in addition to those 94 children, there are 174 children being held in my State of Florida who have been separated from their families. This is the current debate: Children have been ripped apart from their moms and dads, and it has always been an American value to keep families together, even when you are adjudicating the lawful or unlawful status of the parents. You always keep those children together on an immigration question, yet President Trump has now altered that policy.

Despite all the finger-pointing and the deflection, President Trump and his administration know this is their policy; he doubled down on it last night. But there is nothing in the law that requires them to tear parents away from their children. There is nothing in the law that requires the administration to rip an infant from a parent's arms, some young enough still to be nursing.

The decision to enact this quite horrendous and shameful policy was a decision by this administration—and this administration alone. That is why this Senator went to Miami yesterday. I wanted to see it for myself. I wanted to see: Is the facility clean? Are the children sleeping in beds? Are they sleeping on the floor? Do they have adequate care? If they were, I could report that it was a good news story.

I also wanted to be able to talk to the young children, the ones who had been separated. I had already gotten word from Senator VAN HOLLEN, who had been in Texas on Saturday and met a mom who said that her child had been separated from her and that child was in a detention facility in Florida. I wanted to see that child.

I am very proud of all of our colleagues who have come together to support legislation to keep these families together, and 49 of us on this side of the aisle have signed on as cosponsors. The policy of this legislation is simply this: Don't separate families in this question of immigration. It would prohibit the separation of those families. That has been the policy, and all the President would have to do is to say it, but in taking the position he has, maybe the only recourse is for us to pass this law.

I am proud of our colleagues on that side of the aisle who have rightfully stood up and publicly condemned this practice because every American knows that taking children from their parents is just not right. If a family is legitimately fleeing violence, repression, and conditions that most of us cannot imagine, they have a right under American law to present themselves at the border and ask for asylum. Past administrations of both parties have recognized this, which is why they acted with compassion and refused to do what the Trump administration is doing now. It is certainly time that we return to our true American value of keeping families together.

Because the passage of a statute is a long shot, it is really not up to us. It is up to the President. He could say it, and it would be done. No matter what we do here in this Chamber, the power to end this shameful chapter in our Nation's history lies with the President and his pen. He can sign an Executive order today, just as easily as he can sign a law that we pass here in Congress. Either way, it is up to him. He doesn't need Congress to act. He and he alone is allowing this shameful practice to continue, and he alone can stop it right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I first want to respond to something that was said a moment ago. It is not he and he alone who can solve it. Congress is, in fact, the policymaking body within the Federal Government. We are the lawmaking body within the Federal Government. We can make changes to the law, and we can't lose sight of that fact.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—H.R. 3

Mr. LEE. Madam President, pursuant to title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I have a discharge petition at the desk and move to discharge from the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Budget H.R. 3, to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to section 1017(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, there will now be up to 1 hour of debate on the motion to discharge, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, over the next 10 years, our national debt is set to balloon from $21.16 trillion today to more than $33.9 trillion in 2028.

With interest rates set to increase, the payments on the debt will also likely double over the next 10 years as a percentage of total economic output. Consider for a moment the fact we are paying a little more than $300 billion a year to service our debt. It is not that much more than we were paying a couple of decades ago when our national debt was roughly one-fifth, one-sixth of its current size. The only reason our debt service payments are as low as they are today is that our interest rates are at all-time historic lows. Our Treasury yield rates are artificially, historically, aberrationally, severely low. The situation gets a lot worse if our artificially, historically low interest rates increase or start to return to their historical averages at a pace quicker than has been projected, as is easily possible. For example, if interest

rates were to return just to historical norms—I am not talking about a rebound above the historical average, just a rebound to historical norms—taxpayers would soon be drowning in trillion-dollar annual interest payments just for the interest on our debt, which means just the difference between what we are paying in our debt service payment now and what we would be paying then, possibly a few short years from now. It is more than we spend on the Department of Defense. This is really frightening, and this is why it is such welcome news that there is some movement on this front.

That is why it is such welcome news that on May 8 President Trump sent to Congress a request to rescind $15.4 billion worth of extraneous spending. This is something Congress used to do all the time. This is something that in decades past would occur dozens, even scores of times, during a single Presidential administration, and it was a bipartisan matter, of course. Returning unused taxpayer money isn't just good government; in a republic, it should be expected, and it should be the norm. In 1981, President Reagan and a divided Congress rescinded more than $15 billion in Federal spending and another $16 billion in 1985 and 1986. President Clinton made three rescission requests in 2000, totaling $128 million.

Now we have the chance to take up the mantle again. President Trump's specific proposals draw back unused funds from expired programs, obsolete programs, and accounts that the Congressional Budget Office says are wildly, needlessly overfunded. In fact, according to CBO, none of the funds in the requested rescissions would alter current Federal programs in any way. For instance, CBO has certified that the $7 billion CHIP rescission would not affect either outlays or the number of Americans with health insurance. And I should note that Congress has rescinded CHIP funding in every enacted Labor-HHS appropriations bill since 2011, more than $50 billion in total during that time period.

The spending targeted for rescission is either expired or rendered unattainable by current eligibility requirements. The $15 billion is just sitting, unused, in agency accounts. So how does it help to cut spending if this money is just sitting there? This is the real sticking point, for Congress has this cute little habit of paying for new spending by raiding these unused funds. It is a budgetary trick, a gimmick, if you will. The money may not be used this year, but it can be recycled into budget gimmicks in future years. Rescinding it now takes the $15 billion out of circulation for those kinds of shenanigans in the not-too-distant future, and, of course, that is the real reason why it will not pass unanimously.

Now, to its credit, the House of Representatives has stepped up. On June 7, the House of Representatives passed its own $14.8 billion rescissions package. Now it is our chance. Now we have the opportunity to do the same. This is the Senate's chance to show the American people that we retain some modicum of attention and of seriousness when it comes to the spending habits of the Federal Government and when it comes to fiscal restraint in Washington, DC.

Cutting spending that isn't actually going to be spent may not be a profile in courage, but it is at least a sign of a pulse, and in Washington that is something. That is something important that we can and we should show today. It is a step toward fiscal responsibility and away from the cynicism and the waste that has turned this city into what is known as ''the swamp.''

In Congress we face a lot of difficult decisions—gut-wrenching, heart-wrenching decisions—but this is not one of them. President Trump's request is as reasonable as can be imagined. Now, $15 billion may be a drop in the bucket compared to $15 trillion or $21 trillion, but that is a reason to support this legislation, not to oppose it. Congress needs to retrain its atrophied muscles in preparation for the far larger tasks that lie ahead.

If we do not find the will—if we can't somehow muster the willpower necessary to reduce Federal spending ourselves now, long before the laws of mathematics and economics force us to do so—we will regret it. If we wait until those laws catch up with us, it will be a whole lot more painful later than it will be if we start making more modest adjustments now.

Every day that passes without action represents more of our national debt being thrown onto our children's backs—another line item on the fiscal indictment that we are writing, however unwittingly or unknowingly, against ourselves.

We have to change course. This bill provides us with a good chance to take one small step toward sanity.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the motion to discharge.

DISCHARGE PETITION—H.R. 3

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with title 10 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974, hereby direct that the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Budget be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3, a bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act 1974.

Mike Lee, Patick J. Toomey, Ted Cruz, Rand Paul, David Perdue, Jeff Flake, Joni Ernst, Ron Johnson, John Kennedy, Marco Rubio, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Ben Sasse, James Lankford, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, James Risch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have been in the Senate long enough to think that maybe the Senate can start to go back to being the Senate. A Senate that votes on things and debates things and reflects the will of the people—not what is dictated from the White House. Perhaps that was wishful thinking on my part, because in just the latest example of the ''cut first and ask questions later'' policies of the Trump administration, we are now going to vote on a bill that will claw back billions of dollars from children's health insurance, affordable housing investments, infrastructure, rural development, and innovative energy programs. This is the same White House that just forced through Congress a $1.9 trillion—not billion, but trillion—tax giveaway, most of which goes to billionaires and corporations. Then, they say we have to cut children's health insurance because we have to reduce the deficit. We can give billionaires and corporations $1.9 trillion, but this might increase the deficit. So we have to cut children's health insurance, affordable housing investments, infrastructure, rural development, and innovative energy programs. That goes beyond laughable. It is unconscionable.

President Trump is seeking to cut $7 billion from funding for children's health insurance. If you strip this funding from the Children's Health Insurance Program, we leave children unprotected from unforeseen events like a flu outbreak or a natural disaster.

This takes away the ability of Congress should be able to make critical investments in healthcare and education. Even if the money can no longer be dedicated to CHIP, we should reinvest it in other important programs as we have done in the past—programs that support our Nation's children and families. I don't think there is any Member of this body who, when they are campaigning, doesn't talk about how important children and their families are to them. I hope those same families will ask them: How much money did you take out from children and families?

Earlier this year, the Congress did what they were supposed to. Republicans and Democrats came together to direct this funding to the Federal response to the opioid epidemic, the childcare and development block grants, Head Start, and the National Institutes of Health. These are investments in our country. They are not tax giveaways. They are investments in our country. If you strip this funding, it is penny wise and pound foolish.

President Trump wants to claw back billions of dollars from infrastructure programs. I see so many of these photo ops he does, speaking about how we want to have better infrastructure. However, we don't want to pay for it so we will take the money back.

Let's look at what the money is that he wants to take away. It is programs to do everything from supporting loans to helping factories produce more efficient vehicles to building bridges in small communities. These are programs that directly support American jobs. They are not jobs overseas. They

are jobs right here, and now they want to take the money out.

For an administration that is perpetually in ''infrastructure week,'' it doesn't make sense if you are trying to cut funding for infrastructure. How do we put ''America first'' when you strip funds that support Americans jobs?

In a continued push to leave rural America behind, Mr. Trump's rescission package would cut millions of dollars from rural development programs. Every single Senator in this body has rural areas in their State, and they know that these programs help to ensure that the same basic services are offered in rural areas that we see in urban areas—things that we rely on, like schools or healthcare, for instance, or police stations. Are we saying that only urban areas can have that but rural areas can't?

In the Appropriations Committee, Senator SHELBY and I have been focused on moving forward through the fiscal year 2019 process. We are trying to return the committee to regular order—something that most Republicans and Democrats in this body say they want. We have successfully kept poison pill riders and controversial authorizing language out of the appropriations bills, whichever side of the aisle they came from, and we passed, by an overwhelming margin, seven bipartisan bills out of our committee.

It has been years since we have seen that happen. Here we have seven bipartisan appropriations bills come out of committee, and almost all Republicans and all Democrats voted for them. Even with the Interior appropriations bill—that is a bill that has been historically bogged down with poison pill riders and usually forced into a massive omnibus appropriations bill because we could not reach an agreement. In the past we had to put it in an omnibus bill because we couldn't agree on it—guess what happened. We passed it out of committee unanimously. I don't recall that happening in nearly a decade.

Now, if we go forward with this rescission package, it is going to derail the process.

The rescission bill undermines the bipartisan budget deal that Republicans and Democrats struck just four months ago.

If we go forward with this package, another will fall, and another, and another, even further undermining the agreement.

I will remind everybody that if they haven't gotten around to reading the Constitution, it does grant Congress the power of the purse, not the executive branch. Congress decides spending priorities, not the President. We ought to actually do our job. We should exercise our right. We should reject this rescissions package. We should uphold the bicameral, bipartisan budget agreement.

So I urge all Senators to reject this rescissions package and to oppose the motion to discharge.

Madam President, I don't see any other Senator seeking the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TAX REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise in celebration of the 6-month anniversary of passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I know there were a lot of remarks about the benefits of tax cuts right out of the gate, but many of the benefits from the reform of the old, broken, and outdated Tax Code will accumulate over the long run.

I rise to talk about some of the benefits from the new Tax Code that can be witnessed by hard-working families right now. For example, the typical family of four making the median family income of around $75,000 a year is right in the middle of the first year of our cuts. Those typical families are going to see their taxes cut by more than half.

We also doubled the child tax credit and expanded its refundability to benefit more working families. The Tax Code also makes filing taxes easier and more straightforward for the typical middle-class family. That is because the standard deduction was nearly doubled.

Taken all together, provisions like these are the reason the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation found that the overall distribution of the new tax bill is directed toward the middle class. This is happening everywhere.

Take my home State of Utah, for example. According to some recent numbers from the Tax Foundation, citizens of Utah can expect, on average, a tax cut of nearly $1,500, or 2.4 percent of their income.

Take advantage of those hundreds of dollars and start paying off your car a little sooner. Maybe go out to see a baseball game or take your family on a road trip to see some of the beautiful national parks around our country and especially throughout the State of Utah. All of those things are now that much more possible because of our tax reform.

Those direct tax cuts are just a part of the larger picture ushered in by tax reform. More broadly, tax reform has provided a shot in the arm to a long-ailing economy. After cutting the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent, businesses have been able to reinvest, build new facilities, hire new workers, and start innovating now more than ever.

Recent polls by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, Gallup, and the National Federation of Businesses show that optimism, and plans to expand hiring and growth for businesses of all sorts and sizes are at alltime highs. This optimism, along with lower costs of increasing investments and doing business, has already started to result in real changes for the middle class.

Take, for example, the list of more than 100 different utility companies that have cut their rates across the country. According to one compilation, the American people are on track to pocket more than $2.8 billion just this year off those savings.

Some might also argue that this is a normal period of expansion and growth in the economy. As one journalist recently noted, tax reform has poured ''jet fuel'' on a growing economy.

According to the most recent reports in June, the total number of workers receiving unemployment benefits is running at the lowest levels in 44 years, and that is just in terms of numbers of people drawing unemployment benefits, not even taking into account the massive population growth since December 1973.

For the first time since record-keeping began in 2000, the number of available positions exceeded the number of job seekers, according to the information from the Department of Labor. This is just the initial boost. I tend to think positive economic outcomes are most often created by hard work and good policy, like our tax reform package.

That is why activity in the labor market has been especially robust, with more than 1 million jobs already created in this year alone. That is why wage growth has been trending upward, and that is why business investment has been robust. More Americans now have access to more of their own hard-earned money. As Republicans predicted, we are already seeing the middle class and the economy generally benefit.

Mark my words, there is a lot more growth we should anticipate coming down the pike as more and more people start to realize how much tax reform actually does, and will, affect their families, their businesses, their communities, and our country as a whole.

As business investment and productivity pick up due to higher expected aftertax returns from investment, wage growth, too, will continue to pick up. All told, these changes are creating a paradigm shift. More than ever before, Americans can expect things to be better tomorrow than they are today.

Personally, I am more excited than ever for my great-grandchildren, my grandchildren, and my children. I am grateful to everyone who has made this possible. After all, major tax reform like this is truly a once-in-a-generation opportunity for all of us.

Just 6 months in, we have seen so many positive results from the tax reform that the list is too long to cover in just one speech. Make no mistake, the list of positives from tax reform for

American families and businesses will continue to grow larger and longer.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TARIFFS

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I rise to talk about the abuse of authority that is taking place with the administration's use of section 232 of the Trade Act to implement taxes on the American people. Let me say this one more time. The President, and the administration, abusing section 232 of the Trade Act, have decided on their own accord to tax the American people. They have put in place a 25-percent tariff on steel and aluminum and are getting ready to do so on some other products. Yet, this is Congress's responsibility—Congress's responsibility—to generate tariffs or deal with taxes.

The administration, by citing section 232—a national security issue—is taxing goods coming into America from Canada, from Europe, and our allies on a national security basis.

Today I wrote a letter to Secretary Ross, our Secretary of Commerce, because it is my understanding—actually, today, in a hearing with the Finance Committee, he said there were 22,506 requests from companies in the United States asking for exclusions—exclusions—from being taxed for goods that come in to support their companies.

I will say to my friends here, on what basis do we think these exclusions might be granted? We have already had an abuse of authority in using 232. I guess my question to Secretary Ross is, on what basis is he going to be granting these exclusions? Are they going to be friends of the administration who get exclusions? Are they going to deny exclusions to opponents of the administration or are they going to use the national security reason, if you will, to grant exclusions?

I want to say, again, I think this is our responsibility. I realize that when additional tariffs go in place in July—when these other countries retaliate, which is their plan on July 1—my guess is this issue may become more ripe for action, not unlike what is happening at the border right now where people are seeing what is occurring and action is being promoted to solve the problem. I think, once the tariffs by these other companies kick in against us on July 1—because we, in a most unusual way, the administration citing national security against Canada, Mexico, many of our NATO allies and the European Union—I think this issue is going to become ripe. I think it is going to become ripe for Senate action and House action.

Again, I will ask people in this room, knowing they cited 232, which again is an abuse of that authority, are we comfortable with the criteria that the administration is going to be using on the 22,000—actually, let me see here. Maybe that is a low number. It is 26,977 issues that have been dealt with, but 22,506 exclusions have been asked for. In other words, we have companies that are coming to the administration which is abusing its authority. We have companies that are going to the administration, asking that they not be impacted by the taxes that are being placed on their companies, unilaterally by this administration, with no congressional input.

I say to my colleagues, do we not want to know on what basis they unilaterally are going to decide not to tax certain companies? In other words, most companies are being taxed 25 percent. They just decided to do that themselves. Yet they are going to grant exclusions.

I think this issue is going to wreak havoc on our country. It already is wreaking havoc on our relationships with friends that have been with us for many years in defense that have to come our aid, and we have come to their aid. We have had alliances.

Again, I challenge the Senate to take action on this. There is an amendment that is broadly supported by people on both sides of the aisle, with a wide range of ideology, that would say, if we are going to invoke 232, a national security section, we would vote on that. My sense is, as this moves along, people are going to want to vote on that, and I look forward to that day occurring.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to address the issue that I know folks in both parties of both Houses, and, of course, across the country, are concerned about; that is, the issue of child separation at the border.

This is, unfortunately, an issue that because there is so much outrage, there is, in fact, substantial unity against the policy that is in place right now. I am, like a lot of Americans, vehemently opposed to the policy of what, in essence, amounts to ripping children away from their parents. I, like a lot of Americans, have demanded that the President and his administration end this cruel policy immediately.

We are hearing some reports that there may be an action taken. I don't know what that action will be, but I hope it is an action that will end the policy. Until we know that, we have to continue to urge the President to do the right thing.

Earlier this week, the Department of Homeland Security released data showing that between May 5 and June 9—just a little more than a month—2,342 children were taken from their parents at the border. That is about 70 children per day taken from their parents.

I have received thousands of emails, letters, and phone calls from concerned Pennsylvanians who are demanding an immediate end to the policy. I never imagined that I would have to stand here today, nor should anyone, to talk about a scenario where the U.S. Government is separating children from their parents at the border. That seems incomprehensible that would ever happen, but it has.

I am reading part of a statement that reads as follows:

> Our government is forcibly separating children—including toddlers—from their parents and sending them to detention facilities as a means of sending a message and influencing Congress.

That was a statement not made by a Democratic Senator or a Democratic House Member or a Republican or any politician; that was part of a larger statement made by Thomas Donahue, the president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—not someone who is very often lined up on the same side as Democratic Senators. I think that is an understatement.

To say this policy is cruel, inhumane, and an insult to the values of our Nation is to utter an understatement. This is a policy that is straight from the pit of hell, and there is probably worse that we could say about it. It is hard to comprehend that any administration at any time would propose, let alone implement, a policy that would result in children being separated from their parents.

Unlike what the administration has tried to argue, this is not about following the law or securing the border. Neither of those statements is relevant here. This is a conscious decision by this administration, which is contrary to the decisions by the last two administrations—one a Republican administration, the other a Democratic administration—that decided not to separate children from their parents. Unfortunately, this administration decided to do just that.

Many people have heard the statements attributed to the American Academy of Pediatrics. There were several different folks who were quoted on this, depending on which medical organizations they belonged to.

One of the most compelling statements was by Dr. Colleen Kraft, the president of the American Academy of Pediatrics. She is obviously an expert about children and is from an expert organization. Dr. Kraft visited a children's immigration detention facility in Texas earlier this month. She called what she saw there, in the systemic separation of children from their parents, ''a form of child abuse.'' According to Dr. Kraft, once young children are separated from their caregivers or parents, they are likely to develop toxic stress in their brains. The toxic stress disrupts children's brain development and increases levels of flight-or-fight hormones in their bodies. This kind of emotional trauma could eventually lead to children having health problems, such as heart disease and substance abuse disorders.

There is well-documented scientific evidence of the long-lasting harm that policies like this have on children. In the Washington Post yesterday, in an article entitled ''What Separation from Parents Does to Children,'' a professor of pediatrics at Harvard Medical School, Dr. Charles Nelson, said:

> The effect is catastrophic. There's so much research on this that if people paid attention at all to the science, they would never do this.

It goes on and on and on. I could quote more detail for a long time about what he has said and about what other experts have said, but we don't have time today. Suffice it to say the research that shows the damage that is done to children when they are forcibly separated from their parents explains why more than 9,000 mental health professionals and 172 organizations signed a petition to urge the President to end the policy of separating families. In this petition, the mental health professionals wrote:

> From decades of research and direct clinical experience, we know that the impact of disrupted attachment manifests not only in overwhelming fear and panic at the time of separation, but that there is a strong likelihood that these children's behavioral, psychological, interpersonal, and cognitive trajectories will also be affected. The National Child Traumatic Stress Network notes that children may develop post traumatic responses following separation from their parents and specifically lists immigration and parental deportation as situations of potentially traumatic separation. To pretend that separated children do not grow up with the shrapnel of this traumatic experience embedded in their minds is to disregard everything we know about child development, the brain, and trauma.

That is from the petition that was signed by mental health professionals across the country—9,000 of them. Those professionals and the professionals at the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Physicians, and the American Psychiatric Association have also issued statements against the policy. Together, these organizations represent more than 250,000 doctors across the country. To support this policy, you would have to assert that a quarter of a million doctors in the United States of America are somehow wrong and that you know better.

If we were to ask the administration, ''Before you put this policy in place, did you talk to the American Academy of Pediatrics? Did you talk to child psychologists? Did you talk to the American College of Physicians or other professionals who know something about children and trauma and long-term damage to their brains and to their development?'' I am afraid the answer to that question would be no. Yet I await the answer from the administration. I hope the answer will be yes.

I have more here, but I know we have to go, so I will not use all of it. Over the next couple of hours and days, we have to keep insisting that the administration take action to end this policy today, which it could—which the President could, which the Attorney General could. I realize that sometimes here in Washington, people say: Do something right now. Take action today. Take action this week or this month. Yet, in this case, today matters; hours matter; days matter in the lives of those children—more than 2,300 or more, and the projections are just going through the roof about what will happen over the next couple of weeks and month.

Ending the policy today and reuniting child and parent matters a lot because every day that goes by makes it worse for that child. Unfortunately, for some children, it might be too late. That traumatic event and the aftereffects—the hours and the days and even weeks now that they have been separated—might result in permanent damage. I hope I am wrong about this, but days matter here, and even hours matter.

We are hoping that the administration will reverse course on a policy—I will say again and keep saying—that is straight from the pit of hell. It should end today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, our national debt stands at about $21 trillion. The interest costs on this alone are more than $300 billion every single year. That is money that can't go toward shoring up our national defense or shoring up Social Security or Medicare or some other Federal program. That is money that goes to our creditors. Now, it has to, but the scary part is that that is just a drop in the bucket compared to what it could be just a few years from now. The only reason it is even this low is that our Treasury yield rates—the rates at which we pay interest on our national debt—are at an alltime, historic low. As soon as they return to their historic averages, we will see that interest payment increase manyfold. If we wait until that moment arrives, this will be a very difficult process not just for the Federal Government, not just for Congress, but for the entire country.

It is time for us to start taking gradual steps in the right direction now. This opportunity—this rescissions package that has been proposed by the President—provides us with a meaningful step in that direction. I applaud President Trump for proposing these rescissions. It is time for Congress to get back in the practice of taking these things up, of considering them, and of passing them.

I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to vote for this measure.

Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—48

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Gardner | Paul |
| Barrasso | Graham | Perdue |
| Blunt | Grassley | Portman |
| Boozman | Hatch | Risch |
| Capito | Heller | Roberts |
| Cassidy | Hoeven | Rounds |
| Corker | Hyde-Smith | Rubio |
| Cornyn | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Cotton | Isakson | Scott |
| Crapo | Johnson | Shelby |
| Cruz | Kennedy | Sullivan |
| Daines | Lankford | Thune |
| Enzi | Lee | Tillis |
| Ernst | McConnell | Toomey |
| Fischer | Moran | Wicker |
| Flake | Murkowski | Young |

NAYS—50

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin | Gillibrand | Murray |
| Bennet | Harris | Nelson |
| Blumenthal | Hassan | Peters |
| Booker | Heinrich | Reed |
| Brown | Heitkamp | Sanders |
| Burr | Hirono | Schatz |
| Cantwell | Jones | Schumer |
| Cardin | Kaine | Smith |
| Carper | King | Stabenow |
| Casey | Klobuchar | Tester |
| Collins | Leahy | Udall |
| Coons | Manchin | Van Hollen |
| Cortez Masto | Markey | Warner |
| Donnelly | McCaskill | Warren |
| Duckworth | Menendez | Whitehouse |
| Durbin | Merkley | Wyden |
| Feinstein | Murphy | |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|---|---|
| McCain | Shaheen |

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—Continued

### FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the humanitarian crisis that is at our southern border right now. We are living through a moment in history when we are literally sending babies and toddlers into detention camps.

Think about that. Think about what I just said. Our Federal Government is sending babies and toddlers to detention camps. This is immoral. It is wrong.

The AP broke a story last night that left me speechless, and I want the details of this horror recorded and documented in the official Senate RECORD so Americans years from now will look back on us and will see how wrong we were.

I will read this article from the Associated Press, called ''Youngest Migrants Held in 'Tender Age' Shelters.'' It is by Garance Burke and Martha Mendoza.

Trump administration officials have been sending babies and other young children forcibly separated from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border to at least three ''tender age'' shelters in South Texas, the Associated Press has learned.

Lawyers and medical providers who have visited the Rio Grande Valley shelters described play rooms of crying preschool-age children in crisis. The government also plans to open a fourth shelter to house hundreds of young migrant children in Houston, where city leaders denounced the move Tuesday.

Since the White House announced its zero tolerance policy in early May, more than 23,000 children have been taken from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border, resulting in a new influx of young children requiring government care. The government has faced withering critiques over images of some of the children in cages inside U.S. Border Patrol processing stations.

Decades after the nation's child welfare system ended the use of orphanages over concerns about the lasting trauma to children, the administration is starting up new institutions to hold Central American toddlers that the government separated from their parents.

''The thought that they are going to be putting such little kids in an institutional setting? I mean it is hard for me even to wrap my mind around it,'' said Kay Bellor, vice president for programs at Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, which provides foster care and other child welfare services to migrant children. ''Toddlers are being detained.''

Bellor said shelters follow strict procedures surrounding who can gain access to the children in order to protect their safety, but that means information about their welfare can be limited.

By law, child migrants traveling alone must be sent to facilities run by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services within three days of being detained. The agency then is responsible for placing the children in shelters or foster homes until they are united with a relative or sponsor in the community as they await immigration court hearings.

But U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions' announcement last month that the government would criminally prosecute everyone who crosses the U.S.-Mexico border illegally has led to the breakup of migrant families and sent a new group of hundreds of young children into the government's care.

The United Nations, some Democratic and Republican lawmakers and religious groups have sharply criticized the policy, calling it inhumane.

Not so, said Steven Wagner, an official with the Department of Health and Human Services.

''We have specialized facilities that are devoted to providing care to children with special needs and tender age children as we define as under 13 would fall into that category,'' he said. ''They're not government facilities per se, and they have very well-trained clinicians, and those facilities meet state licensing standards for child welfare agencies, and they're staffed by people who know how to deal with the needs—particularly of the younger children.''

Until now, however, it's been unknown where they are.

''In general we do not identify the locations of permanent unaccompanied alien children program facilities,'' said agency spokesman Kenneth Wolfe.

The three centers—in Combes, Raymondville, and Brownsville—have been rapidly repurposed to serve needs of children including some under 5. A fourth, planned for Houston, would house up to 240 children in a warehouse previously used for people displaced by Hurricane Harvey, Mayor Sylvester Turner said.

Turner said he met with officials from Austin-based Southwest Key Programs, the contractor that operates some of the child shelters, to ask them to reconsider their plans. A spokeswoman for Southwest Key didn't immediately reply to an email seeking comment.

''And so there comes a point in time we draw a line, and for me, the line is with these children,'' Turner said during a news conference Tuesday.

On a practical level, the zero tolerance policy has overwhelmed the federal agency charged with caring for the new influx of children who tend to be much younger than teens who typically have been traveling to the U.S. alone. Indeed some recent detainees are infants, taken from their mothers.

Doctors and lawyers who have visited the shelter said the facilities were fine, clean and safe, but the kids—who have no idea where their parents are—were hysterical, crying, and acting out.

''The shelters aren't the problem, it's taking kids from their parents that's the problem,'' said South Texas pediatrician Marsha Griffin who has visited many.

Alicia Lieberman, who runs the Early Trauma Treatment Network at the University of California, San Francisco, said decades of study show early separations can cause permanent emotional damage.

''Children are biologically programmed to grow best in the care of a parent figure. When that bond is broken through long and unexpected separations with no set timeline for reunion, children respond at the deepest psychological and emotional levels,'' she said. ''Their fear triggers a flood of stress hormones that disrupt neural circuits in the brain, create high levels of anxiety, make them more susceptible to physical and emotional illness, and damage their capacity to manage their emotions, trust people, and focus their attention on age-appropriate activities.''

Days after Sessions announced the zero-tolerance policy, the government issued a call for proposals from shelter and foster care providers to provide services for the new influx of children taken from their families after journeying from Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Mexico.

As children are separated from their families, law enforcement agents reclassify them from members of family units to ''unaccompanied alien children.'' Federal officials said Tuesday that since May, they have separated 2,342 children from their families, rendering them unaccompanied minors in the government's care.

While Mexico is still the most common country of origin for families arrested at the border, in the last eight months, Honduras has become the fastest-growing category as compared to fiscal year 2017.

During a press briefing [on] Tuesday, reporters repeatedly asked for an age breakdown of the children who have been taken. Officials from both law enforcement and Health and Human Services said they didn't know how many children were under 5, under 2, or even so little they're non-verbal.

''The facilities that they have for the most part are not licensed for tender age children,'' said Michelle Brane, director of migrant rights at the Women's Refugee Commission, who met with a 4-year-old girl in diapers in a McAllen warehouse where Border Patrol temporarily holds migrant families. ''There is no model for how you house tons of little children in cots institutionally in our country. We don't do orphanages, our child welfare has recognized that is an inappropriate setting for little children.''

So now, the government has to try to hire more caregivers. The recent call for proposals by the federal government's Office of Refugee Resettlement said it was seeking applicants who can provide services for a diverse population ''of all ages and genders, as well as pregnant and parenting teens.''

Even the policy surrounding what age to take away a baby is inconsistent. Customs and Border Protection field chiefs over all nine southwest border districts can use their discretion over how young is too young, officials said. And while Health and Human Services defines ''tender age'' typically as 12 and under, Customs and Border Protection has at times defined it as 5 and under.

For 30 years, Los Fresnos, Texas-based International Education Services ran emergency shelters and foster care programs for younger children and pregnant teens who arrived in the U.S. as unaccompanied minors. At least one resident sued for the right to have an abortion in a high-profile case last March.

For reasons the agency did not explain, three months ago the government's refugee resettlement office said it was ending its funding to the program and transferring all children to other facilities. This came weeks before the administration began its ''zero tolerance'' policy, prompting a surge in ''tender age'' migrant children needing shelter.

In recent days, members of Congress have been visiting the shelters and processing centers, or watching news reports about them, bearing witness to the growing chaos. In a letter sent to Attorney General Jeff Sessions on Tuesday, a dozen Republican senators wrote that separating families isn't consistent with American values and ordinary human decency.

On Tuesday, a Guatemalan mother who hasn't seen her 7-year-old son since he was taken from her a month ago sued the Trump administration. Beata Mariana de Jesus Mejia-Mejia was released from custody while her asylum case is pending and thinks her son, Darwin, might be in a shelter in Arizona.

''I only got to talk to him once and he sounded so sad. My son never used to sound like that, he was such a dynamic boy,'' Mejia-Mejia said as she wept. ''I call and call, and no one will tell me where he is.''

The Presiding Officer has young children. I have young children. I am certain he cannot imagine how horrific it would be for him to give up his child

into the hands of those he does not know and then not know where they will take him or her. I am certain he can't imagine that pain and horror. This body should not allow it. We should stand against it. It is morally wrong. It is outrageous, and it must end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TAX REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 6 months ago, Congress passed historic tax legislation that fundamentally reformed our Tax Code and provided tax relief to middle-income Americans and also to small business job creators.

At the time, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle attempted to derail our efforts through a campaign of misinformation and demagoguery. They tried to argue that up was down and that tax cuts were tax increases. They even suggested the bill's passage was a sign of Armageddon.

Of course, such fearmongering was always nonsense. At the time, analysis from the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation had made it clear that the vast majority of taxpayers across every income group would experience tax cuts. In fact, it made clear that middle-income groups would experience the largest percentage of tax cuts. In even looking at the liberal Tax Policy Center's analysis of the bill, the tax relief for the middle class is unmistakable. Its analysis found that more than 80 percent would experience tax cuts that would average more than $2,100.

In the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we made good on our commitment to fix our broken Tax Code. It makes filing simpler, provides middle-income tax cuts, and reinvigorates our economy through pro-growth business tax reforms.

The positive effects of the tax cuts began almost immediately with companies announcing bonuses, pay raises, higher retirement contributions, new hiring, and increased investment as a result of the law. To date, the list of such companies has climbed to over 600, with there being more than 4 million employees who are benefiting.

This has included a number of businesses in my State of Iowa, which range from the small, like the Anfinson Farm Store, which has invested back into its employees in the form of $1,000 bonuses and a 5-percent increase in wages, to the very large, like Wells Fargo, which has raised its base wage from $13.50 to $15 per hour and benefited more than 1,300 employees.

Higher wages and bonuses are not the only ways that taxpayers are benefiting from the historic tax relief.

Taxpayers across the country are seeing the benefit in the form of lower electric, gas, and water bills. Nationally, utility customers have experienced more than $3 billion in savings thanks to lower utility rates as a result of tax cuts.

In my State of Iowa, Alliant Energy has estimated its customer savings to be between $18.6 million and $19.6 million for electric and from $500,000 to $3.7 million for gas. MidAmerican Energy has estimated between $90 million and $112 million in customer savings, and Iowa American Water Company has estimated customer savings to be between $1.5 million and $1.8 million.

The hundreds of businesses and utility company announcements were only the beginning of the positive news for American taxpayers. In February, taxpayers began seeing the effects of tax reform directly in their paychecks as less was taken out of their pay by the IRS. In all, about 90 percent of taxpayers are seeing less being withheld from their paychecks as a result of the law.

As it became evident that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was delivering meaningful benefits to working families, our Democratic colleagues were in search of new talking points on the law, considering the fact that their old talking points were not working. They could no longer, with a straight face, argue that tax cuts were really tax increases. Instead, they wanted hard-working Americans to believe that an extra $50 a week in their paychecks or a $1,000 bonus was ''crumbs.''

With all due respect to my colleagues who believe that this is true, they don't have a doggone clue what it is like in the real world where people have to work for a living. That $1,000 bonus means a lot for a father or a mother whose children need new school clothes or who has a car that could use some repairs or who, simply, wants to take the family on a vacation. For a family on a tight budget, every additional dollar in a paycheck really counts. It means an additional dollar that can be put away for unexpected emergencies or for a child's college savings or, maybe, even for one's own retirement.

As important as the immediate middle-income tax benefits are that have been afforded by the law, the benefits that will accrue for everybody in this country as a result of the long-term, pro-growth effects of the bill are as important, if maybe not more important. Thanks to this historic tax measure, as well as to regulatory relief, Congress and the administration have declared that America is open for business. When Congress delivers historic tax cuts and, particularly, regulatory rollbacks, the American people enjoy the sweet taste of prosperity. That is how the cookie crumbles.

Despite critics in this town calling the tax cuts crumbs, I would invite them to chew on a few facts: National unemployment has fallen to 3.8 percent—the lowest level since April 2000. Wages have risen at the fastest pace since the end of the recession. For the first time on record, the number of job openings has exceeded the number of job seekers. U.S. manufacturers report historically high investment and hiring numbers as 86 percent report they intend to increase investment, and 77 percent report they plan to increase hiring. Small business confidence has hit record highs. Consumer confidence has reached its highest level in 18 years. All of this good economic news points toward higher economic growth moving forward. This is key to sustainable long-term wage growth, which is the most powerful anti-poverty measure there is. This should be welcome news to all after the years of stagnant wage growth during the Obama years.

With all of this positive news, Democrats have been searching for a talking point that they hope will take hold. They are looking for a big distraction from the prosperity that results from this tax bill. Toward that end, they have lambasted corporate stock buybacks. Their hope is that the American public will disregard all the positive signs they have seen in their paychecks and in the economy generally and be outraged by the benefits accruing to stockholders—more class warfare on their part versus the compassion and social justice that this tax reform brings about. It is a play out of their old playbook, in other words. When all else fails, engage in the historic rhetoric of class warfare. But I have news for some of my Democratic colleagues: That dog no longer hunts either. Millions of middle-class Americans own stock—if not directly, through their 401(k) or pension plan. According to the Tax Policy Center, 37 percent of stock is held in retirement accounts. Thus, the idea of stock buybacks being a boon only to corporate fat cats is hogwash. It is a boon to the millions of middle-class Americans who are longing for secure and comfortable retirements.

Moreover, the Democrats' concerns with stock buybacks demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of economics. Stock buybacks are fully consistent with one of the main objectives of tax reform; that is, promoting economic growth through capital formation that makes workers more productive, which in turn leads to increased wages. When a company repurchases stock, that money is not stuffed into a mattress; it frees up dollars that can be reinvested in a growing economy or maybe a new startup small business. This in turn promotes the type of business expansion and capital investment necessary to grow our economy, boost productivity, and increase wages over the long term.

Although the economic landscape looks more promising than ever, there is more work to do. Those of us from Iowa are particularly focused on trade agreements and renewable energy policies that impact our home State.

So I hope overall that our colleagues across the aisle will finally put an end to their tired attacks on the tax bill and begin working with us to promote further economic growth that has already started at a high level as a result of this tax bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to join my friend, the Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and talk about what has happened with the tax bill—the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, as the President insisted it be called because that is exactly what it was to do.

It has been 6 months since it was signed into law, and it is clear that the country is thinking differently about the future. It is clear that there is more confidence in our economy than there has been in past years. It is also clear, frankly, that a lot of that confidence began after the last election and was reinforced by commonsense regulation instead of out-of-control regulation.

The tax bill, on top of that, as it turns out, is doing the things those of us who voted for it said it would do and does not do the things people who were against it said were going to happen. I remember that nobody was going to get a tax cut—only to find out that 9 out of 10 people who paid income tax last year are paying less income tax this year.

This week, the Gallup poll organization found that the percentage of Americans who are satisfied with the direction of the economy is the highest it has been in almost 15 years.

In May, small business optimism increased among small business owners to the second highest level in the National Federation of Independent Business survey's 45-year history. In fact, there were several records that were broken in May. Compensation increases hit a 45-year high. Positive sales trends reached the highest level since 1995—over 20 years ago. Expansion plans were more robust than they had been at any time in the survey's history. That set a record as well.

The combination of lower taxes and full expensing of new and used equipment has created an additional cash flow incentive that is making a difference.

As of this month, 1 million new jobs have been created since the passage of the tax cut bill. In the last year, Missouri—my State—added nearly 35,000 jobs, and more than 4,000 Missourians who were unemployed just found jobs. Nationwide there are more job openings than people looking for work. In the 20 years that those two things have been measured at the same time—how many people are looking for work and how many job openings there are—it is the first time in 20 years that there were more jobs available than people looking for work.

I said a number of times on the floor as we debated the tax bill that there are two ways to increase people's take-home pay. One is to take less money out of the check they already get. Nine out of ten Americans who paid income taxes last year found that has happened for them. No. 2 is to be sure we have better jobs to start with, have an economy where people are competing to get workers and competing to keep workers.

As businesses try to attract new employees, they are setting new, higher minimum entry-level skills and minimum job compensation than they have had before. The National Federation of Independent Business found that 35 percent of all small business owners reported increases in their labor compensation. One out of three NFIB employers says they are paying more now than they were 1 year ago.

In addition, the report found that nearly 60 percent of respondents are hiring or trying to hire. When 60 percent of the respondents to a survey are trying to hire, that is pretty good news. It is good news for the economy, but it is also good news for people out there trying to get hired. If you are in an economy where lots of people are looking for workers, you are in a lot better place than if you are in an economy where only a few people are looking for workers.

We need to make sure we have a skills and training match that gets people into those better jobs that are out there. I was all over our State a couple of weeks ago, in 10 different cities over 3 days attending business roundtables and going to manufacturing locations. In my hometown of Springfield, one manufacturing location had 20 available jobs right then. Other people were telling me that they have hired people back whom they had fired in the past, and the approach was: If you want a second chance, I know you know how to do what we do here. If you are ready to give it another try, I am ready to give it another try. That doesn't happen very often in very many economies.

According to the survey the Association of General Contractors released this year, more than three-fourths of the people who responded to that survey said they couldn't find or they were having a hard time finding the qualified workers they need.

In a bill that we will mark up in the Appropriations Committee next week, the subcommittee that I chair—the Labor, Education, Health and Human Services Subcommittee—we are going to continue to build this apprenticeship program in a bipartisan way that Congress has embraced. The President likes this program. We have had a 53-percent increase in just the last couple of years in the training money available for apprenticeships.

Two hundred years ago, apprenticeships were the way everybody learned to do whatever it was they were going to do. If you were going to learn a skill, you were going to learn it as an apprentice.

This is a program that really gives the employers the tools they need to develop the workforce they would like to have. It gives workers an opportunity to earn a salary while they are learning skills. It does that in a way that makes it possible for employers to do a couple things at the same time: prepare their own workforce, get people ready for work, and put people in a situation where they are suddenly showing up for work every day, learning skills while they are there, learning a lot of things that will get them ready for full-time employment.

For the 9 out of 10 Americans who complete apprenticeship training programs and get a job—and again, 9 out of 10 people who go through those programs get a job, and the average starting salary for those jobs is $60,000 a year. These are not minimum wage jobs; these are significant opportunities to start at that level and work your way up. I hear from businesses and I hear from unions in Missouri all the time about the need for skilled workers and about the long-term careers that can result from meeting that skilled-worker need.

As we continue to focus on training our 21st-century workforce, we know there are a lot of challenges we have to address. Next week, our subcommittee will consider our bill. Dedicating resources for programs geared toward better preparing and training the next generation of workers is one of our top priorities.

I am pleased that the Trump administration has also taken important steps to strengthen apprenticeship programs. Last year, the administration issued an Executive order that doubled the amount the Federal Government spent on apprenticeship programs. In addition, the order shifted the role of developing government-funded workforce development programs from the Labor Department to private sector entities, such as trade groups, unions, and businesses, which, frankly, are much more likely to produce the workforce they know they need than a government program that is much more likely to produce the workforce we might have needed a couple of years ago.

This is a program that is working. With an economy growing as fast as ours, we need to promote job skills and training that fit the jobs of the future. We need to ensure that opportunities are available for workers in rural areas, suburban areas, and urban areas alike. It is critical that we ensure that Federal programs are designed to continue to take advantage of the apprenticeship model that is working.

Just a couple of years ago, I don't think people would have predicted where we would be with our economy today. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act had a lot to do with that—resetting the foundation of our economy, making it possible for us to compete around the world, going from the highest corporate rate in the world to a rate right in the middle. We are fine in the middle. Nobody is fine, if they are trying to compete, when they give themselves the biggest disadvantage in that field of competition.

It has only been 6 months, but it has been a pretty good 6 months, and I

think we will continue to see the good news we have been seeing as people develop more confidence in their ability to take care of their families and to take care of themselves, and more confidence in the economy is going to make that possible.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, as some of my colleagues mentioned already, today marks 6 months since Congress passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and sent it to the President's desk to become law. When the President signed the legislation, he helped usher in the first major overhaul of the Tax Code in three decades.

Here are some of the results we have seen so far: Over 1 million new jobs have been created since the package of tax reform; at least 101 utilities across the country are lowering rates for customers, including Entergy Arkansas in my home State, as a result of the savings they are seeing from the tax reform bill; and 75 percent of small and independent business owners believe that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will have a positive impact on their businesses, which is leading them to make plans to invest in hiring and increase employees' compensation.

I could go on highlighting the good news related to our overhaul of the Tax Code, but instead I want to spend just a few minutes talking about what I have heard from small business owners and employees—beneficiaries of this historic reform—on a recent visit I made to Arkansas in the south and southwest regions.

Last month, I had the opportunity to travel around Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District with Congressman BRUCE WESTERMAN. We embarked on a tour called the ''Talk Small Y'all'' Small Business Tour to highlight the importance of small businesses to our State's economy and to local communities where they make such a significant impact. The tour was designed to be an opportunity for us to listen and learn, which is exactly what we did. We visited with business owners, managers, and employees of manufacturing companies, an oilfield and industrial products supplier, a food service distributor, dining establishments, and retail stores.

Everywhere we went, we heard a sense of optimism and excitement in the voices of those we were fortunate to meet. In addition to eliminating burdensome regulations through the Congressional Review Act, the passage of meaningful, historic tax reform—which makes our Nation's businesses more competitive globally—is providing cause for business owners to feel more confident about the current economic climate. Tax reform is helping to provide them with the certainty they need to grow and to succeed.

I came to the floor in February to talk about the developments we were seeing in Arkansas as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, just 2 months after it was signed into law. Despite the dire warnings from our friends on the other side of the aisle who opposed our changes to the Tax Code, businesses across the country and in Arkansas were already beginning to reap the benefits and passing them along to their employees, their customers, and the communities they operate in.

I am pleased to say that this trend is continuing. More companies based in Arkansas or with a significant presence in the State are handing out bonuses, improving benefits, or investing in their businesses and their communities. Tax reform is helping hardworking Arkansans keep more of their money in their own pockets. It is delivering results that are helping the middle class.

On the 6-month anniversary of the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, I join my colleagues in celebrating this achievement and the results that have followed from our commitment to make comprehensive tax reform a reality.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2926 AND 2971 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2910

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc: Young No. 2926 and Tester No. 2971. I further ask that the time until 4:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form and that at 4:30 p.m. the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed and, finally, that there be no second-degree amendments in order to the amendments prior to the votes.

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

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BOOZMAN], for others, proposes amendments numbered 2926 and 2971 en bloc to amendment No. 2910.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2926

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the effectiveness of the Veterans Crisis Line)

At the end of section 232 of title II of division C, add the following:

(c)(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a study on the effectiveness of the hotline specified in subsection (a) during the five-year period beginning on January 1, 2016, based on an analysis of national suicide data and data collected from such hotline.

(2) At a minimum, the study required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) determine the number of veterans who contact the hotline specified in subsection (a) and who receive follow up services from the hotline or mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs thereafter;

(B) determine the number of veterans who contact the hotline who are not referred to, or do not continue receiving, mental health care who commit suicide; and

(C) determine the number of veterans described in subparagraph (A) who commit or attempt suicide.

AMENDMENT NO. 2971

(Purpose: To prevent the denial of access to records and documents by various inspectors general)

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

**SEC. _____. INSPECTORS GENERAL.**

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to deny an Inspector General funded under this Act timely access to any records, documents, or other materials available to the department or agency of the United States Government over which such Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), or to prevent or impede the access of such Inspector General to such records, documents, or other materials, under any provision of law, except a provision of law that expressly refers to such Inspector General and expressly limits the right of access of such Inspector General.

(b) TIMELY ACCESS.—A department or agency covered by this section shall provide its Inspector General access to all records, documents, and other materials in a timely manner.

(c) COMPLIANCE.—Each Inspector General covered by this section shall ensure compliance with statutory limitations on disclosure relevant to the information provided by the department or agency over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) REPORT.—Each Inspector General covered by this section shall report to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives within 5 calendar days of any failure by any department or agency covered by this section to comply with this section.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FAMILY SEPARATION POLICY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we have been focused on the U.S.-Mexico border, where the prospect of children being separated from their family has shocked and horrified many of us. We have been working to come up with a solution to this problem. That includes President Trump, who yesterday called

on Congress to preserve family unity, while calling for a zero tolerance policy when it comes to violating our immigration laws.

I would like to provide a little bit of context for how we got here and offer a proposed solution. Just like under the Obama administration in 2014, when we saw tens of thousands of unaccompanied children coming across the border into my State of Texas from Central America through Mexico—I remember at the time President Obama called that a humanitarian crisis, and, indeed, it was—trying to find a way to deal with this flood of humanity coming across our border in a safe and humane manner was a huge challenge for the Federal Government, for local communities, like McAllen, TX, and for various faith-based and other organizations. But come they did.

Between August 1 of last year and May 31 of this year, the number of families apprehended at the southwest border rose 58 percent, compared with the same period a year earlier. Of course, just like the humanitarian crisis of 2014, most of these individuals came from Central America. I think it is important to point out that even though these are not unaccompanied minors in the same number that we saw in 2014, we are still seeing so far this year roughly 30,000 children coming across our southwestern border from across dangerous territory in Mexico and from Central America, transported by human traffickers and the cartels, for whom this is their business model. Let me explain for a minute.

Recently, an expert on this topic made the point that these criminal organizations that run children, families, and other adults across the border are ''commodity agnostic.'' That is what he said. In other words, they don't care whether it is drugs, contraband, children, or adults. Whatever it is, they are in it for the money, and they have found an incredibly profitable business model in transporting all of those commodities, if you can call them that, from Central America and across the Mexican border.

For those who are worried about the opioid crisis here in America, which we all are, it is not just about prescription drugs—that is a huge part of the problem—but it is also the heroin that is frequently substituted for the prescription drugs because it is cheap and it is more plentiful. So all of these are good reasons, in my mind, for us to be very focused on what happens at our border.

My State happens to have 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico, and we are at ground zero when it comes to the border security challenges and when it comes to the humanitarian crises and to the law enforcement challenges that go along with it.

This Friday, Senator CRUZ, my colleague from Texas, and I will be traveling to Brownsville and McAllen, TX, to once again get an idea of what the facts are on the ground. We have been there many times before, of course, and have worked hand in glove with our local and State officials, with our faith-based organizations and with everybody who is concerned about what is happening at the border, including the Border Patrol, the Texas National Guard, and the like.

I want to make one point when it comes to those who enter our country in order to claim asylum, as many of these people do from Central America. They claim a fear of persecution as the basis for a claim for asylum, but those who present themselves lawfully at ports of entry—those are the bridges that enter into the United States—can do so and claim asylum without violating any immigration laws. As Secretary Nielsen, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary, said, it is only those who try to enter the country in those vast areas between the ports of entry, which is exceedingly dangerous, by the way, who violate our immigration laws when they enter the United States illegally. When they come with a child, whether it is their biological child or somebody they claim is their child—maybe the cartels have figured out that if they pair these people up, they have found another way to exploit vulnerabilities in the system—it presents the challenges that we have seen here in the last few days.

I want to emphasize that we have seen the arrival of families and children before. So none of this is new, but we do need to put what is happening now in proper context. As the Secretary of Homeland Security, Ms. Nielsen, has said, if the situation in your home country is dangerous and if you have chosen to seek asylum for your family in the United States, there is no reason for you to enter the United States illegally. We saw this during the previous policy that was since eliminated by the Obama administration of Cuban refugees who, because of a unique policy called ''wet foot, dry foot,'' once they crossed over our ports of entry, they were entitled to seek refuge in the United States under the laws at the time. So none of this is new.

As I said, people with a credible fear of persecution in their home countries may present their claims through a normal, well-defined process. There is no reason for somebody to expose themselves, much less their children, to the dangerous, remote regions—areas I call the wild, wild west—down along the border in order to try to sneak through by illicit means.

But people do sometimes falsely claim a credible fear of persecution. In other words, they don't qualify for asylum. So that is why it is so important for us to give them an opportunity and to insist that they present those claims to an immigration judge on a timely basis so those claims can be properly evaluated.

The Trump administration has made the very commonsensical decision to have a zero tolerance policy when it comes to illegal immigration. They have made the decision to fully enforce our laws by prosecuting adults in criminal courts when they are apprehended crossing our borders illegally. In my opinion, that is exactly the right decision—enforce the laws as written. The relevant laws—the ones that criminalize illegal crossings—have been on the books for a long time. They are a product of congressional action and Presidential approval, like all legislation. These are not something that President Trump created out of whole cloth, as some people would have you believe. But the truth is that often these laws were not enforced by previous administrations and, particularly, when families were involved. Now that they are being enforced, the adults are, unfortunately, under the status quo, separated from families as part of the legal process as it plays itself out. It is not because of any desire to separate families and children, but rather because of previous Federal court decisions, consent decrees, and statutes that Congress has passed that require children to be placed in a separate, safe setting. In other words, we don't want to place children in a jail cell with hardened, potentially violent criminals because the adult that brought them into the country has violated our criminal laws. So putting the children in a safe, separate setting was really motivated by the best of intentions.

The relevant authorities are important to acknowledge because, as the New York Times has stated this last weekend, contrary to what you may have heard, ''technically, there is no Trump administration policy stating that illegal border crossers must be separated from their children.''

What there are, instead, are many variables that are hard to disentangle from one another, and, I think, unfortunately, those who would like to create a false narrative here have taken advantage of the complexity of these laws and the situation in order to claim some sort of sinister intent to tear children away from their parents unnecessarily. That is not the goal. In fact our goal is just the opposite: How do we keep these children with their families, pending the decision by an immigration judge of whether or not they have a viable claim to asylum or some other benefit.

The so-called Flores agreement is one of those laws that are required to be observed which requires that children can be held no longer than 20 days. A Ninth Circuit opinion applies the Flores bill to family units, protracted timelines for asylum claims, limited detention facilities, and a division of responsibility among ICE, or Immigration and Custom Enforcement, Health and Human Services, and other agencies. All of this adds to the complexity of this situation.

Most of these factors are pretty uncontroversial. I think every Member will agree with the Trump administration that we should never place children in prisons or jails with hardened,

potentially violent criminals when their parents are being lawfully prosecuted for entering the country illegally.

We need to see that this is how we got to where we are now. They are entirely reasonable decisions that seemed to make sense at the time—that children should not be held for any longer than is strictly necessary, that they should never be detained with adults in a jail cell in potentially dangerous circumstances. A lot of that seemed to make sense at the time. By the same token, I and many others certainly don't want family members to be separated from one another as a consequence of officials doing their duty and enforcing the laws they are sworn to uphold.

I know Customs and Border Protection leaders like Manny Padilla, chief of the Rio Grande Valley sector, and David Higgerson, and all of the other men and women who work under them in the Rio Grande Valley, are trying to do their job. They are trying to enforce the law. That is what we have asked them to do. That is their duty. It is a good thing, and I think we should all appreciate their attempt to do so in a very complex environment.

This is where I have some questions for the minority leader Senator SCHUMER and others. Senator FEINSTEIN, my friend from California whom I have worked with on a number of pieces of legislation, secured the support of all Members of the Democratic side of the aisle on a piece of legislation which does nothing to ensure that the law will be enforced. Sure, it purports to deal with family separation but basically provides a get-out-of-jail-free card to any adult who illegally crosses the border. In fact, they go from a zero tolerance program by President Trump's administration to a zero enforcement program, thus creating an incentive for people to illegally immigrate across the border and making it almost impossible for law enforcement to enforce our immigration laws. That will continue to be a draw on people from different parts of the world who would love to move to the United States.

We can be sympathetic. We can be concerned. We should do everything within our power to help them so they can live in their own country safely, but we know we simply can't have an open border policy so anybody and everybody who wants to move to the United States can do so. That is why we have exceptions like asylum claims that have to be decided by an immigration judge.

Yesterday, Senator SCHUMER said President Trump alone could fix this situation by signing a Presidential order, but even though the President has stated his decision to do so, I think that is likely not going to be decided finally by the President but rather by the courts when that Executive order is challenged based on the other legal considerations I mentioned a moment ago: the Ninth Circuit decision, a consent decree in the Flores case, and other statutes.

I don't think our friend, the Democratic leader, actually believes President Trump can do this by a flick of a pen, as he said; otherwise, he wouldn't have cosponsored the bill by the Senator from California to address this situation. Why in the world would he propose legislation if he actually sincerely believes the President alone can fix this problem?

The truth is, we in Congress and the President have a shared responsibility and a role to play in addressing this crisis at the border, but the result of the proposal by the Senator from California, embraced and cosponsored by the Democratic leader, is that it makes it impossible to enforce the laws Congress has written when it comes to adults illegally entering the United States when they are accompanied by a child.

We should not be under any illusion that the criminal organizations that facilitate the movement of people from other countries into the United States—they understand these gaps in our laws. That is why they sent tens of thousands of unaccompanied children into the United States in 2014, creating that humanitarian crisis. They know well that because of the gaps in our law that allow adults with children to be treated differently, they are exploiting that for financial gain.

The result of the proposal by the minority leader and our Democratic colleagues means it is impossible to enforce laws that Congress has written. Ending zero tolerance means ignoring the law, and that amounts to ignoring the will of the people who put Members of Congress in office and ending our respect for the rule of law. Ending zero tolerance, as they would seek to do, means tolerating criminal activity. As I mentioned, these are organized criminal organizations—they are sometimes called transnational criminal organizations—and they will trade in anything that makes them money: People, guns, drugs, any sort of contraband we can imagine. Not applying the law to illegal entry does nothing but fuel them and feed their money machine, which is why they continue to do what they do.

The other concern I have with the legislation proposed by our Democratic colleagues, even though they have said only the President can fix it, is that while legislation from the Senator from California does seek to keep families together—a goal we share—it doesn't specify where those families should be held. That is a big problem because when it comes to the safety of these children, we don't want to leave that open to interpretation or misunderstanding. We want to be sure and clear that these families are kept in separate residential housing facilities, away from hardened and potentially violent criminals, but our Democratic colleagues' bill that every single one of the Democrats in the Senate has signed on to doesn't even address that. As I said, in fact, their bill would likely result in many adults entering the United States illegally getting off scot-free because of the no enforcement zone, basically extending within up to 120 miles from the border. Basically, Federal law enforcement authorities, not just the Border Patrol but the FBI, the U.S. attorneys, and others, would be essentially prohibited from prosecuting anybody for violation of our laws.

Now, all of us sat up and paid close attention when former First Lady Laura Bush and the current First Lady Melania Trump expressed their concerns about family separation and called on us to find a better way to answer the current crisis, and I agree with them. In fact, we have gotten off to a pretty good start.

Led by our colleague from North Carolina, some of our colleagues and I, just a few minutes ago, introduced a bill called the Keep Families Together and Enforce the Law Act. The goals of this legislation are pretty straightforward: keep families together in safe, secure facilities while their cases are waiting to be decided by a court.

We set mandatory standards of care for family residential centers to make sure they are hygienic and safe and the sort of place where we can treat people compassionately.

We also authorize 225 new immigration judges because of the huge backlog that makes it hard to handle all the cases that come across the border. We give these families a chance to move to the head of the line to get their cases decided on an expedited basis so that while they are being detained in these safe, secure, family facilities, their cases can be decided quickly. Also, if they are entitled to an immigration benefit like asylum, they could be afforded that on a reasonable timetable and not left in limbo for any longer than absolutely necessary.

Now, I believe, talking to my friend the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, that these are elements of a bill we might be able to agree to, Democrats and Republicans, in order to address the common concerns we have about family separation. Throughout the course of our discussions, though, it has become clear this is something we all believe; that families crossing the border should be kept together. Where we may differ is whether that should also go along with a joint commitment to enforce our immigration laws, but, as I said earlier, this is not an either-or situation. We can keep parents and children together while, at the same time, remaining resolute in enforcing our immigration laws—something I believe we should do.

The Trump administration has said it will not tolerate any violation of those laws and that all offenders will remain on the table for prosecution, but there is no reason for our Democratic colleagues to oppose what I have

laid out. Either we are or we are not a nation of laws, with a government that enforces those laws, or we are a nation with no law and open borders; simply waving through anybody who wants to come into the country at their discretion.

So I would urge all of our colleagues to work together to continue talking about and supporting a bill that represents these shared values. If we come together, we can resolve the situation swiftly and ensure that these children are kept together with their families and, as I said, that they can be expeditiously presented before an immigration judge so they can present any legitimate claim they may have to any immigration benefit. I think that is a commonsense solution to this problem, and I look forward to our colleagues working together to try to solve it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as we know, last week President Trump took what I believe is a historic first step in making America and the whole world more safe, more stable, and more secure. I believe his efforts to end North Korea's nuclear weapons program have already produced tangible results. North Korea has suspended nuclear tests and is dismantling a test facility. They have also committed to recovering and sending home the remains of Americans killed during the Korean war.

Now the Trump administration is taking the next steps. The State Department is hard at work on followup discussions. Secretary of State Pompeo says he may personally return to North Korea before very long.

When we heard from President Trump about his trip to Singapore last week, he was upbeat about the talks. He understands these followup talks are going to be where the specifics really start to be discussed. That is where, as they say, the rubber meets the road. I think the talks have a very real opportunity for success. Success means an agreement that is durable, enforceable, and verifiable. It means an agreement that eliminates all nuclear weapons from North Korea and from the entire Korean Peninsula—nothing less. So I am cautiously optimistic about the talks.

President Trump has applied a program of maximum pressure, and that has brought North Korea to the table. We had a hearing in the Foreign Relations Committee, and the upload from the whole discussion was this: Sanctions work.

The next stage of these negotiations is going to help us understand whether now is the right time, whether the Kim regime is truly ready to give up its nuclear weapons. If it is not ready, the pressure can resume. The pressure can even be increased. The maximum-pressure approach will ultimately work—if not today, then someday.

Meanwhile, the United States is in a very strong negotiating position. We know that as a result of the efforts by President Trump and the strong position we are in, it is something that not just we know but North Korea knows as well. We know exactly what we need to have happen in these talks and exactly what North Korea must do. We are willing to walk away if an agreement falls short. That is how you win a negotiation.

When President Obama negotiated with Iran over their nuclear program, I think he lost sight of that important rule. He wanted a deal so badly that what he was willing to accept was a bad deal. President Trump is a negotiator, and I am confident that he is going to walk away if the only deal to be had is one that is bad for the United States.

I am confident we can reach our goals of a nuclear-free North Korea—today or at some point down the road. I remain very clear-eyed, as does the President, about the possibilities, as well as the pitfalls, and I think we should be clear-eyed and concerned.

The world remains a very dangerous place. Our adversaries, including North Korea, are cunning, opportunistic, and aggressive. We need to be sure we don't lose sight of whom we are dealing with. The Kim regime, going back to his father and grandfather, has a history of appalling attacks on their own people. They have shown no interest in the human rights, political rights, or civil liberties of North Koreans. I think history will judge this family very harshly.

All that said, making the world a safer place and doing what is best for America means we have to deal with other countries as they are. Sometimes it includes sitting down to negotiate with other countries and other leaders who have a terrible record on human rights. The United States must continue to do all we can to force hostile nations back from the brink of war. We must encourage countries to embrace democracy, to abide by the rule of law, and to support the freedoms and rights of all people. As President Kennedy once said, ''Is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights?''

The worst human rights violations imaginable would be a nuclear explosion killing millions of people, some of them instantly, many of them slowly and in agony. President Trump knows that is what these negotiations are about, that the stakes are high, and that Mike Pompeo is the right person for this difficult job. He understands the people he is negotiating with, and he understands the facts on the ground.

During his confirmation hearing to be Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo said an interesting thing about America's place in the world. He said: ''If we don't lead for democracy, for prosperity, and for human rights around the world, who will?'' I think it is clear that the Secretary of State approaches these talks with a clear understanding of what American leadership looks like. He also knows what American strength looks like.

The President hit the ''pause'' button on military exercises scheduled for later this year. He can just as easily restart those exercises. We have 28,000 U.S. troops in South Korea. I have visited some of them who are from my home State of Wyoming. The U.S. Navy is still in the area; they remain ready at a moment's notice.

So America is going to be in a position of strength at every step of these negotiations, whether it is economically, diplomatically, politically, or militarily.

I was critical of President Obama's Iran deal because it was a bad deal, not because ending Iran's nuclear program was a bad idea. I was critical of the Iran deal because it gave up too much in return for too little. It made permanent concessions for temporary return. I was critical because it was done without the support of the American people through their representatives in the Senate. I am confident that President Trump will not make the same mistakes. President Trump has given Kim Jong Un a taste—just a taste—of what it means to be welcomed as one of the peaceful, civilized nations of the world. It is up to Kim whether he wants to remain in this world or whether he wants to return to being an isolated, backward, pariah state, as North Korea has been for so long. It is up to Kim whether he wants to embrace civilized norms of respecting human rights and the freedom of his people. That is his decision to make.

As for the rest of us, we can remain hopeful while still being skeptical. We cannot insist that the talks in North Korea must lead to great breakthrough immediately. Nobody can make a promise like that, and no one can expect that as the only standard for success. What we can expect is that our President will always put the interests of the American people first, whether he is negotiating with our allies or with our adversaries. That is what the American people expect, and I think all of us can rest assured that President Trump will keep that promise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

FAMILY IMPRISONMENT POLICY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, as we await the details of the President's Executive order today, we know enough already to have serious and significant concerns about the continuing policy of this administration in dealing with asylum seekers coming across our borders.

Make no mistake—ending family separation would be a welcomed and humane step, but the solution cannot be the immoral and unlawful detention and imprisonment of children. Family separation cannot be replaced with

family incarceration and imprisonment. Indefinitely imprisoning children and families is still inhumane and ineffective law enforcement.

President Trump's current policy, as articulated in this Executive order, will put children behind bars indefinitely and indiscriminately, and that is intolerable in a free and democratic society. Children will experience much of the same lasting trauma that they do now in the current situation, and the world will continue to watch the spectacle of the American Government locking up innocent children and throwing away the key. Locking up innocent children indiscriminately and indefinitely is a betrayal of American values.

Much like the policy of family separation, this new policy of indefinite and indiscriminate family imprisonment hearkens back to the worst days of our country's history.

Japanese children thrown into World War II-era detention camps were imprisoned with their parents, but the days of history rightly judged that decision harshly, and history will also judge us harshly if we permit an inhumane and immoral policy to be carried out without our protests and opposition. Instead, we must now shame the administration into adopting a humane and moral policy.

This policy threatens to be costly. It will be costly in dollars and cents. The estimate is, approximately, almost $800 per day for every incarcerated person or detained individual. Even more costly will be the undermining of our moral authority and our image around the world and our own sense of offending our basic morality, our image of ourselves, and our sense of our own morality must be offended by imprisoning, indefinitely and indiscriminately, families with their children.

There are alternatives. One is stronger oversight and supervision over families who can be released without danger of flight or physical violence. These programs have been tried, and they have been proven successful. Family case management efforts have produced appearance rates above 90 percent, and those alternatives must be explored instead of detaining and incarcerating, indefinitely and indiscriminately, children with their families.

The world and all of us were repulsed by the images of children separated from their families. Those sights and sounds were searingly painful, but so must be children in cages and behind bars indefinitely, without the basic services and respect for humanity that our great Nation has epitomized.

At the core of the current administration policy is so-called zero tolerance, which results in criminal prosecution of the asylum seekers. The President has recognized the public outrage and yielded to it, but the policy of zero tolerance will continue.

The current approach of detaining and incarcerating these children indefinitely likely violates court orders issued in 1997 and 2016, but indefinite and indiscriminate imprisonment of children and families ought to violate, as well, our rules of morality and humanity.

I urge the administration to explore alternatives, to work with Congress on real reform, to support the legislation that has been supported by every Democrat in this body that would, in effect, avoid imprisonment of immigrant families.

Beyond that legislation, we should pass compassionate and comprehensive immigration reform that provides a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the shadows and improves the due process right so that adjudication is fairer and more effective.

We must shame this administration to do what is right—to end zero tolerance and support changes to our immigration system that represent the best in America, not as the House bills to be voted on today or tomorrow reflect the worst.

We are here on World Refugee Day, appropriately. We ought to acknowledge the remarkable journey of refugees and asylum seekers as they pursue freedom and opportunity over the immense obstacles they encounter. We should recognize their contributions to our country, the talents and energy they bring here. We should recognize the humanitarian importance of refugee resettlement programs nationwide.

Though victims of global conflict come here from all parts of the world, almost all of these refugees are also resilient survivors who embrace their new lives and contribute to their communities, even after these harrowing journeys to the United States. Too often we fail to recognize their contributions to American communities, but today we celebrate all that they offer.

Today, on World Refugee Day, we commemorate that Connecticut, since 2005, has resettled 7,000 refugees—our small State, with 3½ million people from all over the world, particularly in major resettlement cities like Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven.

Today, proudly, I wish to share some of the stories from refugees who have made Connecticut their home and highlight the important work my constituents are doing to support refugees. There are several refugee agencies throughout Connecticut that serve as a key touchstone for these refugees by providing essential case management and employment services. I am proud of these organizations and am grateful for the work they do.

IRIS—Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services—is Connecticut's largest refugee resettlement and immigrant services organization headquartered in New Haven. Volunteers welcome and resettle refugee families in over 35 of Connecticut's towns. Likewise, the Connecticut Institute for Refugees and Immigrants, located in Bridgeport, assists refugees and immigrants in resolving legal, economic, linguistic, and social barriers as they integrate into their communities.

Let me tell you about the journey of Issa, Aminah, and their three children. They resettled in Westville, CT, the night of the 2016 Presidential election. This family fled Syria to Jordan after one of their members was abducted and beaten by the regime. When they arrived in the United States, Issa started working as a parking attendant at a hospital parking garage, and Aminah launched a thriving catering business. Their children are thrilled to attend school again after years of educational disruption caused by their displacement.

Let me tell you about Rafid. He was an electrical engineer in Baghdad who worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during military operations in Iran. After he received death threats from insurgents, he fled with his family to Jordan and then resettled in Connecticut, where he works as a team leader at Schick Manufacturing in Milford. He also started his own subcontracting company, Golden Gate CT, to create jobs for other Connecticut residents. He is truly an entrepreneur in the best sense of that word.

Francis and Evelyne fled persecution in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to resettle in Bridgeport, CT. When they shared their story with my office, they said: ''We understood that the American Dream was alive in each of us if we wished to move forward and work hard.'' Francis and Evelyne certainly embody that American dream.

Connecticut constituents have embraced these refugee families. They have opened their hearts to these individuals and families who are seeking nothing less than the American dream and escape from the trauma of war, the violence of persecution, and the face of oppression. In the face of unimaginable upheaval and horror, they have come to this country and made that journey. I am grateful to them for their courage.

I wish to recognize one of my constituents who has demonstrated equal courage and strength, a Trinity College professor, Janet Bauer. She has dedicated her entire career to welcoming and integrating families. She established the Hartford Global Migration Lab, which connects college students and refugees. Through this program, Janet's students tutor at Jubilee House and help children with their homework at the Hartford Public Library.

Like her, Jean Silk, a coordinator with the Jewish Community Alliance for Refugee Settlement, has also worked with refugees and done immeasurable good. At a time of global conflict, when the horrors of war are all too real every day, the Trump administration has capped refugee resettlement at 45,000 this fiscal year—the lowest in American history. Even with

this cap, the estimate is that the United States will resettle only about 20,000 refugees this year.

Each of these numbers represents an individual human life transformed by coming to this country, given new light and life. I hope the administration will commit to resettling at least 75,000 refugees in fiscal year 2019.

Again, as I close, I want to emphasize the importance of this day, the historic significance of our turning a point and taking advantage of an opportunity to do right and to do better than we have. I urge that colleagues across the aisle join in supporting a policy that stops indefinite and indiscriminate imprisonment of children. It may be with their families, but it recalls the worst chapters in our history when families were detained indiscriminately and indefinitely.

When the judgment of history is made, I hope we will be spared the kind of blame that rightly went to previous generations who made the wrong decision. Let us do what is best for America. Let us exemplify the best in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the 74th anniversary of the GI bill, which we will be celebrating later this week.

Before the Senator from Connecticut leaves the floor, I want to thank him for his comments. I want to follow up briefly on what he has said. As the Presiding Officer knows, and our colleague from Connecticut knows, every Wednesday morning, there is a prayer breakfast. Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and a number of Senators from both sides have breakfast together. One of the Senators talks about their faith and how their faith affects the way they approach their work here, our work here.

Today, I was invited to speak, and I mentioned that sometimes when people say ''What kind of Democrat are you?'' I say I am a Democrat who has read Matthew 25.

People say: What is Matthew 25?

Matthew 25 goes something like this. When I was hungry, did you feed me? When I was naked, did you clothe me? When I was thirsty, did you give me something to drink? When I was sick and imprisoned, did you visit me? When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me?

Every day here, the Chaplain starts our session with a prayer, and we have Bible study groups. I want to take a minute, and I don't expect my friend from Connecticut to stay on the floor, but I want him to hear the beginning of this. I just want to cite a couple of Scriptures. There are one or two in the Old Testament and maybe one or two in the New Testament.

In the Book of Leviticus in the Old Testament, chapter 19, we read these words: ''When a stranger resides with you in your land, you shall not wrong him.''

The next verse, 34, reads: ''You should treat the stranger who sojourns with you as the native among you, and you shall love him [or her] as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt.''

In the New Testament are the words of Jesus. We read in Matthew 18, I think verses 2 through 6: ''He called a little child [meaning Jesus] and placed the child among them.''

Jesus said to them: ''Truly, I tell you, unless you change and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of Heaven. Therefore, whoever takes the lowly position of this child [who was with him that day] is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven. And whoever welcomes one such child in my Name welcomes me.''

Matthew 18:6 reads: ''If anyone causes one of these little ones, those who believe in me, to stumble, it would be better for them to have a large millstone hung around their neck than be drowned in the depths of the sea.''

That is pretty straight talk or, as we used to say in the Navy, the straight skinny. Those are good words from the Old Testament and the New Testament to keep in mind.

Again, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for his words.

74TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL

Mr. President, our colleague from Connecticut, by the way, is somebody who has spent time in uniform. His sons have spent time in uniform, and I think one or two are still serving.

When I came back from Southeast Asia at the end of the Vietnam war, after having been a naval flight officer for a number of years, I was fortunate to have been eligible for the GI bill. The GI bill that I was eligible for was a bill that provided me $250 a month to help pay for my tuition and my expenses at the University of Delaware, where I was in the business school trying to earn an MBA, which I ultimately did.

The benefit for GIs today is not $250 a month. As my colleagues know, whatever the tuition costs are, they are paid for by the GI bill. If you go to a private school or something like that outside of your State, the benefit could be higher. There is a cap on that, but I think it is over $20,000. The expenses for tuition, tutoring, books, and fees are paid for by the GI bill. In Delaware, there is a monthly housing allowance, and there is in every State. The monthly housing allowance in Delaware is $2,000 a month. That compares with those of us who, at the end of the Vietnam war, received $250 a month.

I don't deny or feel bad about the current GIs—sailors, airmen, airwomen. I don't feel bad about their getting a lot more, because it is a good benefit, and it is one that is worth celebrating.

My dad came back from World War II, and my uncle served either in World War II or Korea. I was born after the war was over. Somewhere along the line when I was a little kid, my dad talked about how he got his early training after the war, but I was not old enough to understand what he was talking about. Shortly after the war ended in 1945, he went back to West Virginia.

As best I could figure out, other people took advantage of the GI bill, which was new then. They went to colleges and universities. My recollection is that Frank Lautenberg, who was a Senator for a number of years, went to Harvard. People went to different kinds of colleges and universities and maybe to community colleges.

Apparently, my dad got training not by going to a 2-year school or a 4-year school but by gaining a skill. The skill that he apparently gained was to be able to fix wrecked cars and to do bodywork on those cars. He worked at a place called Burleson Oldsmobile in Beckley, WV. He must have been pretty good at what he did. One day, an insurance adjuster came in from Nationwide Insurance to look at a car that was insured by Nationwide. He talked to my dad for a while.

The insurance agent from Nationwide Insurance said: You sound like a pretty sharp guy. I am surprised that somebody who seems to have as much on the ball as you do is here, fixing wrecked cars. You could do what I do.

My dad asked: Do you mean be a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance?

The fellow said: Yes.

Sure enough, a year later, my dad, apparently, became a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance. He had a high school degree from Shady Spring High School, which is just outside of Beckley. My mom did as well. Neither of them ever went to college. My dad worked for Nationwide for probably 25 years or more—maybe 30 years—in different places around the country. One of his last assignments for Nationwide Insurance, in its home office of Columbus, OH, was to run the training school for Nationwide's insurance adjusters from all over the country.

Here was a guy with a high school degree, who had served in World War II with honor, who had a chance to get a GI bill benefit and turn it into a lifetime opportunity for himself and his family. It enabled my sister and me to go on and finish school. Thanks to the Navy, I got my Navy scholarship and used some money when overseas to help my sister go to school.

The GI bill means a lot to my family, and it does to a lot of families. I think this is a benefit which has been around now for I believe 74 years this Friday. Think about that—three-quarters of a century this Friday. This Friday marks the 74th anniversary of President Franklin Roosevelt's signing of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 into law. This legislation is more commonly known as the GI bill, and we have always called it the GI bill.

Thanks to the GI bill, millions of returning World War II veterans flooded our Nation's colleges and universities,

and it ushered in an era of unprecedented economic expansion. Since 1944, the GI bill has transformed our country and the lives of millions of veterans, including mine. It really helped to create a middle class in this country, as millions of GIs came back and had a chance to learn a skill and go to college in many cases and have economic opportunities for themselves and their families that never before had been possible.

This week, we are recognizing—I think for the first time—the historical significance of the GI bill. We are going to designate the week from June 18 through June 22 as ''National GI Bill Commemoration Week.''

I want to thank several Senators.

I thank Senator SULLIVAN from Alaska—a colonel in the Marine Corps.

As the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I thank JOHNNY ISAKSON and Senator JON TESTER for joining me in submitting the resolution in the Senate to designate June 18 through 22 as ''National GI Bill Commemoration Week.''

I thank House Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ for submitting the same solution in the House of Representatives.

I also thank the American Legion for its hard work in making this resolution a reality and for advocating for veterans and veterans' education benefits in Congress, as have other service organizations, but I think the American Legion was present at the creation and worked very hard right at the creation to make sure that we had a GI bill and that it would survive.

Because this is GI Bill Week, I want to mention just a few reasons some folks refer to the GI bill as the greatest legislation. We have a greatest generation—my parents' generation. They are the folks who grew up in the Great Depression and went on to do amazing things with their lives.

Some have referred to the GI bill as the greatest legislation, and I have already shared my own story today. The GI bill made immediate financial support, education, and home loan programs available. I bought my first home with the GI bill, with VA mortgage-backed insurance. That is how I insured my mortgage. I was able to get the low rate offered in the GI bill. Millions of veterans bought homes with the help of the GI bill. This combination of opportunities changed the social and economic fabric of our country.

A 1988 report from the Joint Economic Committee estimated that for every $1 the United States invested in the GI bill, about $7 was returned in economic growth. Think about that. For every $1 we invested, there was a $7 return in economic growth thanks to the GI bill.

Close to half a million engineers, close to a quarter of a million accountants, close to a quarter of a million teachers, almost 100,000 scientists, about 67,000 doctors, over 120,000 dentists, and thousands of other professionals entered the workforce of the United States. I might add that they are still entering the workforce of the United States.

The GI bill truly democratized our higher education system, established greater citizenship and civic participation, and empowered the ''greatest generation'' to lead our country following World War II.

Over the past 74 years, Congress has enacted subsequent GI bills to provide educational assistance to new generations of veterans, including the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, the Post-Vietnam Era Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1977, the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1984, and most recently the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008, which we voted on and debated here, I think in about my eighth year here in the Senate.

After returning from three tours of duty over in Southeast Asia, as I said earlier, I was fortunate enough to be able to use my Vietnam-era GI bill benefits at the University of Delaware.

I close by saying that Senator YOUNG is on the floor. I think he is going to offer an amendment in just a moment. He is a marine, and I am proud to serve with him. The Marine Corps and the Navy have different uniforms but are on the same team. I salute him for his service.

If you go back to 2008, that was when we were falling into the worst recession since the Great Depression, some of us will recall. These pages up here were about half their current age. They are now about 15 or 16 years old. They were about 8 years old when we were falling into the worst economic hole we had been in since the Great Depression. The unemployment rate for our country, as I recall, reached or exceeded 10 percent. The unemployment rate—I was told by my staff—was higher for veterans. It was higher than 10 percent. I have been told it was significantly higher. That was where we were in 2009—at the bottom of the great recession.

Since that time, a lot of veterans have come home. They have been able to take advantage of the current GI bill, the new GI bill—a very generous GI bill. Do you know what has happened? They have found jobs. They have found economic opportunity. They are doing all kinds of things with the education they have gained at sometimes 4-year colleges with advanced degrees, at 2-year colleges, at trade schools.

The unemployment rate for our country has now dropped to under 4 percent. We are in the ninth year of an economic expansion—the longest running economic expansion in our country's history. While the national unemployment rate is about 3.9 percent, the veterans' unemployment rate is no longer above the national average. It is below. The national average is down to about 3.9, and the veterans' unemployment rate is about 3.4. Again, I think we can say that the GI bill has helped to educate a whole new generation of young men and women. The GI bill is in no small part responsible for that.

I commend my colleague Jim Webb, a former Senator from Virginia, who was the author of the legislation in 2008 that a lot of us supported and voted for.

We are also grateful to those veterans and to the people of this country for having confidence in us in making sure that we could make an investment on their behalf and our behalf.

Later this week, on Friday—people ask, what day is Friday? It will be the 74th anniversary of the GI bill. It is one of the greatest pieces of legislation we have ever passed and enacted in this country. It is the gift that keeps on giving, and it hopefully will continue to do so for a long time.

Mr. President, there are two Senators on the floor who lead the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I ask unanimous consent for Senator YOUNG, who is the author of an amendment that has been offered, to speak for 5 minutes and for Senator TESTER to speak for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his naval service and for his concern for veterans. It is a pleasure to serve with him.

AMENDMENT NO. 2926

Mr. President, as marines, we tend to make interservice jokes when we are in the company of one another, but I know we share a common dedication in making sure our veterans receive the sort of care and support that, of course, they deserve. That is why I rise in support of amendment No. 2926 to the MILCON-VA bill.

Suicide is one of the most serious problems that face our veterans today. According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, ''after adjusting for differences in age and sex, risk for suicide was 22 percent higher among Veterans when compared to U.S. non-Veteran adults.'' That figure is 19 percent higher among male veterans when compared to U.S. non-veteran adult men and 2½ times higher among female veterans.

Our veterans deserve the highest possible quality of care. Mental health care services are a critical component of that effort and are essential to preventing veteran suicides. Congress and the Department of Veterans Affairs has a solemn duty to ensure that programs designed to protect veterans' emotional and mental health are effective.

The Department of Veterans Affairs launched what is now known as the

Veterans Crisis Line in 2011. While we applaud the VA for administering this program, we embrace the fundamental responsibility of Congress to exercise robust oversight of the Veterans Crisis Line to ensure that this program is actually effective and properly supporting at-risk veterans. That is why I joined with Senator DONNELLY and Congressman BANKS to introduce a bill to study the effectiveness of the Veterans Crisis Line and the followup treatment these veterans receive.

Amendment No. 2926 is based on the core elements of the original S. 2174 Veterans Crisis Line Study Act. Studying the Veterans Crisis Line is vital to ensure that it is successful in its mission to save as many veterans as we can, and I ask my colleagues for their support.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Indiana for this amendment. It is a good amendment and is an amendment we need to pass in this body. As Senator YOUNG pointed out, issues around mental health are very prevalent. It is the signature injury coming out of the Middle East. When these folks come back home, our men and women who have served need to have access, especially when they are in crisis. I thank Senator YOUNG.

AMENDMENT NO. 2971

Mr. President, I have a different amendment. This amendment does one simple thing. It stresses the importance of the independence of the Office of the Inspector General at the VA. To be honest, I am not sure we should ever have had to have this amendment, but we do because it is clear the VA is denying access to the Office of Inspector General to get the information it needs to carry out its mission of oversight. Over the past week, there have been a flurry of letters back and forth from the VA to the IG about access to information about the nature of the relationship between the two.

This is what I have to say. The rhetoric coming out of the VA is a bit troubling. Sunlight, bringing information to light, is the best antiseptic for good government. When the IG is doing its job correctly, that is exactly what happens. So with the rhetoric that is coming out of the VA, it opens the door to the VA to be able to control or interfere for political reasons what should be the OIG's independent oversight efforts. I am here to state that the VA is not above the law or exempt from independent oversight. Despite the Acting Secretary directing the inspector general to act like he is his subordinate, he is not. This amendment No. 2971 simply prohibits funds appropriated in this bill to be used in a way that limits the access of the Office of Inspector General to the information or documents it deems necessary to investigate and do the oversight of the VA's work.

As we have seen, the Department cannot be trusted to police itself. It must be held accountable to the veterans and taxpayers, and the Office of Inspector General is an important watchdog that should not be undermined.

I would like to add to the RECORD the cosponsors of this bill: Senators ISAKSON, MURRAY, BLUMENTHAL, HIRONO, MANCHIN, DUCKWORTH, BALDWIN, KING, GILLIBRAND, WARREN, BROWN, MCCASKILL, JONES, DURBIN, and WYDEN.

This is a good amendment. It is a good governance amendment. It is an amendment to allow us, the folks in the Senate, to offer the kind of oversight we need to offer to the VA to make sure it is serving the veterans of this country.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2926

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Young amendment No. 2926.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—96

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Gillibrand | Murray |
| Baldwin | Graham | Nelson |
| Barrasso | Grassley | Paul |
| Bennet | Harris | Perdue |
| Blumenthal | Hassan | Peters |
| Blunt | Hatch | Portman |
| Booker | Heinrich | Reed |
| Boozman | Heitkamp | Risch |
| Brown | Heller | Roberts |
| Burr | Hirono | Rounds |
| Cantwell | Hoeven | Rubio |
| Capito | Hyde-Smith | Sanders |
| Cardin | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Carper | Isakson | Schatz |
| Casey | Johnson | Schumer |
| Cassidy | Jones | Scott |
| Collins | Kaine | Shelby |
| Coons | Kennedy | Smith |
| Cornyn | King | Stabenow |
| Cortez Masto | Klobuchar | Sullivan |
| Cotton | Lankford | Tester |
| Crapo | Leahy | Thune |
| Cruz | Lee | Tillis |
| Daines | Manchin | Toomey |
| Donnelly | Markey | Udall |
| Durbin | McCaskill | Van Hollen |
| Enzi | McConnell | Warner |
| Ernst | Menendez | Warren |
| Feinstein | Merkley | Whitehouse |
| Fischer | Moran | Wicker |
| Flake | Murkowski | Wyden |
| Gardner | Murphy | Young |

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|---|---|
| Corker | McCain |
| Duckworth | Shaheen |

The amendment (No. 2926) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2971

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to Tester amendment No. 2971.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER). and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Leg.]

YEAS—96

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Gillibrand | Murray |
| Baldwin | Graham | Nelson |
| Barrasso | Grassley | Paul |
| Bennet | Harris | Perdue |
| Blumenthal | Hassan | Peters |
| Blunt | Hatch | Portman |
| Booker | Heinrich | Reed |
| Boozman | Heitkamp | Risch |
| Brown | Heller | Roberts |
| Burr | Hirono | Rounds |
| Cantwell | Hoeven | Rubio |
| Capito | Hyde-Smith | Sanders |
| Cardin | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Carper | Isakson | Schatz |
| Casey | Johnson | Schumer |
| Cassidy | Jones | Scott |
| Collins | Kaine | Shelby |
| Coons | Kennedy | Smith |
| Cornyn | King | Stabenow |
| Cortez Masto | Klobuchar | Sullivan |
| Cotton | Lankford | Tester |
| Crapo | Leahy | Thune |
| Cruz | Lee | Tillis |
| Daines | Manchin | Toomey |
| Donnelly | Markey | Udall |
| Durbin | McCaskill | Van Hollen |
| Enzi | McConnell | Warner |
| Ernst | Menendez | Warren |
| Feinstein | Merkley | Whitehouse |
| Fischer | Moran | Wicker |
| Flake | Murkowski | Wyden |
| Gardner | Murphy | Young |

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|---|---|
| Corker | McCain |
| Duckworth | Shaheen |

The amendment (No. 2971) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, first of all, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana, Mr. TESTER, on his amendment in support of the VA's inspector general position. I believe it is critical to ensuring oversight and accountability at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

What this amendment does and the reason I support it is that it ensures that the inspector general's office can fully vet, investigate, and examine the cases presented to them by making certain they have access to the necessary

records and documentation within the Department of Veterans Affairs. To arrive at the truth, the inspector general must have all of the information associated with any given situation to determine what is accurate and who should be held accountable.

Mr. President, I also want to express my pleasure in speaking today in regard to something I have long advocated for, and I compliment the three chairmen and women here in support of the appropriations bills of which they have jurisdiction, but we need regular order, and this return to regular order for consideration of the fiscal year 2019 appropriations process is important to the U.S. Senate. More importantly, it is valuable to the American people and valuable to my constituents home in Kansas.

As a U.S. Senator and a member of the Appropriations Committee, our duty is to fund the Federal Government in a responsible way that will wisely utilize every taxpayer dollar, which requires a deliberation to prioritize Federal spending. I also think, when we can return to regular order, we have greater ability to influence decisions made by Cabinet Secretaries, department heads, bureau chiefs, and agency heads because we can influence decisions they make because of the power of the purse string.

On the appropriations bills we are debating this week, I want to call attention to the MILCON-VA appropriations bill and the great work Senator BOOZMAN and his ranking member, Senator SCHATZ, have achieved as chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee. I am very familiar with their staff, and I compliment them on their work.

This bill provides an additional $1 billion in fiscal year 2019 for the VA to provide veterans access to care in the community, and to avoid any lapse in that care, this bill provides $11 billion in advance appropriations for fiscal year 2020.

The point I am making is, we have worked hard to provide services in the community for veterans who either can't get the service or live such a distance from the VA or, now, because of the new law, when it is in their best interests to have care provided in the community. It is necessary we provide the funding to accomplish that.

We have the opportunity to provide veterans and the VA with appropriations for fiscal year 2019 that builds on the momentum the reform legislation, which just became law, the VA MISSION Act, provides. I want to make sure we do the right things because we want the VA MISSION Act to work.

On June 6, we paid tribute to one of our Nation's heroes who bravely stormed the beaches of Normandy in November of 1944. In addition, 2 weeks ago today, on June 6, Senator BOOZMAN and I, as well as many of our colleagues, were at the White House, where we joined the President as he signed the VA MISSION Act into law.

The VA MISSION Act represents a significant achievement in providing our Nation's veterans with access to the care they are entitled to and that they deserve.

Just as I urged my colleagues to support the VA MISSION Act, I call on my colleagues to support the appropriations for implementation of the reforms contained in this legislation. It is critical we do so to make certain veterans can rely on a community care program that meets their needs and offers access to the care they deserve.

The MISSION Act delivers several critical reforms that the funding provided in this bill will enable the VA to carry out and build on. Particularly helpful for the appropriations process, it requires the Department to submit routine strategic plans to Congress and develop a multiyear budget process to better forecast future needs and requirements. It also mandates market area assessments to better understand what communities and local VAs are able to offer their veterans, allowing the VA and Congress to better identify gaps that require more resources to be filled and prevent redundancy; in other words, to provide the resources where they are needed and to make sure we don't spend them where they are not.

As my colleagues are aware, the VA has faced several budget shortfalls in recent years. We have been on the floor often, and I have spoken about this numerous times. Unfortunately, it has required our attention numerous times. The VA has been unable to estimate how much money they will need to provide care in the community through the Choice Act, and this legislation requires a process by which they can accurately forecast those needs, particularly when it comes to care in the community.

I have long believed that when it comes to the VA, it isn't a lack of funds that is the problem. In fact, we have consistently—and this bill does it again—increased their budget. Instead, it is a problem of how they spend the funds that are appropriated to them, how they manage those funds, and how the Department of Veterans Affairs is led.

I am confident reforms like those included in the MISSION Act will enable the VA to be a better steward of taxpayer funds, while also enabling them to better carry out their mission of providing veterans with the care and benefits they are entitled to through consistent, stable budgeting.

As reforms in the VA MISSION Act and the new community care programs are implemented over the next year, it is important that third-party administrators—administration entities which managed the community care program, Choice, in its old days for the VA—manage a network of community providers that serve veterans. Continuity of care is paramount to the success of VA's community care program, and we must ensure that the VA maintains veterans' access to the care they need by utilizing third-party administrators during the implementation stage of these reforms.

I remind my colleagues that the VA is not ready to manage or operate a health network themselves. Our urgency to fund the Choice Program during repeated shortfalls in the past was, in part, out of the necessity of making certain that network continued to support veterans and those third-party administrators—the services they provide. I do not believe the VA is now capable of building or replicating those networks that currently exist, and I would indicate that, at least in part, the contract with the third-party administrator is terminated on June 30, and we need assurance the Department of Veterans Affairs has a plan to make certain those contracts are extended so that care does not lapse.

This next year must be focused on the implementation of the MISSION Act and readying the VA healthcare system for its transformation. Any distraction from completing this mission is unfair to veterans who will benefit from it and puts the community care program at risk.

Our work on the MISSION Act and a community care program is in jeopardy if the Department of Veterans Affairs declines or is unable to renew contracts to keep the network in place.

We are on the cusp of real reform and transformation at the VA which will benefit veterans and their families for decades to come. I can think of no greater obligation during this year's appropriations process than ensuring veterans, and the programs that serve them, are resourced to deliver the care and benefits they deserve.

I thank the chairman, Senator BOOZMAN, the ranking member, Senator SCHATZ, and their staff for their expertise and their work in making sure the appropriations process lends its support to the MISSION Act—the John McCain MISSION Act—we enacted in the Senate and was signed by the President now just a few short days ago.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the images that we have seen from our own country over the past few days are shocking and heartbreaking. They don't reflect our values as a nation. I am glad the President is reversing course. I am glad that he is signing something, putting a stop to his administration's cruel, pointless, and heartless policy of separating children from their parents at the border. That is just the beginning of the work that needs to be done to undo the damage that the President's policy has inflicted on these children and to begin to create a more human and humane immigration solution.

Any parent can tell you that being separated from a child is one of the worst things you can imagine. We have seen pictures and heard the sounds of crying children—children who are still in diapers. When I first heard that

audio clip—I think all of us remember the first time we heard it—of children who were screaming and crying for their parents, I almost couldn't listen to it.

As an American, as a human being, as a father, as a grandfather, it was revolting. It should be hard to listen to. We should recoil at those terrible sounds. The second it is not heard, the second we shrug our shoulders and do nothing at the sounds of little children who are wailing, that is the second we lose our humanity. It is hard for us to listen to. If it is hard for us to listen to—if it makes us uncomfortable—that is nothing compared to what it must mean, to what it must feel like, and what those parents are going through.

Yesterday, the administration reported that some 2,300 children were taken from their parents at the border in just a single month. Everybody in this body has gone to a school, and probably everybody in this body has gone to a grade school to visit. Remember what it is like to walk down the hall or to walk into a gym or to walk into a classroom and see dozens or even hundreds of children. Think about that. Think of walking into a school and seeing happy children—lots of them, dozens of children—who are singing or talking or playing on a playground.

Now think of these 2,300 children who were taken from their parents at the border in a single month—from May 5 to June 9. For 5 weeks, there were 60 kids taken, every single day, on average. There were 60 kids yesterday, 60 kids the day before, and 60 kids the day before that. We don't know how many since June 9, but from May 5 to June 9, there had been 60 kids every single day.

Clearly, the President did the right thing. Clearly, the President did it under great political pressure. Clearly, the President never admitted he was wrong about it. That is not something he would do, unlike most human beings I know. Yet signing something today doesn't magically reunite those families overnight. It is not like these children now—as any of my colleagues who have watched children who are at a grade school, who will run out to the cars when their moms pick them up or run out to the playground, joyfully, when their dads visit. They will not magically reunite with their families overnight. Signing this order the President signed—oh, so clearly reluctantly—will not undo the trauma those children have endured.

We still don't have good answers as to what has happened to those kids or what kinds of conditions they are living under. We have heard reports of siblings who have been ripped from their parents that they can't hug each other. We have heard of staff being told they are not allowed to comfort these children by touching them and hugging them. Imagine that. A child is taken away from her mother, and you are not even allowed to comfort her. You are just supposed to let her scream. That is inhumane, un-American, and is counter to everything most of us—at least in this body, if not the White House—have been taught.

Dr. Colleen Kraft, the current President of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the past medical director of the Health Network by Cincinnati Children's in my State, warned that the toxic stress resulting from these separations can slow down brain development. She called it ''a form of child abuse.''

Today, I demanded answers from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and from the Secretary of Homeland Security about what they are doing to care for the mental, physical, and emotional well-being of the thousands of traumatized children in their custody.

This chapter isn't closed. You don't just say, ''Thank you, Mr. President, for finally doing the right thing. Everything is fine.'' We have to track those 2,300 children for that month's period. There have been almost 2 weeks since then and more children. We have to find these children, comfort them, and examine them. Pediatricians have warned that this is some kind of child abuse because it can slow down brain development, and these children have already seen horrors that the rest of us can't imagine.

Some of these parents are seeking asylum in America. They are fleeing violence, and they are just looking for a safe place for their children. Who knows how many of these children already were traumatized because they had lived in a war zone, because they had lived in an area with all kinds of violence from drug wars. They were pulled out of that and were traveling with almost nothing but the clothes on their backs and very little, with one or both parents, and went north, not knowing what was going to happen each day and seeing things that almost none of us growing up has seen. Then they were separated from their parents at the border.

The way we keep our country safe is by going after terrorists and violent criminals, not by turning our backs on families and children just like ours, whose only goal is to escape violence and persecution.

We have a lot of work to do to fix our immigration system, but tearing families apart will not solve anything. We need to come together, and we need to work on a bipartisan solution that recognizes we aren't going to deport 13 million people who are already here. We can secure our borders. We can create a pathway for people to earn citizenship if they follow the law, to have a job, and pay taxes.

My son-in-law, Alejandro, lives in Cranston, RI—the boyhood home of our colleague Senator JACK REED. He was 10 years old—maybe 11 years old—when he came to this country. His mother was a journalist. She had her life threatened as a journalist in El Salvador. She fled their country to come to our country. The parents then went to New York. We embrace people like that—who are refugees, whose lives we can save, and who can contribute so much to our country, as Alejandro has and his mother has. His whole family has contributed to this country. He is the father of two of our grandchildren now.

This may be a complicated issue, but we are a country of values that protects people. We are a haven for so many people. We have made a difference in so many lives because of who we are and what our values are. Surely, it is a complicated issue, but the administration has only made it so much worse. It has added the challenge of having to undo the damage it has done in having to work to get those children back to their parents and help to make them whole.

I hope we are seeing the end of this heartlessness. I hope this isn't a one-step pullback by the President, and then there will be more attacks on immigrants and more attacks on children. We have a lot of work to do to pick up the pieces and reunite families. The administration needs to provide answers immediately as to how it is going to make that happen and end the cries of these children with comforting words and much more.

I close with this story.

I had a message on Facebook from an Ohioan. He had heard the tragic story of a 10-year-old with Down syndrome who was reportedly separated from her parents at the border. That is barbaric, but this Ohioan gives me hope. He wrote that he and his wife have a daughter with Down syndrome. They wanted to offer to take in the little girl and her mother and have them stay with their family in Ohio. Imagine that.

Those are the values of Ohioans. Those are the values of North Carolinians. Those are the values of Americans. They are not the President's values, who, because of whatever motive, has separated these families. That encompasses the State and the country I love—this family who wrote to us. I know there are so many more Americans out there who feel the same way—who practice compassion, whose hearts break for these children. It is time for their government to step up and reflect those values of this great country.

Mr. President, yesterday, I met a veteran from Massillon, OH, James Powers. Mr. Powers brought to my attention a problem he was having with the VA's accounting mistakes, and our conversation led to a bill I introduced with Senator TESTER, a Montana Democrat, and Senator BOOZMAN, an Arkansas Republican, the bipartisan Veteran Debt Fairness Act. Both Senators serve with me on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Both Senators know how VA overpayment and debt affect veterans every day.

James retired 2 years ago, but he noticed that the Army was continuing to pay him both an Active-Duty salary

and retirement benefits. James caught the mistake. He did the honorable thing. He notified the VA it was overpaying him, but the VA continued to overpay him. Then it charged him twice to recoup the overpayments, and they garnished his benefits.

The staff in my office worked with the VA to resolve James's issues, but this should never have happened in the first place. It is fixed now. He had to go through that. To his credit, to James's credit, he wanted to make sure his experience, which was uncomfortable—or worse at times—would change policy and affect future veterans so they wouldn't have to go through this, which is why I admire him so much.

This story is too common. In 2016, the VA issued some 200,000 overpayment notices to veterans. When this happens, the agency often tries to get its money back by withholding some or all of the monthly disability payments our veterans have earned. Our veterans deal with enough stress already. They shouldn't be forced to pay for the VA's accounting mistakes.

Our bill would ban the VA from charging veterans for its own mistake in overpayments. It should protect veterans' payments who depend on their benefits by capping the amount the VA can deduct from a veteran's monthly payment at 25 percent. It would ban the VA from collecting debts that are more than 5 years old.

Our veterans sacrifice so much already to serve our country. I am the first Ohioan to ever serve a full term. I have been on this committee now for 12 years, the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am on that committee because we should serve those who serve us. We should protect those who protect us. The veterans shouldn't be paying for the mistakes of the agency that is supposed to serve them.

Unfortunately, our bill was not included in the National Defense Authorization Act last week. Instead, we have an amendment to the MILCON-VA bill to require the VA to track down these overpayments and report to Congress on the scope of VA debt. We will continue to push for the Tester-Boozman bill, but I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense step toward fixing VA overpayment and debt for America's veterans.

I yield the floor.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I have submitted amendment No. 2955 to H.R. 5895 on behalf of Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN. I strongly support the provision's intent to ensure that veterans in New Hampshire receive the best possible care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2910.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Senate amendment No. 2910 to Calendar No. 449, H.R. 5895, an act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Todd Young, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Ben Sasse, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, John Cornyn, Patrick J. Toomey, Pat Roberts, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Mitch McConnell.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the bill H.R. 5895.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 449, H.R. 5895, an act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Todd Young, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Ben Sasse, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, John Cornyn, Patrick J. Toomey, Pat Roberts, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, here is where we are. I filed cloture, but we anticipate that will not actually be necessary and we will be able to vitiate the cloture motions tomorrow because we anticipate being able to process additional amendments throughout the day and wrap the bill up sometime tomorrow afternoon. But there will be an opportunity during the day to continue to process amendments, and we should be able to finish the bill this week without resorting to cloture.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

## VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the June 19, 2018, vote on Senate amendment 2914 to Senate amendment 2910 to H.R. 5895, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019. I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the June 19, 2018, vote on Senate amendment 2920 to Senate amendment 2910 to H.R. 5895, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019. I would have voted yea.

## WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of World Refugee Day and to express my deep concern over the Trump administration's systematic assault on refugees, asylum seekers, and the United States' refugee resettlement program.

Manmade conflict, natural disasters, poverty, and violence have left the world in the midst of the largest refugee crisis in recorded history with over 25 million refugees worldwide. Tragically, less than 1 percent of these individuals will ever be resettled to a third country.

The United States was built on the hopes and dreams of those fleeing persecution and oppression, those seeking better lives for themselves and their families. The values and moral compass that embraced these individuals and shone as a beacon of freedom have made this country great. In times of crisis, the United States traditionally asserted global leadership through these values that have made this country so successful. That leadership served as an important uniting and motivating voice in the face of tremendous international challenges.

Unfortunately, instead of asserting moral and strategic leadership, the Trump administration has chosen to retreat. The President has traded in our proud tradition of lifting up the most vulnerable for an agenda of degrading and insulting those who seek our support. Starting with his assertion that Mexicans are ''rapists'' and ''drug dealers,'' this President has spent his tenure as our Nation's leader attacking America's immigrant and refugee communities. The President said he wanted to protect Dreamers; yet he abruptly ended the DACA program throwing the lives of 800,000 people into great uncertainty. He imposed a slap-dash Muslim ban that has been repeatedly struck down by the courts. He has slowed refugee admissions to a trickle, closing America's doors to some of the most vulnerable people on the planet, reducing America's global leadership standing.

Driven by vitriolic voices, the President and the Attorney General together have worked to effectively destroy the refugee resettlement program, which traditionally received broad bipartisan support. Last September, the President decreed that the number of refugees to be admitted in

fiscal year 2018 should be 45,000—half of the historic average. Even more concerning, it is now clear that this administration is further rigging the admissions program to ensure that only a fraction of that number of people will be allowed in. In the first quarter of 2018, just 6,704 refugees were resettled, compared to 25,671 in 2017 and 13,791 in 2016.

The U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program—and the faith groups, organizations, families and individuals that assist it—supports the most vulnerable. These are the victims of torture, people with urgent medical needs, and desperate women and children. They are not safe in their home country. They have gone through extensive multi-agency vetting before even reaching the United States. We are witnessing the intentional dismantling of a program that has helped the world's most defenseless, built our leadership abroad and here at home helped create thriving, diverse communities across the country, including in places like Camden and Elizabeth in my home State of New Jersey.

Despite its effort to prove the opposite by commissioning a study by the Department of Health and Human Services, the administration's own report found that refugees have had a net positive economic impact in the United States over the past decade. The study concluded that between 2005 and 2014, refugees ''contributed an estimated $269.1 billion in revenues to all levels of government'' and estimated the net positive fiscal impact of refugees over the 10-year period to be $63 billion.

Alarming and horrifically, we have witnessed the administration's callous and misguided approach to migrants and refugees most recently on our southern border. American citizens and people around the world have watched in horror as U.S. officials are forcibly pulling babies and children out of their parents' arms, tearing families apart, and using preposterous defenses for their actions. This is not the United States I know. This is not the United States that has stood as a champion for the rule of law and human rights.

The President has blamed those fleeing persecution. He has blamed Democrats. He has taken no responsibility. His tweets have only gotten more hysterical. His repeated demands for a ridiculous wall are not a solution and only further fuel negative perceptions of the United States.

The party of ''family values'' has become the part of ''family separation.'' This ''policy'' is not required by U.S. law. This is a choice that this administration has made. It was a policy choice to charge asylum seekers in criminal court with illegal entry. In essence, it seems that President Trump and Attorney General Sessions want to turn every asylum seeker into a criminal and every child into a foster child.

It is easy to be distracted by the President's tweets and outlandish statements. The palace intrigue coming from the White House provide endless fodder for the talking heads on TV, but we cannot lose focus on the real harms being done to our fellow human beings and to our global standing.

On this World Refugee Day, let us come together and remember that part what makes America great is our open doors that have welcomed people from all over the world. We have been a shining city on a hill; a beacon of light and hope. Since 2001, the United States has settled nearly a million refugees. They are our friends, our neighbors, our coworkers. They sit next to your kid in school, and someday, they may grow up to be a Secretary of State like Madeleine Albright.

What kind of a country do we want to be? A country where we rip children from their parents? A country that keeps out refugees because of their religion? I have seen a quote posted on Twitter, pasted on signs at rallies, even on a church bulletin board—I don't know who said it first—but it bears repeating here: ''Rather than a wall, America needs to build a giant mirror to reflect on what we've become.''

## FOOD LABELING

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jacob's letter and my response letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SENATOR RUBIO: Approximately a year and half ago I was diagnosed with Celiac, which means that I can only eat gluten free foods.

There are not a lot of things that are labeled gluten free and there should be more. A lot of things right now I have to look up to see if they're gluten free. I have read some articles that explain how every company should label their products. It's also hard to know for sure if something is safe to eat when I go food shopping, out with my friends, and to restaurants. It would be great if the government could find a way to put food labeling on packages consistently.

Thank you for putting your time into this.

Sincerely,

JACOB TANNENBAUM.

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, DC, June 20, 2018.*

Jacob Tannenbaum,
*202 Royal Palm Way,*
*Boca Raton, FL.*

DEAR JACOB: Thank you for your letter regarding food labeling. Hearing from fellow Floridians on issues that affect millions of Americans, including children, is important for me to do my job in the U.S. Senate.

Food allergies are sometimes mild and easily preventable by avoiding consumption of certain foods, while other cases may be life-threatening. With respect to celiac disease, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) estimates that there are approximately 3 million people in the United States, like you, who must refrain from ingesting gluten.

Among its many roles, the FDA is responsible for ensuring the safety of our nation's food supply by enforcing labeling laws and regulations. The Food Allergen Labeling and Consumer Protection Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–282) was enacted to require a list of ingredients that may cause allergic reactions to be included on food labels. Further, the law tasked the Secretary of Health and Human Services to define the term ''gluten-free'' on food labels. The FDA issued its final ''gluten-free'' rule in 2013. Currently, all FDA regulated food products and dietary supplements (including imports from other countries) which bear a ''gluten-free'' label must comply with the agency's 2013 voluntary labeling law. Under the rule, ''gluten-free'' means a food is either naturally gluten-free, is not constituted from gluten-containing grains, is constituted from gluten-containing grains that have been processed to remove gluten, or has an ''unavoidable presence'' of gluten of not more than 20 parts per million.

With the prevalence of food allergies impacting millions across our nation, the federal government plays an important role in enforcing voluntary labeling requirements, based on sound science, to ensure consumer safety and confidence. National, uniform, voluntary labeling standards establish consistency for businesses engaged in interstate commerce, while providing necessary protections for consumers to make safe choices when selecting what food products to purchase and eat. Mandatory labeling, however, could pose significant burdens on industry and produce confusion for consumers with a multitude of labels for every food allergy recognized by the federal government on each product.

I understand your concerns that it may be difficult at times to determine what is safe to eat. The good news is that we live in a country blessed with a plethora of food options, and a market that responds quickly to consumer needs and demands. This evolving market, in concert with federal standards for voluntary labeling, means that it will only get easier for all Americans to find the ingredient and nutrition you need to make safe and smart choices in the future.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve you as your United States Senator, and I commend you for bringing awareness to this important issue.

Sincerely,

MARCO RUBIO,
*U.S. Senator.*

## TAX REFORM

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, as you may know, I voted in favor of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that became law last year. Every day we are learning more about the positive impact this law is having on the economy and about average Americans having more money in their paychecks. While it is important to appreciate the effects that the tax law had on individuals, we should not forget that small businesses have benefited from the law as well. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I supported the legislation because I believed it would allow small business owners to invest in their businesses, increase overall economic growth, and reduce taxes for the millions of small businesses who employ the majority of Americans in every part of the country. I also saw the potential that the legislation would have, not just to give an economic boost to small businesses in my home State of Idaho, but to spark renewed confidence from small businesses across the country. A couple of weeks ago, I began this series of speeches to bring attention to small businesses that have benefited from this law.

While there are many stories about small businesses benefitting from tax reform, I rise today to talk about Dempsey Wood Products in Orangeburg, SC. Dempsey Wood Products offers a wide variety of high-quality pine and hardwood products to its customers. The company serves many different industries with kiln-dried lumber for the housing industry, pallet stock for pallet manufacturers, debarked chips for the paper industry,

mulch for landscapers, and sawdust for alternative fuel use. The company employs about 80 to 100 workers and has an extensive sawmill and dry kiln operation. Ronny Dempsey started the company in 1988 and has spent all of his life around the lumber industry. His father, Charles Parker Dempsey, worked in various sawmills over the course of his career and eventually was the co-owner of a sawmill that he later sold. Today Parker Dempsey, a third-generation sawmill operator, has taken over as president, though his father, Ronny, is still by his side as vice president of the company.

This family-owned small business has already benefitted greatly from the tax law that was passed last year. They have announced plans to upgrade their sawmill, purchase a new dry kiln, and invest in a new planer mill over the next 5 years. They expect the capital expenditure to total $7 million and estimate that they could add a second shift in the near future, thereby creating new jobs in the Orangeburg community. These investments were viable for the company due to the accelerated depreciation provisions contained in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. This section of the law allows companies to deduct the value of any new equipment purchased in a single year, instead of over several years. Tax reform has had a material impact on small businesses like Dempsey Wood Products and their employees. Overall, the new law has increased small businesses' confidence, employee bonuses and wages, while lowering taxes and spurring new capital investment.

## TRIBUTE TO ALAN L. GUNN

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today, Senator CRAPO and I recognize and congratulate Mr. Alan L. Gunn on his upcoming retirement from the U.S. Department of Energy after more than 40 years of distinguished service in various roles at the U.S. Navy and U.S. Department of Energy.

In 1980, Mr. Gunn received a bachelor of science degree from Mississippi State University and went on to complete graduate work in business administration at Louisiana State University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, State University of New York at Albany, and Idaho State University.

In February 1982, Mr. Gunn completed the Navy officer candidate school as a distinguished military graduate and was commissioned as a Navy officer. He was selected for duty in the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program and served as both a member of the staff of the Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion program in Washington, DC, and as a field representative for the director in Schenectady, NY, and Idaho Falls, ID.

In 1996, Mr. Gunn completed the College of Naval Warfare program in residence at the U.S. Naval War College, Newport, RI, and received a master of arts degree in national security and strategic studies.

Since the completion of his Active-Duty service, Mr. Gunn has served as a civilian with the U.S. Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration in numerous leadership and management positions with the Office of Naval Reactors in Washington, DC, the Idaho branch office of Naval Reactors, the Naval Reactors Laboratory field office, and the Idaho operations office.

In 2007, after completing over 28 years of Active and Reserve military service, Mr. Gunn retired as a captain in the U.S. Navy.

Most recently, Mr. Gunn served as the principal deputy manager for Nuclear Energy and served as the assistant manager for programs and facilities at the Department of Energy's Idaho Operations Office, DOE-ID. In his current capacity, he provides exceptional leadership for DOE-ID's nuclear programs and Idaho facilities management divisions, national security programs, the Radiological and Environmental Science Laboratory, and the Office of Project Management project.

Mr. Gunn's organization is responsible for oversight of the Idaho National Laboratory, INL, and other contractor performance on nuclear energy, education, national security, and other research and development projects and programs, including strategic partnership projects and the INL laboratory directed research and development programs; as well as facility and infrastructure operations, maintenance, planning, and other activities associated with facility and infrastructure operations at the INL. Mr. Gunn also provides direct support to the specific manufacturing capability, SMC, project that includes the oversight of the maintenance and operations of the SMC facilities, as well as the programmatic oversight of the armor production.

Through his years of dedicated service, Mr. Gunn exemplifies the best qualities of Idaho. Senator CRAPO and I want to thank Alan for his service and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

## TRIBUTE TO DENNIS E. FRYE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a dedicated public servant and proud student of West Virginian and American history, Dennis E. Frye, on the occasion of his retirement from the National Park Service. Innumerable visitors to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park benefited from his wealth of knowledge and notorious performances that brought history to life.

As Dennis tells it, at a young age, he wanted to be either a historian or an astronaut. Once he found out that becoming an astronaut entails being very good at math, he decided history was the way to go. He studied at what was then Shepherd College in Shepherdstown, WV, while volunteering at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, becoming a park ranger in 1977. Eschewing the traditional route of advancement in the National Park Service through moving from park to park, Dennis stayed put and advanced within the park, and set about the task of changing perceptions of Harpers Ferry in the Civil War history community.

As staff historian and later chief historian at the park and through his work in various historical societies concerned with the Civil War, Dennis emphasized the importance of Harpers Ferry to the history of the Civil War. Thanks, in large part, to his efforts, the Battle of Harpers Ferry and the importance of the town in the history of America are better recognized by the historical community, of which he is a vocal member. Indeed, Dennis's dedication to his passion as an advocate and student of history is apparent from the 10-year sabbatical he took to focus on writing historical works and to serve as president of the Civil War Trust, an organization dedicated to the preservation of Civil War battlefields. He is also a recipient of the Shelby Foote Award from the Civil War Trust, the National Park Service's Freeman Tilden Award for excellence in interpretation and education, and the Nevins-Freeman Award for outstanding contributions to the study of the Civil War.

Dennis later returned as chief historian of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, where his work of inspiring and educating visitors, including my staff and myself, through meticulous detail and dramatic performances continued to the present day. If the job of a historian is to both impart knowledge and ensure the lessons of history remain with us, then Dennis Frye is a master in his field.

No one who knows him doubts that Dennis E. Frye will continue to be a forceful advocate for his passions in retirement, which includes being an ardent fan of the Boston Red Sox. I believe I speak for many when I say that I sincerely appreciate his public service and the contributions he has made to a better understanding of the history of West Virginia and America. I am proud to call him a friend, and I wish him well in his future pursuits.

# ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## TRIBUTE TO ROCKY BARKER

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Rocky Barker for his extensive career as an Idaho journalist.

Rocky is retiring from the Idaho Statesman where he worked as an environmental reporter-blogger-columnist for the past 22 years. Prior to his position at the Statesman, Rocky was a columnist and correspondent-at-large for the Post Register in Idaho Falls. He has also written and contributed to numerous books, created an Idaho news website, and received many awards and recognitions for his reporting.

Over his more than 30-year career, Rocky has reported comprehensively

on issues that matter deeply to Idaho. He has dug into pressing and often controversial issues, including reporting on water, public lands, fish and wildlife habitat, fires, and other related matters that no doubt have required considerable resolve. Throughout, his devotion to reporting and his deep respect for the importance of a free press to our system of governance has remained unwavering.

Congratulations, Rocky, on your years of writing. ''Litera scripta manet,'' meaning the written word endures, is among the inscriptions in the Library of Congress. You can go onto the next chapter of your career and life knowing that you have been an important part of taking down that written word for our great State for decades. Thank you for your devotion to and deep personal interest in chronicling issues that matter greatly for Idahoans. I wish you and your wife, Tina, all the best in your retirement and much happiness in the years ahead.●

## 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GORHAM SAVINGS BANK

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of Gorham Savings Bank, a notable leader of financial services and community engagement in southern Maine. As the only bank headquartered in Cumberland County, Gorham Savings Bank's impressive, locally based economic focus allows the institution to serve as a source of strength for the community.

Founded in February of 1868, Gorham Savings Bank was established by the Maine State Legislature under its first president, Captain Toppan Robie. A few weeks later, the bank began business when the first deposit of 10 cents was made. Over the years, the bank has expanded to multiple locations across southern Maine, incorporating new financial services to meet the expanding needs of its customers. In 1998, during my time as Governor, I attended the opening of the bank's operations center in Gorham, ME, and hosted the ribbon-cutting ceremony. Across its branch locations, Gorham Savings Bank provides a variety of banking services to its customers, including resources for personal and business accounts. Through online banking services, customers have the tools they need to manage their money at their convenience. Today, Gorham Savings Bank has surpassed the $1 billion mark in assets, and last year, the bank began the restoration of the historic Grand Trunk Railway Company Building in Portland, ME, as a new office space. With over 200 employees across 13 locations, the community bank is an important employer in the region.

In addition to serving their customers, Gorham Savings Bank supports the prosperity and growth of the surrounding communities. First, the bank promotes a number of financial literacy programs, including ones for tax preparation and another geared towards high school students. In the education field, Gorham Savings Bank participates in job-shadowing programs and contributes to scholarship opportunities for individuals looking to further their education. Gorham Savings Bank also supports the growth of local business and hosts an annual Launchpad small business competition, where five Maine entrepreneurial businesses compete for $50,000 for business development. Thanks to the teamwork of the bank's employees, Gorham Savings Bank has led efforts to fundraise for nonprofit organizations, including the Boys and Girls Club and United Way.

I applaud Gorham Savings Bank on their achievements over the past 150 years and look forward to their continued success as a force for good for the State of Maine.●

## REMEMBERING ANDREW RAMOTNIK

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I commemorate the life of Andrew Ramotnik, a retired veteran from Jacksonville, FL, who recently passed away.

Andy Ramotnik grew up in Pennsylvania coal country. Two weeks after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, at the age of 18, he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps. In 1943, after basic and radio operator training, he was assigned to a B–25 medium bomber squadron based in the north African desert.

On his 43rd bombing mission, Andy's bomber was shot down over Italy, and he was captured. Andy was a prisoner of war in Stalag 17B for 19 months in Austria. In April 1945, he escaped, was recaptured, and escaped a second time. For 13 days, Andy and a fellow POW evaded capture. He was evading the enemy when the war ended in May 1945 and had to find his way to friendly troops. Andy met up with American troops and was granted leave and returned to service. After his return, Andy received a letter from the War Department and a check compensating him $1 for every day he was a POW. The check was for $554.

It was the rest of the letter that led to my knowing Andy and his incredible story. While the check he received was for $554, Andy had actually been a POW for 567 days. However, for 13 of those days, Andy was evading capture while hiding from the Germans in the Austrian countryside. The Army does not pay soldiers when they are evading capture, so the Army docked Andy $13 for the days he had escaped.

Now, Andy did not need the $13. It was not the money but rather the principle. He had done what was expected of him and what was prescribed in the Armed Services Code of Conduct. He had escaped, and the Army was docking him for it. So when I met Andy more than 60 years later, he still had that $13 on his mind. He told me his story of the bombing missions, of his plane being shot down, and the struggle to get the door open so he and another soldier could parachute out. He told me about the POW camp, hiding in a cave during his first escape, and hiding at an Austrian farm during his second. He also told me how foolish he thought it was that the Army docked his pay for doing what he was supposed to do.

My office looked into it. Unfortunately, it is a longstanding policy not to pay soldiers evading capture and an issue not easily remedied. Unfortunately, we could not get Andy his $13.

So, with his passing, I would like to recognize the life of Andy Ramotnik and thank him for his service. On principle, I think we still owe him $13. It is a small cost to pay for an 18-year-old boy standing up to help stop the spread of tyranny and preserving the free world.●

## TRIBUTE TO JAHA DUKUREH

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jaha Dukureh for her Nobel Peace Prize nomination.

A recent graduate of the University of Central Florida, Jaha was named one of TIME magazine's ''100 Most Influential People in the World'' in 2016 and has been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize this year for her work to end female genital mutilation, FMG. She was born in The Gambia, a small west African country, and was subjected to female genital mutilation when she was just one week old.

A documentary produced by the Guardian called ''The Girl Who Said No to FGM'' was made about her story. It details how her identity was stripped again when she was forced into an arranged marriage at the age of 15 in New York City and was cut for a second time.

Since beginning her activism, Jaha helped usher in the ban of female genital mutilation in The Gambia. It is estimated that, by the age of 14, nearly 56 percent of girls in The Gambia were subjected to FMG. She is also the first person to have been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize from The Gambia.

Jaha earned her bachelor's degree in business administration management at Georgia Southwestern State University in 2013. She graduated with her master's degree in nonprofit management from the University of Central Florida in 2018.

I am honored to express my sincere gratitude to Jaha for her extraordinary leadership to end this horror and look forward to hearing of her continued work in the years to come.●

## TRIBUTE TO DONALD ESLINGER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Donald Eslinger, the former Seminole County sheriff, for his induction into the Law Enforcement Officers' Hall of Fame.

Sheriff Eslinger's law enforcement career began in 1978 as a radio dispatcher for the department. He subsequently rose through the ranks, leading in various roles at the department

until his appointment as sheriff in 1991 and election to the position the next year. He served the community as sheriff for 25 years, retiring in 2017. Throughout his tenure, Sheriff Eslinger focused on mental health advocacy, crime reduction, and is responsible for the Kids House, Shop with the Sheriff, and Christmas Village programs.

Sheriff Eslinger was nominated by law enforcement leaders to be inducted into the Florida Law Enforcement Officer' Hall of Fame. His induction was approved by Governor Rick Scott and the State cabinet. At his induction ceremony, Sheriff Eslinger noted protecting the most vulnerable in the community was at the core of the Seminole County Sheriff's Office under his leadership.

Sheriff Eslinger earned his bachelor's degree from National Louis University and graduated from the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy in Virginia. He and his wife, Elise, have four children.

I express my sincere gratitude to Sheriff Eslinger for his dedication to serving the community with the Seminole County Sheriff's Office, and I wish him the very best in his retirement.●

## TRIBUTE TO THOMAS PATTERSON MANEY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Judge Thomas Patterson Maney, who has served his Nation honorably and is retiring.

Judge Maney served our Nation in the Army Reserve for almost 37 years, including 8 years of Active Duty, serving in Panama, Haiti, Bosnia, and Afghanistan. As a major and lieutenant colonel, he worked with the military group at the U.S. Embassy in Panama, training the Guardia Nacional/Panama Defense Force in civil affairs and civic action. He commanded a reserve civil affairs brigade in Maryland, as well as the 350th Civil Affairs Command in Pensacola, and later served as the deputy commander of the Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations Command and deputy commandant of the John F. Kennedy Special Operations School at Fort Bragg. He is the recipient of the Purple Heart and retired as an Army brigadier general in 2007.

Judge Maney was appointed Okaloosa County court judge by Governor Bob Martinez and assumed the bench on June 5, 1989. He was elected to the position in 1990 and was subsequently reelected each time he was on the ballot. During his time as a circuit court judge, he served as a juvenile dependency judge, child support judge, and served as the Baker Act/Marchman Act judge for nearly a decade. Judge Maney shares his passion and expertise of the law with colleagues across the district and the State of Florida, delivering educational presentations for the Conference of County Court Judges and the Advanced Judicial College. He also started the Okaloosa Mental Health Court and the Okaloosa Veterans Treatment Court. The act establishing the Okaloosa Veterans Treatment Court was named the T. Patt Maney Veterans Treatment Court Act in his honor.

Judge Maney was born in Lexington, KY, and is a graduate of the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville College of Law, Troy State University, and the Army War College. He has been married to his wife, Caroline, for almost 47 years, and they have two daughters and six grandchildren. He is also a member of the Sons of the American Revolution.

I thank Judge Maney for a lifetime of devotion to serving our Nation both overseas and on the bench. I extend my best wishes to him and his family on his well-earned retirement.●

## TRIBUTE TO JAMES WEIR

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Mr. James Weir with respect for his service and accomplishments as he turns 93 years old this month. Jim, as his friends refer to him, or Pap-pap, as he is known by his family, grew up in Mount Pleasant, PA, not far from Pittsburgh. Inducted into the U.S. Navy on August of 1943, Jim went to war on behalf of this Nation, fighting in Europe and Asia. On June 6, 1944, Coxswain Weir crossed the English Channel aboard a LCT(A) to deliver tanks and troops onto the beaches of Normandy. After the battle was won in Europe, Jim fought in the liberation of the Philippines and was stationed in Japan as part of the occupational forces after the war.

In between those pivotal moments, Jim received a 20-day leave after D-Day. He rushed back to the States to marry his sweetheart, Laverne Myers. They had been sweethearts since he had sat behind her in sixth grade, but Laverne was only 17 and Jim's leave was short. He loved Laverne, and she loved him. They quickly left Pennsylvania for Alabama, where they tied the knot before he had to return to the war. They remained in love for 73 years of marriage.

After the war, he worked as a master electrician and was a renowned Corvette racer, leading the national Corvette club as its president. Jim now lives in Miami, FL, where he has two granddaughters and six great-grandchildren who love him dearly.

In honor of his 93rd birthday, for his service to our great Nation and his love for his family and community, I would like to recognize my friend Jim Weir and look forward to seeing him on his 94th birthday this time next year.●

## TRIBUTE TO STEVE FORRESTER

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I want to honor longtime Oregon journalist Steve Forrester.

Steve has retired as editor and publisher of the Daily Astorian. He will remain president and chief executive officer of the EO Media Group, which owns the Astorian, as well as several other newspapers, including publications in eastern Oregon, but we will no longer benefit from his day-to-day leadership at the Astorian.

I have known Steve for nearly 40 years, since he was a reporter in Washington, DC, and I was a young Member of the House. In all that time, Steve has never hesitated to ask the tough questions and to be fiercely devoted to local journalism's principles and importance. The theme running consistently throughout Steve's career has been always to ensure local readers understand the impact of decisions and policies made in Congress, the statehouse, and city hall.

I particularly wanted to honor Steve today because, over the Fourth of July recess, I will be home in Oregon highlighting the foundational freedoms of the First Amendment with events celebrating those freedoms of religion, speech, assembly, and the press.

The Founding Fathers knew those First Amendment freedoms were core to our country and to creating the values that have made America a destination for all who hunger to be free of fear and liberated to pursue their dreams. As the child of parents who fled the Nazis for refuge in the United States, I learned early on about the importance of these freedoms. As the son of a reporter, I also learned especially about the importance of the freedom of the press.

Because Steve has contributed so much to a vibrant and free press in our great State of Oregon, I will be proud to present him on July 1, in Astoria, with a ''Go Fourth'' award. Steve's career makes him richly deserving of this award and an inspiration for Oregon journalists for generations to come.

I suspect Steve will exercise his self-deprecating modesty and question why he is worthy of such attention. I know Steve would much rather shine the spotlight on others, but the bottom line is I want Oregon to recognize his enormous and long-lasting contributions to making our State a better place to live and to making all of us as Oregonians better-informed citizens.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3192. An act to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to ensure access to mental health services for children under the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4005. An act to promote State innovations to ease transitions to the community for individuals who are inmates of a public institution and eligible for medical assistance under the Medicaid program.

H.R. 4627. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize expenditures to combat emerging terrorist threats, including vehicular attacks, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4991. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5590. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for an action plan on recommendations for changes under Medicare and Medicaid to prevent opioids addictions and enhance access to medication-assisted treatment, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5605. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an opioid use disorder treatment demonstration program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5676. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the suspension of payments by Medicare prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans pending investigations of credible allegations of fraud by pharmacies.

H.R. 5687. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require improved packaging and disposal methods with respect to certain drugs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5723. An act to require the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission to report on opioid payment, adverse incentives, and data under the Medicare program.

H.R. 5762. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize a Joint Task Force to enhance integration of the Department of Homeland Security's border security operations to detect, interdict, disrupt, and prevent narcotics, such as fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, from entering the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5773. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require electronic prior authorization for covered part D drugs and to provide for other program integrity measures under parts C and D of the Medicare program.

H.R. 5774. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidance on pain management and opioid use disorder prevention for hospitals receiving payment under part A of the Medicare program, provide for opioid quality measures development, and provide for a technical expert panel on reducing surgical setting opioid use and data collection on perioperative opioid use, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5775. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage plans and part D prescription drug plans to include information on the risks associated with opioids, coverage of certain nonopioid treatments used to treat pain, and on the safe disposal of prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5796. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide grants for eligible entities to provide technical assistance to outlier prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5801. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for requirements under the Medicaid program relating to the use of qualified prescription drug monitoring programs and prescribing certain controlled substances.

H.R. 5811. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to postapproval study requirements for certain controlled substances, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6042. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6110. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the review and adjustment of payments under the Medicare outpatient prospective payment system to avoid financial incentives to use opioids instead of non-opioid alternative treatments, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3192. An act to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to ensure access to mental health services for children under the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4005. An act to promote State innovations to ease transitions to the community for individuals who are inmates of a public institution and eligible for medical assistance under the Medicaid program to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4627. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize expenditures to combat emerging terrorist threats, including vehicular attacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4991. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5590. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for an action plan on recommendations for changes under Medicare and Medicaid to prevent opioids addictions and enhance access to medication-assisted treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5605. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an opioid use disorder treatment demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5676. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the suspension of payments by Medicare prescription drug plans and MA–PD plans pending investigations of credible allegations of fraud by pharmacies; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5687. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require improved packaging and disposal methods with respect to certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5723. An act to require the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission to report on opioid payment, adverse incentives, and data under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5762. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize a Joint Task Force to enhance integration of the Department of Homeland Security's border security operations to detect, interdict, disrupt, and prevent narcotics, such as fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, from entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5773. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require electronic prior authorization for covered part D drugs and to provide for other program integrity measures under parts C and D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5774. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidance on pain management and opioid use disorder prevention for hospitals receiving payment under part A of the Medicare program, provide for opioid quality measures development, and provide for a technical expert panel on reducing surgical setting opioid use and data collection on perioperative opioid use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5775. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage plans and part D prescription drug plans to include information on the risks associated with opioids, coverage of certain nonopioid treatments used to treat pain, and on the safe disposal of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5796. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide grants for eligible entities to provide technical assistance to outlier prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5801. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for requirements under the Medicaid program relating to the use of qualified prescription drug monitoring programs and prescribing certain controlled substances; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5811. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to postapproval study requirements for certain controlled substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 6042. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 6110. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the review and adjustment of payments under the Medicare outpatient prospective payment system to avoid financial incentives to use opioids instead of non-opioid alternative treatments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 3093. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the protective custody of alien children accompanied by parents, and for other purposes.

S. 3100. A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2019'' (Rept. No. 115–280).

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3092. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide certain requirements relating to commitments by State agencies to provide the State share of the administrative costs of administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3093. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the protective custody of alien children accompanied by parents, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3094. A bill to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3095. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help build a stronger health care workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 3096. A bill to allow the Coast Guard to issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel OLIVER HAZARD PERRY, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 3097. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to report on tax compliance with respect to non-employer business income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HYDE–SMITH:

S. 3098. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the sources of the authority to issue regulations regarding certifications and other criteria applicable to legislative branch employees under the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3099. A bill to require the review of durations of use of approved indications of medically-important antibiotics labeled for use in animals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3100. A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington; read the first time.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 3101. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to require a State to conduct State leadership activities that reduce or eliminate out-of-pocket expenses related to enrollment in a career and technical education course or dual or concurrent enrollment program for students in special populations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 552. A resolution commemorating June 20, 2018, as ''World Refugee Day'' ; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. Res. 553. A resolution designating June 20, 2018, as ''American Eagle Day'' and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 554. A resolution designating the month of June 2018 as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month'' and June 27, 2018, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. Res. 555. A resolution recognizing the freedom of Muslims of the United States to exercise their religion and participate in the civil systems of their country; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 26

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 26, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 700

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 802, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot program for providing portable benefits to eligible workers, and for other purposes.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in

recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1520

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes.

S. 1835

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1835, a bill to provide support to States to establish invisible high-risk pool or reinsurance programs.

S. 1903

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1903, a bill to assist communities affected by stranded nuclear waste, and for other purposes.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2072, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take action to eliminate human exposure to asbestos, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2131

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2157

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2157, a bill to require drug manufacturers to disclose the prices of prescription drugs in any direct-to-consumer advertising and marketing to practitioners of a drug.

S. 2165

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2165, a bill to provide additional disaster recovery assistance for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

S. 2221

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2221, a bill to repeal the multi-State plan program.

S. 2360

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes.

S. 2410

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2410, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit high deductible health plans to provide chronic disease prevention services to plan enrollees prior to satisfying their plan deductible.

S. 2432

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2432, a bill to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

S. 2463

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2463, a bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 2513

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to improve school safety and mental health services.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2736, a bill to develop a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region, and for other purposes.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2830

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2830, a bill to reauthorize the rural emergency medical services training and equipment assistance program under section 330J of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2938

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2938, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify provisions relating to hours of service requirements with respect to transportation of livestock and insects, and for other purposes.

S. 2995

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2995, a bill to establish the Rural Export Center, and for other purposes.

S. 3051

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3051, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricultural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes.

S. 3091

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3091, a bill to limit the separation of families seeking asylum in the United States and expedite the asylum process for individuals arriving in the United States with children.

S. RES. 477

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 477, a resolution recognizing and celebrating the National Comedy Center being built at 203–217 West Second Street, Jamestown, New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 2551

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2551 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2927

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2927 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2929

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added

as cosponsors of amendment No. 2929 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2954

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2954 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2971

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2971 proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2972

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2972 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2978

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2978 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2986

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2986 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2999

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2999 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3003

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3003 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3095. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help build a stronger health care workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senator BLUNT in reintroducing the Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act.

According to the Association of American Medical Colleges, by 2030, there will be a shortage of up to 120,000 physicians. Over one third of the shortage, up to 49,300, will be in primary care. Individuals and families living in underserved areas—urban and rural—will continue to be those most disadvantaged by this shortage.

The passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2010 ushered in an expansion of access to health insurance for millions of Americans. While we fight to protect these gains and work to improve the system further, many Americans are going to the doctor for preventive health care for the first time. In order for this to be successful, we must expand our health care workforce to ensure that we have enough health care professionals to seamlessly accommodate the newly insured as they join the ranks of those who already have coverage. In addition, as the baby boomers age, we will need health care professionals to care for them as well. According to the Pew Research Center, roughly 10,000 baby boomers will become eligible for Medicare every day through 2030.

The Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act would authorize programs that would grow the overall number of health care providers, as well as encourage providers to pursue careers in geographic and practice areas of highest need.

Building on the success of the National Health Service Corp (NHSC) Scholarship and Loan Repayment Program and the State Loan Repayment Program, our legislation would establish a State scholarship program. Like the NHSC State Loan Repayment Program, States would be able to receive a dollar-for-dollar match to support individuals that commit to practicing in the state in which the scholarship was issued after completing their education and training. At least 50 percent of the funding would be required to support individuals committed to pursuing careers in primary care. The States would have the flexibility to use the remaining 50 percent to fund scholarships to educate students in other health care professions with documented shortages with the approval of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act would also authorize grants to medical schools to develop primary care mentors on faculty and in the community. According to the Association of American Medical Colleges, graduating medical students consistently say that one of the most important factors affecting the career path they choose is role models. Building a network of primary care mentors in the classroom and in a variety of clinical settings will help guide more medical students into careers in primary care.

The legislation would couple these mentorship grants with an initiative to improve the education and training offered by medical schools in competencies most critical to primary care, including patient-centered medical homes, primary and behavioral health integration, and team-based care.

It would also direct the Institute of Medicine (IOM) to study and make recommendations about ways to limit the administrative burden on providers in documenting cognitive services delivered to patients. Primary care providers treat patients in need of these services almost exclusively, and as such, spend a significant percentage of their day documenting care. That is not the case for providers who perform procedures, such as surgeries. This IOM study would help uncover ways to simplify documentation requirements, particularly for delivering cognitive services, in order to eliminate one of the potential factors that may discourage medical students from pursuing careers in primary care.

Providers across the spectrum of care recognize that this bipartisan legislation is part of the solution to addressing the looming health care workforce shortage and have lent their support, including: the Alliance for Specialty Medicine, the American Association of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, the American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine, the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, the American Osteopathic Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the Society of General Internal Medicine.

I look forward to working with these and other stakeholders as well as Senator BLUNT and our colleagues to pass the Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act in order to help ensure patients have access to the health care they need.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 552—COMMEMORATING JUNE 20, 2018, AS ''WORLD REFUGEE DAY''

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE,

Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 552

Whereas World Refugee Day acknowledges the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children forced to flee their homes because of persecution or conflict;

Whereas, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—

(1) a refugee is an individual who faces persecution or has a well-founded fear of persecution because of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group;

(2) more than 68,500,000 people are displaced worldwide, which is the worst displacement crisis in global history, including 25,400,000 refugees, more than 40,000,000 internally displaced people, 3,100,000 asylum seekers, and 10,000,000 stateless people;

(3) children comprise 52 percent of the global refugee population, many of whom lack access to education;

(4) on average, 44,400 people per day are displaced from their homes;

(5) 16,200,000 individuals were newly displaced due to conflict or persecution in 2017, including 11,800,000 internally displaced persons and 4,400,000 refugees and asylum seekers;

(6) more than 68 percent of all refugees worldwide come from the following 5 countries:

(A) Syria, with 6,300,000 refugees;

(B) Afghanistan, with 2,600,000 refugees;

(C) South Sudan, with 2,400,000 refugees;

(D) Myanmar, with 1,200,000 refugees; and

(E) Somalia, with 986,400 refugees;

(7) 37 countries resettled 102,800 refugees, less than 1 percent of people in need of resettlement, in 2017;

(8) more than ½ of the Syrian population was displaced, either across borders or within the country, in 2016; and

(9) the need for third country resettlement continues to grow, with over 1,200,000 refugees requiring resettlement in 2017;

Whereas, during 2017, the United States welcomed a total of 33,400 refugees, well below the United States Government goal of 45,000 refugee admissions, and a 65 percent drop compared with the 96,900 refugees welcomed in 2016;

Whereas, at this pace, the United States may only admit approximately 20,000 refugees this year;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted travelers to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in-person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas refugees contribute to local economies in the United States, pay an average of $21,000 more in taxes than they receive in benefits, revitalize cities and towns by offsetting population decline, and boost economic growth throughout the United States by opening businesses, paying taxes, and buying homes;

Whereas several industries rely heavily on refugee workers to support economic stability, and low rates of refugee arrival has impacted economic growth, especially in towns that rely on refugee populations to revitalize their industries;

Whereas the ongoing crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is projected to produce nearly 1,000,000 refugees in neighboring countries in 2018;

Whereas the escalating crisis in Venezuela has forced 1,500,000 refugees to seek safety in neighboring countries and beyond since 2014;

Whereas refugee children are 5 times more likely not to be in school than non-refugee children;

Whereas refugee women and children are often at greater risk of violence, human trafficking, exploitation, and gender-based violence; and

Whereas the United States resettlement program is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which strengthens global security, advances United States foreign policy goals, and alleviates the burden placed on front-line host countries: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) underscores the importance of the United States Refugee Resettlement Program as a critical tool for the United States global leadership, including leveraging foreign policy, strengthening national and regional security, and encouraging international support of refugees;

(2) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees, including the education of refugee children and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, or torture in search of freedom and safety;

(3) recognizes individuals who have risked their lives working individually and for nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, such as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to provide life-saving assistance and protection for people displaced by conflict around the world; and

(4) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to uphold its international leadership role responding to the global refugee crisis with humanitarian assistance and protection for the most vulnerable;

(B) to continue to provide adequate funding for refugee resettlement in the United States and protection for refugees overseas;

(C) to work in partnership with the international community to find solutions to existing conflicts and to prevent new conflicts;

(D) to alleviate the burden on frontline refugee host countries that absorb the majority of the refugees of the world through humanitarian and development support; and

(E) to reaffirm the long-standing tradition of resettling refugees in the United States regardless of nationality or religion.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 553—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2018, AS ''AMERICAN EAGLE DAY'' AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 553

Whereas the bald eagle was chosen as the central image of the Great Seal of the United States on June 20, 1782, by the Founding Fathers at the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is widely known as the living national symbol of the United States and for many generations has represented values, such as—

(1) freedom;

(2) democracy;

(3) courage;

(4) strength;

(5) spirit;

(6) independence;

(7) justice; and

(8) excellence;

Whereas the bald eagle is unique to North America and cannot be found naturally in any other part of the world, which was one of the primary reasons the Founding Fathers selected the bald eagle to symbolize the Government of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the official logos of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

(1) the Executive Office of the President;

(2) Congress;

(3) the Supreme Court of the United States;

(4) the Department of Defense;

(5) the Department of the Treasury;

(6) the Department of Justice;

(7) the Department of State;

(8) the Department of Commerce;

(9) the Department of Homeland Security;

(10) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(11) the Department of Labor;

(12) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(13) the Department of Energy;

(14) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(15) the Central Intelligence Agency; and

(16) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas the image and symbolism of the bald eagle has—

(1) played a significant role in art, music, literature, architecture, commerce, education, and culture in the United States; and

(2) appeared on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the bald eagle was endangered and facing possible extinction in the lower 48 States but has made a gradual and encouraging comeback to the land, waterways, and skies of the United States;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the national bird of the United States is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example to other environmental, natural resource, and wildlife conservation efforts worldwide;

Whereas, in 1940, noting that the bald eagle was threatened with extinction, Congress passed the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the ''Bald Eagle Protection Act'') (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), which prohibited killing, selling, or possessing the species, and a 1962 amendment expanded protection to the golden eagle;

Whereas, by 1963, there were only an estimated 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remaining in the lower 48 States, with loss of habitat, poaching, and the use of pesticides and other environmental contaminants contributing to the near demise of the national bird of the United States;

Whereas, in 1967, the bald eagle was officially declared an endangered species under Public Law 89–669 (80 Stat. 926) (commonly known as the ''Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966'') in areas in the United States south of the 40th parallel due to the dramatic decline in the population of the bald eagle in the lower 48 States;

Whereas the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) was enacted in 1973, and in 1978, the bald eagle was listed as an endangered species throughout the lower 48 States, except in the States of Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, in which the bald eagle was listed as a threatened species;

Whereas, in July 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced that in

the lower 48 States, the bald eagle had recovered sufficiently to change the status of the species from endangered to threatened;

Whereas, by 2007, bald eagles residing in the lower 48 States had rebounded to approximately 11,000 pairs;

Whereas, on June 28, 2007, the Secretary the Interior and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service removed the bald eagle from protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but the bald eagle continues to be protected under the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the ''Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act'') (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Lacey Act''), and the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.);

Whereas Challenger, the trained, educational bald eagle of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee, was invited by the Secretary of the Interior to perform a free-flight demonstration during the official bald eagle delisting ceremony held at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas experts and population growth charts estimate that the bald eagle population could reach 15,000 pairs, even though a physical count has not been conducted by State and Federal wildlife agencies since 2007;

Whereas caring and concerned agencies, corporations, organizations, and people of the United States representing Federal and State governments and the private sector passionately and resourcefully banded together, determined to save and protect the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the recovery of the bald eagle population in the United States was largely accomplished through—

(1) the dedicated and vigilant efforts of Federal and State wildlife agencies and nonprofit organizations, such as the American Eagle Foundation;

(2) public education;

(3) captive breeding and release programs;

(4) hacking and release programs; and

(5) the translocation of bald eagles from places in the United States with dense bald eagle populations to suitable locations in the lower 48 States that had suffered a decrease in bald eagle populations;

Whereas various nonprofit organizations, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, contribute to the continuing recovery of the bald eagle through rehabilitation and educational efforts;

Whereas the bald eagle might have been lost permanently if not for dedicated conservation efforts and strict protection laws such as—

(1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(2) the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the ''Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act'') (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.) ;

(3) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(4) section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Lacey Act''); and

(5) the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.); and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle population will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs to ensure that the population numbers and habitat of the bald eagle remain healthy and secure for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2018, as ''American Eagle Day'';

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury to generate critical funds for the protection of the bald eagle; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 554—DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF JUNE 2018 AS ''NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH'' AND JUNE 27, 2018, AS ''NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY''

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 554

Whereas the brave men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States (in this preamble referred to as the ''Armed Forces''), who proudly serve the United States, risk their lives to protect the freedom of the people of the United States and deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas more than 3,000,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed overseas since the events of September 11, 2001, and have served in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the current generation of military men and women has sustained a historically high rate of operational deployments, with many members of the Armed Forces serving overseas multiple times, placing those members at high risk of experiencing combat stress;

Whereas, when left untreated, exposure to traumatic combat stress can lead to post-traumatic stress, sometimes referred to as post-traumatic stress disorder (in this preamble referred to as ''PTSD'') or post-traumatic stress injury;

Whereas men and women of the Armed Forces and veterans who served before September 11, 2001, remain at risk for post-traumatic stress;

Whereas the Secretary of Veterans Affairs reports that—

(1) about 11 to 20 percent of veterans who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom have PTSD in a given year;

(2) about 12 percent of Gulf War veterans have PTSD in a given year; and

(3) about 30 percent of Vietnam veterans have had PTSD in their lifetimes;

Whereas many combat stress injuries remain unreported, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about post-traumatic stress and the persistent stigma associated with mental health conditions;

Whereas exposure to military trauma can lead to post-traumatic stress;

Whereas post-traumatic stress significantly increases the risk of anxiety, depression, suicide, homelessness, and drug- and alcohol-related disorders and deaths, especially if left untreated;

Whereas public perceptions of post-traumatic stress or other mental health disorders create unique challenges for veterans seeking employment;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and Veteran Service Organizations, as well as the larger medical community, both private and public, have made significant advances in the identification, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of post-traumatic stress and the symptoms of post-traumatic stress, but many challenges remain;

Whereas increased understanding of post-traumatic stress can help eliminate the stigma attached to this mental health issue;

Whereas additional efforts are needed to find further ways to eliminate the stigma associated with post-traumatic stress, including—

(1) an examination of how post-traumatic stress is discussed in the United States; and

(2) a recognition that post-traumatic stress is a common injury that is treatable and repairable;

Whereas post-traumatic stress can result from any number of stressors other than combat, including rape, sexual assault, battery, torture, confinement, child abuse, car accidents, train wrecks, plane crashes, bombings, or natural disasters, and affects approximately 8,000,000 adults in the United States annually;

Whereas the diagnosis now known as PTSD was first defined by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980 to commonly and more accurately understand and treat veterans who had endured severe traumatic combat stress;

Whereas combat stress had previously been viewed as a mental illness, and the word ''disorder'' carries a stigma that perpetuates this misconception; and

Whereas the designation of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day will raise public awareness about issues related to post-traumatic stress, reduce the associated stigma, and help ensure that those individuals suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2018 as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month'' and June 27, 2018, as ''National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day'';

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense, as well as the entire medical community, to educate members of the Armed Forces of the United States, veterans, the families of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and veterans, and the public about the causes, symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress;

(3) supports efforts by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to foster cultural change around the issue of post-traumatic stress, understanding that personal interactions can save lives and advance treatment;

(4) welcomes the efforts of the National Center for PTSD of the Department of Veterans Affairs and local Vet Centers (as defined in section 1712A(h) of title 38, United

States Code) to provide assistance to veterans who are suffering from the effects of this injury;

(5) encourages commanders of the Armed Forces of the United States to support appropriate treatment of men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States who suffer from post-traumatic stress; and

(6) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 555—RECOGNIZING THE FREEDOM OF MUSLIMS OF THE UNITED STATES TO EXERCISE THEIR RELIGION AND PARTICIPATE IN THE CIVIL SYSTEMS OF THEIR COUNTRY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 555

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees religious freedom to people of all faiths;

Whereas article VI of the Constitution of the United States asserts that no religious test may be required for public office, ensuring that people of all faiths may serve their country;

Whereas the United States has always valued the right of individuals to practice their faith as they please, and religious freedom is fundamental to the national character of the United States;

Whereas people of the United States of all faiths, including Muslims, both immigrant and native-born and from a variety of races and ethnicities, have made valuable contributions to the United States throughout its history;

Whereas more than 3,000,000 Muslims now reside in the United States;

Whereas Muslims have served in the Armed Forces of the United States for generations, with more than 5,000 Muslims currently serving and many having made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States;

Whereas Muslim scientists and researchers in the United States have helped expand the understanding of medicine, engineering, and outer space;

Whereas Muslim inventors in the United States have made breakthroughs ranging from brain tumor treatments to the creation of the ice cream cone;

Whereas Muslim athletes have represented the United States in the Olympics and in most professional sports leagues;

Whereas Muslim entrepreneurs and business leaders in the United States have helped shape industries including financial services, food, transportation, cosmetics, and furniture;

Whereas countless Muslims contribute to the economy and well-being of the United States as business owners, firefighters, police officers, physicians, laborers, service workers, and teachers; and

Whereas Muslims have served as Members of Congress, Ambassadors of the United States, and other types of public servants: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate recognizes the religious freedom of Muslims of the United States and their civic contributions to the United States.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3005. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3006. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3007. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3008. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3009. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3010. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3011. Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3012. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3013. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3014. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3015. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3016. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3017. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3018. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3019. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3020. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3021. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3022. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3023. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3024. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3025. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3026. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3027. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3028. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3029. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3030. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3031. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3032. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3033. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3034. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3035. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3036. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3037. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3038. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3039. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3040. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3041. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. ENZI)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 770, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

SA 3042. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3043. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3044. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3045. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3046. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3047. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3048. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 3005.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2____. Any amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for bonuses for individuals in Senior Executive Service positions (as defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code) at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs that have a one-star rating shall instead be used to conduct background check adjudication actions for employees of the Veterans Health Administration.

**SA 3006.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 50, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 51, line 4.

Beginning on page 51, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 53, line 2.

**SA 3007.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 29, line 19.

**SA 3008.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III in division A, add the following:

SEC. 3____. No funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, may be used by the Secretary of Energy to develop or manage any training or workforce development program for the growth of the energy efficiency or clean energy sectors.

**SA 3009.** Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 3____. Section 136(a)(5) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013(a)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''designed to carry'' and inserting the following: ''designed—

''(A) to carry''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) to carry at least 28 seated passengers and that achieves not less than a 22 miles-per-gallon equivalent at a model bus testing program, while operating as a fully electric vehicle.''.

**SA 3010.** Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 18, strike ''$2,161,000,000'' and insert ''$2,165,000,000''.

On page 5, line 3, strike the period at the end and insert the following: '': *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $12,000,000 shall be for the navigation program of the Corps of Engineers under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577).''

On page 8, line 3, strike ''$193,000,000'' and insert ''$189,000,000''.

**SA 3011.** Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, line 22, insert '', and, in recognition that there is growing evidence that plastic straws contribute to the 8,000,000 tons of plastic that enter the oceans every year while not contributing significantly to the beverage consumption experience, not more than $5,000 that shall be used by the Architect of the Capitol to work with contractors to eliminate or reduce the use of plastic straws in facilities of the legislative branch that are under the care of the Architect of the Capitol'' before ''; for''.

**SA 3012.** Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2____. The Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall conduct an investigation of all nursing homes of the Department of Veterans Affairs that had an overall one-star rating as of December 31, 2017, as determined by the rating system of the Department.

**SA 3013.** Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

**SEC. 2____. PUBLICATION OF QUALITY RATING OF NURSING HOMES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs the rating assigned by the Department to each nursing home of the Department with respect to quality of care, including all internal metrics and criteria used in determining such rating.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

**SA 3014.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a civil works project of the Corps of Engineers authorized by Congress if that construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair does not provide an open, competitive process that considers both domestic and international supplies of iron and steel products used in the project.

**SA 3015.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV of division C, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act for Overseas Contingency Operations and none of such funds that remain available after fiscal year 2019 may be used for the European Deterrence Initiative after fiscal year 2019.

**SA 3016.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, strike lines 3 through 9.

**SA 3017.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 5____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the advanced technology vehicles manufacturing incentive program established under section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013).

**SA 3018.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, add the following:

SEC. 3____. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to provide financial assistance under section 363 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6323).

**SA 3019.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in Division A, insert the following:

SEC. 5____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on analysis contained in—

(1) the document entitled ''Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) the document entitled ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) the notice published by the Council on Environmental Quality entitled ''Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews'' (79 Fed. Reg. 77802 (December 24, 2014));

(4) the document entitled ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) the document entitled ''Addendum to Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) the document entitled ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

**SA 3020.** Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, line 7, insert '': *Provided*, that the Director shall use not less than $500,000 of the amount made available under this heading for (1) improving technical systems, processes, and models for the purpose of improving the transparency of estimates of budgetary effects to Members of Congress, employees of Members of Congress, and the public, and (2) to increase the availability of models, economic assumptions, and data and the replicability of estimates of budgetary effects for Members of Congress, employees of Members of Congress, and the public'' before the period.

**SA 3021.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in Division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The final rule issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army entitled ''Clean Water Rule: Definition of 'Waters of the United States' '' (80 Fed. Reg. 37054 (June 29, 2015)) is void.

(b) Until such time as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army issue a final rule after the date of enactment of this Act defining the scope of waters protected under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and that final rule goes into effect, any regulation or policy revised under, or otherwise affected as a result of, the rule voided by this section shall be applied as if the voided rule had not been issued.

**SA 3022.** Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. 1____. (a) In the case of the funds made available under the heading ''CONSTRUCTION'' that are in excess of the budget request submitted to Congress by the President and are for the continuation of construction of projects that principally include improvements to rainfall drainage systems that address flood damages, the funds shall be equally distributed among all eligible projects.

(b) In this section, the term ''eligible project'' means a project—

(1) that principally includes improvements to rainfall drainage systems that address flood damages; and

(2) for which construction has begun or can continue.

**SA 3023.** Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 305. (a) The amount appropriated by this title under the heading ''DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION'' under the heading ''NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'' under the heading ''ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES'' is hereby increased by $65,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be allocated to developing and preparing to implement a comprehensive, long-term monitoring and verification program for activities related to the denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea, in coordination with relevant international partners and organizations.

(b) The amount appropriated by this title under the heading ''WEAPONS ACTIVITIES'' under the heading ''NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'' under the heading ''ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES'' is hereby reduced by $65,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be derived from amounts allocated to the W76–2 warhead modification program.

---

**SA 3024.** Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

**SEC. _____. PILOT PROGRAM TO EXTEND PAVEMENT LIFE.**

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Army may, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Energy, carry out a pilot program to design, build, and test technologies and innovative pavement materials in order to extend the service life of military roads and runways.

(b) SCOPE.—The pilot program authorized by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The design, test and assembly of technologies and systems suitable for pavement applications.

(2) Research, development, and testing of new pavement materials for road and runway use in different geographic areas in the United States.

(3) Design and procurement of platforms and equipment to test performance, cost, feasibility, and effectiveness.

(c) COMPETITION REQUIREMENTS.—Any award of a contract or grant under the pilot program authorized by subsection (a) shall be made using merit-based selection procedures.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the commencement of the pilot program, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the pilot program.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the effectiveness of activities under the pilot program in improving the service life of military roads and runways.

(B) An analysis of potential lifetime cost-savings associated with the extended service life of the runways and roads as well as potential reduction in energy demands.

(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authorities under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2024.

---

**SA 3025.** Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 103, line 18, of division C, strike the period at the end and insert the following: ''*Provided further*, that of the funds made available under this heading, $3,500,000 shall be for the planning, design, and architect and engineer services for the strategic dispersal of the United States capital fleet.''.

---

**SA 3026.** Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 103, line 18, of division C, strike the period at the end and insert the following: ''*Provided further*, that of the funds made available under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be for the incremental funding of force protection measures.''.

---

**SA 3027.** Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V of division A, add the following:

SEC. 5_____. None of the funds made available by this division or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to issue any order pursuant to section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4511) or section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(c)) that requires any entity—

(1) to purchase electric energy based on the fuel used to generate the electric energy; or

(2) to generate or sell electric energy unless the electric energy is required to meet an existing or imminent shortage of electric energy and the demand for electric energy cannot otherwise be met.

---

**SA 3028.** Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

**SEC. 2____. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON FURNISHING DENTAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS IN RURAL AND OTHER UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a demonstration program to assess the feasibility and advisability of furnishing dental health care services, including through the use of alternative dental health care providers, to increase access to such services for eligible veterans who reside in rural and other underserved communities.

(b) LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the demonstration program in not more than four rural States, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize the establishment of programs under the demonstration program under this section in States that do not have a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that offers on-site dental services.

(c) ELIGIBLE VETERANS.—A veteran is eligible for dental health care services under the demonstration program under this section if—

(1) the veteran is entitled to dental health care services from the Department; or

(2) the veteran is enrolled in the system of patient enrollment of the Department under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, but is not eligible for dental health care services from the Department under authorities other than this section.

(d) TELEHEALTH.—For purposes of alternative dental health care providers and other dental care providers who are licensed to provide clinical care, dental services provided under the demonstration program under this section may be administered by such providers through telehealth-enabled collaboration and supervision when appropriate and feasible.

(e) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Of the amounts made available to the Veterans Health Administration in this title, $20,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the demonstration program under this section.

(f) ALTERNATIVE DENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''alternative dental health care providers'' has the meaning given that term in section 340G–1(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256g–1(a)(2)).

---

**SA 3029.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

**SEC. _____. AUTOMATIC ANNUAL INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.**

(a) INDEXING TO SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES.—Section 5312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) Whenever there is an increase in benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) as a result of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)), the Secretary shall, effective on the date of such increase in benefit amounts, increase the dollar amounts in effect for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation by the Secretary, as specified in paragraph (2), as such amounts were in effect immediately before the date of such increase in benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act, by the same percentage as the percentage by which such benefit amounts are increased.

''(2) The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to paragraph (1) are the following:

''(A) COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1114 of this title.

''(B) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1115(1) of this title.

''(C) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1162 of this title.

''(D) NEW DIC RATES.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1311(a) of this title.

''(E) OLD DIC RATES.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1311(a)(3) of this title.

''(F) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES WITH MINOR CHILDREN.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1311(b) of this title.

''(G) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR DISABILITY.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under subsections (c) and (d) of section 1311 of this title.

''(H) DIC FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of this title.

''(3) Whenever there is an increase under paragraph (1) in amounts in effect for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation, the Secretary shall publish such amounts, as increased pursuant to such paragraph, in the Federal Register at the same time as the material required by section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) is published by reason of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (d) of section 5312 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

---

**SA 3030.** Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2____. It is the sense of Congress that none of the funds made available in this Act should be used in a manner that would increase wait times for veterans who seek care at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

---

**SA 3031.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV of division C, insert the following:

SEC. ____. It is the sense of the Senate that beginning in fiscal year 2020, the European Deterrence Initiative should be funded only from funds made available for base or discretionary spending of the Department of Defense instead of funds made available for Overseas Contingency Operations.

---

**SA 3032.** Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

**SEC. _____. LIMITATION ON CONVERSION OF FUNDS FOR PROGRAM TO IMPROVE RETENTION OF HOUSING BY FORMERLY HOMELESS VETERANS AND VETERANS AT RISK OF BECOMING HOMELESS.**

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not convert any of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in a fiscal year to carry out section 2013 of title 38, United States Code, from a specific purpose program to a general purpose program unless the Secretary included a proposal to do so in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs budget for such fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President for such fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code).

---

**SA 3033.** Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

**SEC. _____. STAFFING OF PROGRAM MANAGERS FOR SUPPORTED HOUSING PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) STAFFING.—Section 2003(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary''; and

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

''(2) The Secretary shall provide case management support whenever requested by a local housing authority under the supported housing program administered under such section.

''(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall ensure that in each fiscal year no case manager is concurrently assigned to more than 35 veterans under this subsection.

''(B) The Secretary may waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) for a particular case manager in a particular fiscal year as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(C) Not less frequently than once each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the waivers made by the Secretary under subparagraph (B) in the previous fiscal year. Each report shall include a description of the circumstances under which each waiver was made.

''(4) The Secretary shall ensure that each veteran to whom a case manager is assigned under this subsection is located within such distance of the case manager as the Secretary considers reasonable.

''(5)(A) In any case in which a position within the Veterans Health Administration for a case manager described in paragraph (1) is vacant for a period of 180 days or more, the Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with a local service provider with knowledge and expertise applicable to a case manager in such position to furnish the case management services that would otherwise be provided by a case manager in such position.

''(B) The requirement in subparagraph (A) to seek to enter into a contract shall cease to apply if the Secretary fills the vacancy referred to in such subparagraph.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON CONVERSION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not convert any of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in a fiscal year to carry out section 2013 of such title from a specific purpose program to a general purpose program unless the Secretary included a proposal to do so in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs budget for such fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President for such fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code).

---

**SA 3034.** Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I of division C, add the following:

SEC. _____. (a) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2019, the Secretary of Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the results of a review, conducted by the Secretary for purposes of the report, of the analytical model used for strategic basing of KC–46 aircraft.

(b) PARTICULAR ELEMENT.—The report shall include such recommendations of the Secretary for the analytical model as the Secretary considers appropriate in order to ensure that the model addresses changes in refueling requirements along the Northern Tier of the United States as a result of the 2018 National Defense Strategy and associated mobility capability requirements, including, in particular, in connection with the growth of activities in the Northern Polar region by global and regional powers.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The requirement for a report under this section may not be construed as limiting the ability of the Air Force to make any future adjustment to the analytical model used for strategic basing of KC–46 aircraft or to any of the criteria in the analytical model.

---

**SA 3035.** Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended to execute any organizational change in the Department of Energy that would—

(1) limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy over the National Nuclear Security Administration, unless the Secretary has determined the organizational change to be in the public interest; or

(2) make the General Counsel of the National Nuclear Security Administration independent of the General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

---

**SA 3036.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making

appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, line 5, insert ''$10,000,000 shall be for activities related to the development of regulatory infrastructure for advanced nuclear technologies,'' after ''mission,''.

---

**SA 3037.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 503 of title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 5____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the amount available under the heading ''NUCLEAR ENERGY'' under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ENERGY PROGRAMS'' under title III shall be $1,196,000,000, of which not more than $292,000,000 shall be for research and development relating to reactor concepts; and

(2) the amount available under the heading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'' under the heading ''INDEPENDENT AGENCIES'' under title IV shall be $908,350,000, of which not less than $10,000,000 shall be for activities related to the development of regulatory infrastructure for advanced nuclear technologies, except that the amounts reserved for such development under this paragraph shall not be derived from fee revenues, notwithstanding section 6101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2214).

---

**SA 3038.** Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

**SEC. _____. REPORT ON CELL SITE SIMULATORS DETECTED NEAR FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a full accounting of cell site simulators detected near facilities of the Department of Defense during the three year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act and the actions taken by the Secretary to protect personnel of the Department, their families, and facilities of the Department from foreign powers using such technology to conduct surveillance.

---

**SA 3039.** Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

RELOCATION EXPENSES

SEC. 131. (a) Any amounts made available for salaries and expenses of the Congressional Budget Office that are authorized to be used to reimburse new employees of the Congressional Budget Office for relocation expenses shall only be available for such purposes if the Joint Committee on Taxation has been authorized to reimburse new employees of the Joint Committee on Taxation for relocation expenses.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2019 and each succeeding fiscal year.

---

**SA 3040.** Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

SEC. 121. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the Joint Committee on Taxation serves as a critical resource to Members of Congress on tax policy and legislation, providing expertise and technical knowledge on a nonpartisan basis;

(2) the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office both provide revenue estimates of legislation, and thus compete for many of the same candidates; and

(3) the professional staff of economists with a doctoral degree, attorneys, and accountants of the Joint Committee on Taxation should be recognized for their expertise and placed on a level playing field with the employees of the Congressional Budget Office.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office should be treated the same for purposes of compensation limitations and any other relevant matters pertaining to personnel.

---

**SA 3041.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. ENZI)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 770, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 6, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 8, line 5, and insert the following:

''(A) ORDER OF ISSUANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The coins issued under this subsection commemorating either an innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each State, the District of Columbia, or a territory shall be issued in the following order:

''(I) STATE.—With respect to each State, the coins shall be issued in the order in which the States ratified the Constitution of the United States or were admitted into the Union, as the case may be.

''(II) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND TERRITORIES.—After all coins are issued under subclause (I), the coins shall be issued for the District of Columbia and the territories in the following order: the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(ii) APPLICATION IN EVENT OF THE ADMISSION OF ADDITIONAL STATES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), if any additional State is admitted into the Union before the end of the 14-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a $1 coin with respect to the additional State in accordance with clause (i)(I).

''(iii) APPLICATION IN THE EVENT OF INDEPENDENCE OR ADDING OF A TERRITORY.—Notwithstanding clause (i)—

''(I) if any territory becomes independent or otherwise ceases to be a territory of the United States before $1 coins are minted pursuant to this subsection, the subsection shall cease to apply with respect to such territory; and

''(II) if any new territory is added to the United States, $1 coins shall be issued for such territories in the order in which the new the territories are added, beginning after the $1 coin is issued for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(B) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING FOUR INNOVATIONS OR INNOVATORS DURING EACH OF 14 YEARS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Four $1 coin designs as described in this subsection shall be issued during each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1) until 1 coin featuring 1 innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each of the States, the District of Columbia, and territories has been issued.

''(ii) NUMBER OF COINS OF EACH DESIGN.—The Secretary shall prescribe, on the basis of such factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the number of $1 coins that shall be issued with each of the designs selected for each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1).

---

**SA 3042.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 30_____. Pursuant to section 1807 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–575; 106 Stat. 4672), section 3(d)(1) of Public Law 106–392 (114 Stat. 1604), section 601(b) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act (43 U.S.C. 1551(b)), and section 15 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the ''Colorado River Storage Project Act'') (43 U.S.C. 620n) of the offsetting collections in the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund of the Western Area Power Administration for repayment of capital costs, $23,000,000 may be transferred to the Upper Colorado Basin Fund.

---

**SA 3043.** Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

**SA 3044.** Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

**SA 3045.** Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

**SA 3046.** Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(i) WEST VALLEY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—All high-level radioactive waste at the Western New York Service Center in West Valley, New York, from the project carried out under the West Valley Demonstration Project Act (42 U.S.C. 2021a note; Public Law 96–368) shall be considered to have resulted from atomic energy defense activities—

(1) for purposes of section 8 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10107); but

(2) not for purposes of—

(A) section 3(a)(3) of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plan Land Withdrawal Act (Public Law 102–579; 106 Stat. 4779); or

(B) section 213 of the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Authorization Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–164; 93 Stat. 1265).

**SA 3047.** Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 18, strike ''$2,161,000,000'' and insert ''$2,250,000,000''.

On page 5, line 3, strike ''law.'' and insert the following: ''law: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $89,000,000 shall be for dredging projects.''.

On page 22, line 23, strike ''$2,322,000,000'' and insert ''$2,144,000,000''.

On page 22, line 25, strike ''direction.'' and insert the following: ''direction: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, $37,000,000 shall be available for bioenergy technologies.''.

**SA 3048.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division A, add the following:

SEC. 2____. (a) Section 206(c)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (43 U.S.C. 620 note; Public Law 113–235) is amended by striking ''2018.'' and inserting the following: ''2022: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall not fund pilot projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin without the participation of the Upper Colorado River Division States, acting through the Upper Colorado River Commission.''.

(b) Section 9504(e) of the Secure Water Act of 2009 (42 U.S.C. 10364(e)) is amended by striking ''$450,000,000'' and inserting ''$480,000,000''.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Combating money laundering and other forms of illicit finance: How organizations launder money and innovative techniques for fighting them.''

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Geoffrey Adam Starks, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, and Peter A. Feldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nomination: William Charles McIntosh, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Administrator, and Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Current and Proposed Tariff actions administered by the Department of Commerce.''

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''USAID Resources and Redesign.''

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Medicaid fraud and Overpayments: Problems and Solutions.''

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Keep What you Catch: Promoting Traditional Subsistence Activities in Native Communities.''

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, and Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Roy Kalman Altman, and Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, and Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018 during votes to conduct a hearing entitled ''Election Security Preparations: A State and Local Perspective.''

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Policy Response to Russian Interference in the 2016 U.S. elections.''

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 12 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

## APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 105–292, as amended by Public Law 106–55, Public Law 107–228, and

Public Law 112–75, appoints the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: Ahmed M. Khawaja of California.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3093 AND S. 3100

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3093) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the protective custody of alien children accompanied by parents, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 3100) to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

## RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 553, S. Res. 554, and S. Res. 555.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

## AMERICAN INNOVATION $1 COIN ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 770 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 770) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Murphy amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 3041) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

Beginning on page 6, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 8, line 5, and insert the following:

''(A) ORDER OF ISSUANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The coins issued under this subsection commemorating either an innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each State, the District of Columbia, or a territory shall be issued in the following order:

''(I) STATE.—With respect to each State, the coins shall be issued in the order in which the States ratified the Constitution of the United States or were admitted into the Union, as the case may be.

''(II) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND TERRITORIES.—After all coins are issued under subclause (I), the coins shall be issued for the District of Columbia and the territories in the following order: the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(ii) APPLICATION IN EVENT OF THE ADMISSION OF ADDITIONAL STATES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), if any additional State is admitted into the Union before the end of the 14-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a $1 coin with respect to the additional State in accordance with clause (i)(I).

''(iii) APPLICATION IN THE EVENT OF INDEPENDENCE OR ADDING OF A TERRITORY.—Notwithstanding clause (i)—

''(I) if any territory becomes independent or otherwise ceases to be a territory of the United States before $1 coins are minted pursuant to this subsection, the subsection shall cease to apply with respect to such territory; and

''(II) if any new territory is added to the United States, $1 coins shall be issued for such territories in the order in which the new the territories are added, beginning after the $1 coin is issued for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(B) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING FOUR INNOVATIONS OR INNOVATORS DURING EACH OF 14 YEARS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Four $1 coin designs as described in this subsection shall be issued during each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1) until 1 coin featuring 1 innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each of the States, the District of Columbia, and territories has been issued.

''(ii) NUMBER OF COINS OF EACH DESIGN.—The Secretary shall prescribe, on the basis of such factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the number of $1 coins that shall be issued with each of the designs selected for each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1).

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate.

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 770), as amended, was passed.

## ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:45 a.m., Thursday, June 21; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 5895.

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

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

## FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, many members of the Democratic caucus are coming down to the floor to speak to the abomination of a policy of separating children from their parents when people are seeking asylum in the United States of America. The Senator from Minnesota is going to speak first, followed by the Senator from Hawaii, then the Senator from Washington, followed by the Senator from Illinois.

I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank Mr. MERKLEY, the Senator from Oregon, for his leadership and his calling attention to the tragedy that has been going on right on our border.

I rise today to join my colleagues to express my deep concern about the policy that was adopted by this administration to separate families at the border.

What we have seen over the past several days and weeks and actually months is simply unacceptable. While the President has now recognized publicly that we should not be taking children from their parents, this should not be happening in our country.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, 2,342 children were separated from their parents at the border between May 5 and June 9. The pace of these separations had been increasing, with nearly 70 children being taken from their parents up until today and being kept in facilities that are increasingly overcrowded.

The American Medical Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics have expressed their opposition. They said that this type of family separation does ''irreparable harm'' to children. The president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, who traveled to the border, called it ''a form of child abuse.''

It is not just the medical groups. A bipartisan group of 75 former U.S. attorneys called on the administration to end its policy. The group included a former Republican U.S. attorney who served under both President Bushes, Tom Heffelfinger from the State of Minnesota. Their letter emphasized that the administration's zero tolerance policy was ''a radical departure from previous Justice Department policy'' and that it is ''dangerous, expensive, and inconsistent with the values of the institution in which [they] served.''

All five First Ladies have been critical, and, as we know, probably the woman who said it best was First Lady Laura Bush. She said:

> This zero-tolerance policy is cruel. It is immoral. And it breaks my heart.

I think that says it all.

I am glad that several of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have recently stood up and said they disagree with this policy.

Senator GRAHAM said: ''President Trump could stop this policy with a phone call.''

The weeks went by, and the families kept getting separated.

I am pleased that Senator FEINSTEIN is leading a bill, the Keep Families Together Act. I was an original cosponsor of this bill, but I do want to note that we do not need the legislation to stop the separation of children and their parents.

While I am still reviewing this Executive order, I will note that it still raises serious issues, including with respect to the indefinite detention of children and their families, and that there are major questions about the order. That being said, action on this was necessary, and now we must move forward.

I see the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, here, who has given so many speeches about Dreamers that I don't think we could even count them. We have more issues for this country besides the one that has just broken the hearts of Americans. We have people on temporary status who are sitting in Minnesota who don't know if they are going to be deported in a year, when they have been in this country legally for decades, working in our hospitals. We have Dreamers who came to this country through no fault of their own. We have immigrants who love this country, who want to be citizens here, and this Senate gave them a path to be citizens in a vote in this very Chamber years ago, and that bill never advanced in the House. We can do that again.

If there is any silver lining to this tragedy as we work through it, I hope that it will focus the American people again on the fact that this is a country of immigrants and that immigrants do not diminish America; immigrants are America.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I thank Senator MERKLEY from Oregon for his leadership and my other colleagues who are coming to the floor this evening.

Like so many people across the country, I have been deeply affected by what is happening on our southern border. Children are being ripped away from their parents, placed into mass detention, deprived of adequate legal counsel, and isolated from everyone they have ever known. Millions of people are rising up with sorrow and horror over what is happening and with good reason.

The President of the United States and this administration are playing games with the lives of these innocent children, and when confronted, they hide behind excuses that they are just ''following the law.'' This is just another lie from a President and an administration that have institutionalized lying to justify their unconscionable policies. There is nothing in the law that requires a zero tolerance approach at the border. It was a choice that Donald Trump and his administration made, and these children are suffering the consequences.

The President's actions are unnecessary and cruel, but they aren't particularly surprising, coming from him. On issue after issue, Donald Trump creates a crisis through his own actions, blames others for what is happening, and uses the ensuing chaos to demand a legislative solution that often harms even more people.

It is up to each of us and to the millions of Americans outraged by his actions to stand up, fight back, and demand action. This action remains urgent, even after the President announced earlier today that he would use his Executive authority to end family separation at the border. This Executive order just creates an entirely new problem. It does not end zero tolerance, and it does not end indefinite detention. It only means children are going to be incarcerated together with their parents. This is still unacceptable and echos back to one of the darkest periods in our history when, during World War II, the U.S. Government incarcerated 120,000 Japanese Americans. That this time we are incarcerating non-Americans misses the point. Due process applies to everyone—everyone—on American soil.

The President's order also instructs the Attorney General to challenge the Flores settlement, which sets national standards for humane treatment of children in immigration detention and ensures their prompt release. The elimination of these national standards would have profoundly negative consequences for thousands of children every year and is yet another demonstration of the cruelty with which this administration treats immigrants to our country.

The President has also hinted that legislation will accompany his Executive action. Any legislative solution must result in less chaos and more justice for these children and their families.

Congress certainly has a responsibility to repair our broken immigration system, and we tried hard in 2013, with months of work and bipartisan compromise. But we cannot and should not enact a patchwork solution that enshrines Donald Trump's hatred and fear of immigrants into law. We need to think through the inevitable consequences of our policies and propose legislation that will actually help these families and their children. This approach stands in stark contrast to a President and an administration that rarely think things through. They never stop to consider the consequences of their actions.

Instead of being ashamed about this, the President appears to take pleasure in the chaos he sows, but this chaos causes real damage to real people. These misguided, shoot-from-the-hip decisions of his have already caused significant harm to thousands of children who will face a lifetime of trauma after being separated from their parents.

Let me tell you a story. It is one I haven't told very often because it is difficult to talk about. I often speak about my own immigrant experience of coming to this country when I was 7 years old with my mom and my older brother Roy. Mom was escaping an abusive marriage to start a new life for us. Mom brought us two older kids with her, leaving my 3-year-old younger brother behind in Japan, because we were old enough to go to school, and at 7 and 9 years old, we could look after ourselves while she was at work supporting us. My younger brother left back in Japan never really recovered from the trauma of the separation from his mother and his siblings. My mother always had deep sorrow about having to leave her baby behind. We finally reunited almost 3 years later.

What is happening to these children feels personal to me. Like so many people, I find that my anger and emotion about this issue aren't far below the surface for me. I am very concerned about what will happen to these 2,400 children who have already been separated from their parents. These children have already been traumatized.

Yet the President's Executive order does not prioritize reuniting these children with their parents.

Years from now, stories will be written about this dark moment in our Nation's history and what happened to these children. People will judge what we did and how we responded.

I will continue to fight against this President's reprehensible actions that dehumanize immigrants, tear families apart, and undermine our country's moral leadership. I call on all of my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle, to join us in this fight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Hawaii for sharing her personal experience of how that felt because that is so important for us to hear. I thank the Senator from Oregon and all the Senators who are out here tonight to speak on this.

I may be only one person, but today I bring to the floor of the Senate the outrage, the pain, and the frustration of millions of people in my home State of Washington and across the country who see what President Trump has been doing on our southern border, who have been watching the pain this forced family separation has caused so many innocent children, who have begged the President to pick up the phone, sign a piece of paper, do whatever it takes to make it stop, who have refused to be silenced as President Trump carries out his hateful and divisive attacks on immigrants, and who heard a recording with desperate cries of children calling for their parents. When I heard that, my heart stopped. Like every mom, like every human being, I just wanted to reach out and comfort that child. I could only think of how his mother felt because I assure you, whether she was in that room, a room 100 miles away, or a room 3,000 miles away, like every mom, she heard her child's cry, too, and her heart was broken.

While today we saw President Trump change his story about whether he did, in fact, have the ability to make it stop, there are a lot of questions that remain—questions that actually I and others have been asking the Trump administration for weeks that have gone unanswered, like exactly how these parents are being informed about their children's safety. Where are they? Where are they being located? When will they be reunited? Those are just a few. There are more.

President Trump says the Executive order stops the separation. Does that mean starting today? Next month? When? What about the thousands of children who have been removed? Will they ever see their parents again? When? Where? How?

I have not gotten answers from the Secretary of Health, Alex Azar, whose Department should be focused on families' health and well-being but has instead spent that time complicit in a policy of separating families and traumatizing parents and children alike.

Even experts, such as the president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, said that the practice of intentionally inflicting trauma on young children is child abuse.

While it is a good thing that President Trump dialed back his systematic child abuse, it is not enough. We are not going to say everything is OK now. We are not going to stay quiet because while we are still digging into this new Executive order, here is what we do know right now: If this is implemented, there will continue to be zero tolerance for all asylum seekers, including domestic violence survivors. It is a system of locking up children by the thousands, all carried out in our great country's name.

I just read the story of a woman named Blanca who left El Salvador after she received threats on her 8-year-old son's life. She took those threats seriously, she said. Why? Because another family member had already been kidnapped. And as Blanca said, when the extortionists don't get their money, they kill people.

So Blanca left everything behind to seek safety for her son. Two months ago she arrived at the U.S. border to seek asylum. Blanca said that was the last time she saw or talked to her son, Abel, whose last words to her were ''Mom, don't leave me.''

That is the last thing she heard.

Blanca now sits in a Federal detention center at SeaTac in Washington State where she told her story through tears to an AP reporter. Her son, she has been told, is in custody in upstate New York. That is 3,000 miles away from her, and she doesn't know when or if she is ever going to see him again.

Blanca's story is horrifying. It is sad. Unfortunately, it is not unique. She is one of thousands of parents and children who fled violence and persecution only to find a new nightmare upon arrival in the United States of America—a nightmare caused deliberately, for no good reason, by President Trump, who has chosen to scapegoat asylum seekers and put their children into detention centers for an undetermined amount of time.

We are better than this. We must be better than this. Turning children into bargaining chips or leverage points or deterrents—that kind of cruelty should not be an option in this great Nation.

In recent days, my office has been flooded with thousands of calls and emails and letters from moms and dads and grandmothers and grandfathers—people from all walks of life, from every community I represent—who are angry at the President's new zero tolerance policy and who are horrified by these families who are being ripped apart. So I know I am not alone.

If we can find hope in one thing, it is knowing that all those calls and emails and letters—all of that outcry—got through to the President to change course on one of his most heartless policies yet.

But we cannot let up now.

President Trump has claimed for days he needed congressional action to do anything at all. Today, he proved that to be simply untrue.

So now we know President Trump will bow to stern pressure of a stern moral movement. Families in Washington State and in every State across the Nation are continuing to demand action, and I am going to keep working to make sure their voices are heard for the sake of so many who seek refuge in our great country and those who believe in the kindness and respect and compassion that does make this country great.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first he came for the Dreamers. It was in September of last year when President Trump announced that he was going to abolish the DACA Program, an Executive order by President Obama that protected 790,000 young people who came forward, registered with the Federal Government, paid a $500 filing fee, went through an extensive criminal background check, proved that they had completed at least a level of education, and made clear that they were no threat to this country. For that, they were allowed, under the Executive DACA order, to live in the United States without fear of deportation for 2 years at a time, renewable, and to work in this country.

Last September, President Trump decided to abolish that protection. He challenged Congress. He said: Now it is up to you. Pass a law.

Many of us took him seriously. I worked on a bipartisan basis with many Senators, including Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, Senator CORY GARDNER of Colorado, Senator MICHAEL BENNET, and Senator BOB MENENDEZ, and we put a lot of hours into it. We wrote a bill to answer the President's challenge. We produced the bill and presented it to him, and he rejected it. He was not going to allow us to come to a bipartisan conclusion to solve this problem without changing other parts of the law, which he demanded.

We couldn't find bipartisan consensus for the President's proposal. In fact, when President Trump's immigration proposal was called on the floor of this Senate Chamber, 39 of the 100 Senators voted for it—only 39. It was a clear illustration that the President's approach to immigration was not even acceptable to all of the Members of his own political party.

So, today, 790,000 young people across America, because of the action of President Trump last September, have only the protection of a court order that saves them from being deported, which allows them to continue to work, which allows them to renew

their DACA status. If that court decision changes in a matter of days, weeks, or months, their protection disappears. Clearly, this President could care less.

First he came for the Dreamers. Then, in April, with the zero tolerance policy, he came for the children—the infants, the toddlers, the little boys and girls who accompanied their parents to the border of the United States.

President Trump did something that most Americans—two out of three—find not only objectionable but unimaginable. This President decided as a matter of policy—a get-tough policy toward immigration—that he would take children—babies, infants—away from their parents. So far, 2,400, we believe, have been taken this way. What has happened to them? We don't know.

You see, in this great country of America—this transparent and open democracy—the Trump administration will not allow any type of visits by Members of Congress, members of the press, to see exactly what is happening with these children. A few photos have made it out, showing these kids being held in cages—kids in cages. That is the Trump approach when it comes to immigration. The recording came out of the cries of these children when they were being separated from their mothers and their parents. There was the report of a father who had a son yanked out of his arms and in desperation went to his jail cell and committed suicide. That is the reality of this Trump policy.

He has been unapologetic. From where he is standing, with the inspiration of Stephen Miller, his adviser and expert on immigration, getting tough is the only answer, the deterrent, putting pressure on Congress to pass the law this President demands—this ridiculous $25 billion wall that he wants to build on our border with Mexico.

So what has happened? People have spoken out, and I want to thank those Republicans who had the courage to stand up and speak out. Forty-eight Democratic Senators joined Senator FEINSTEIN in making it clear that we were prepared, if necessary, to pass legislation to solve this problem. Some Republican Senators have said the same, that this approach is unacceptable and reprehensible. And the First Ladies of the United States, including Laura Bush, who was quoted earlier by Senator KLOBUCHAR, have just been amazing. They have come forward to let us know, on a bipartisan basis, that what President Donald Trump is doing at the border with children is not only un-American, it is inhumane by any standard.

Treating children this way is something that can have long-term trauma on individuals. We heard from our colleague, Senator HIRONO. She experienced an emotional moment here in the Senate, and I have never seen that before from her. She talked about her family's separation and what it meant to her brother and mom. That is the reality of life. It is a reality this President has ignored.

Well, today, after days and weeks of objections from all across the United States, the President said that he would respond to the situation he created with an Executive order that I have in my hand. It is not that long; it is three pages. I read it closely. I read it carefully. I will tell my colleagues, this Executive order by this President does not solve the crisis that he created.

The order doubles down on the President Trump, Attorney General Sessions, Stephen Miller zero tolerance policy that started this whole crisis of punishing children and families.

The order provides no guarantee that families actually will be kept together. Here is what the language says: It just says the administration will try to maintain family unity, including by detaining alien families together ''where appropriate and consistent with law and available resources.'' That is from the President's Executive order. That is no guarantee that these families will be kept together.

The order does nothing, speaks not a word to uniting the 2,400 children who have been separated from their families—not one word in there. For goodness' sakes, that is where the President should start with his Executive order: ordering his agencies to reunite these families as quickly as possible so the children who are going through the trauma of this separation will finally have a chance to see their parents again.

And the order provides for—this is the President's order issued today—the indefinite detention of mothers, fathers, and children who are fleeing violence and seeking asylum in the United States.

There is no law on the books that requires this government or allows this President to rip children away from their parents. The horrific scenes we have seen and heard on television are the result of a Trump administration policy that could have ended today if President Trump had simply issued an order to end it. He has it within his power to end the crisis he created. He chose not to.

Instead, on World Refugee Day, President Trump offered this remedy to the crisis he created: Lock up entire families together indefinitely.

To do this, he has to ignore a court order that applies to his administration and every administration for the last 20 years. The Flores settlement between the U.S. Government and the petitioners resulted in a binding 1997 court order that required that children be released from custody without unnecessary delay. The Government of the United States of America was a party to that agreement. That Flores case recognizes that children should not be treated like criminals, and it prohibits the prolonged detention of children because of harmful effects.

The Trump Executive order seeks to undo the Flores consent decree. Repealing Flores was actually a key component of President Trump's own immigration legislation. That was rejected, if my colleagues will remember, by 39 to 60 in the Senate in February.

Is throwing kids in indefinite detention what we want to do as a nation? Is it a loophole that a 5-year-old child cannot be detained beyond 20 days under Flores? Of course not.

Remember, the Flores settlement does not prohibit detention if it is necessary to ensure the safety of the child. The Flores settlement simply prohibits indefinite detention of children, even with their families, and any order to undermine this critical protection will almost certainly be challenged in court.

This Executive order from President Trump will be challenged on the very first day that it violates the Flores settlement. In this order he sends Attorney General Sessions into court to undo the Flores settlement, which has been the law of the land and the standard for Presidents of both political parties for almost 20 years.

Looking at the administration's policy of so-called zero tolerance, which Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced in April and on which the President doubled down on today, here is what we find: The policy means they are criminally prosecuting everyone at the border, no matter what reason brought them to that border.

If someone is coming to the border to smuggle opioids or as part of a criminal gang, throw the book at them. But it makes no sense to throw the book at parents who come to the border with their kids because they are fleeing violence and death threats. There is no requirement—none—to prosecute every border case as a criminal case. As with many laws, there can be criminal or civil penalties for crossing the border without authorization. Our Nation could criminally prosecute everyone who drives too fast, but we use discretion and prosecute selectively.

Asylum seekers do not need to be caged to remain united with their families. The government has the power to individually assess each person apprehended at the border and determine whether that person presents a flight risk or a safety risk. Those who do not present a risk can be released with their families to await immigration proceedings. We have found that if they are given the benefit of counsel, over 90 percent of those who have court proceedings show up for the proceedings. We should do that. We have effective and cost-efficient alternatives to detention available.

President Trump and his allies have taken thousands of children hostage to try to enact their anti-immigration agenda into law. We will not be fooled. This crisis doesn't need legislation to fix it. It requires Republican Members of Congress to join us, stand up, say no, and put an end to this ill-conceived Trump policy.

Instead, we face efforts like Senator CRUZ's bill, which would not protect

children and could undermine the due process approach that we have used in this government. This bill, like the President's Executive order, would override the Flores settlement. That is not a good starting point to the humane treatment of children.

Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen claimed: ''We do not have a policy of separating families at the border. Period.'' Like many of the President's tweets, that was just plain false. Attorney General Jeff Sessions established the zero tolerance policy that separated families—a policy that former First Lady Laura Bush called cruel and immoral. When asked to justify how we could take this immoral position, Attorney General Sessions appeared to find some quote in the Bible that gave him solace.

The president of the American Academy of Pediatrics was more plain-spoken. She called this Trump policy ''government-sanctioned child abuse.''

I urge my Republican colleagues. People are watching and asking across this country: Aren't we better than this? Can't we treat the Dreamers in a more humane way? Can't we save these children from being caged away from their parents?

Do we want this image in the world? Is this what America has come to? I don't believe so, and two out of three Americans happen to agree with what I just said. We are a better country than this. This President's Executive order does not solve this problem. It makes it worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I first thank Senator MERKLEY from Oregon for organizing this very important session tonight.

Last month, Attorney General Jeff Sessions unveiled the Trump administration's new zero tolerance immigration policy. Whether you come to this land fleeing violence, poverty, or persecution, justice isn't blind. It is now also brutal.

This inhumane policy sends a shudder down the spine of the Statue of Liberty, but not that of our President. Zero tolerance really means zero refuge. Zero tolerance really means zero discretion. Zero tolerance really means zero humanity.

The Trump administration's mindless approach to our broken immigration system takes away the ability of Federal law enforcement officers to exercise any discretion that might be warranted based on the facts and circumstances on the ground. In other words, zero tolerance is an anti-immigrant dragnet, the shocking effects of which we have been witnessing these past few days as children have literally been ripped from their parents' arms and separated from them, as their mothers and fathers are taken into custody.

These horrific images were finally enough, even for President Trump. This afternoon, he signed an Executive order that he says addresses the family separation crisis. It does no such thing. The Executive order that the President signed doesn't end the zero tolerance policy of prosecuting anyone and everyone who crosses the border. It reaffirms it.

If all parents are still being prosecuted as criminals, which the Executive order requires, what does this Executive order actually do? We can only assume that this Executive order would imprison, remand, and incarcerate children—some as newborns—into the same correctional facilities as their parents. They would be sleeping in cages instead of cribs.

In this country, our courts have decided that this treatment of children and families is malicious. In the Flores agreement, more than 20 years ago, we stopped this practice. Now, the President wants to bring it back with a vengeance.

The Executive order directs the Attorney General to try to modify the Flores agreement, but any attempt to undermine the critical protections for children that this landmark settlement has put in place should and will face immediate court challenge. Families and children don't belong in jail, period.

Our President's Executive order does not ask for trained child welfare workers to carry out his wishes. He has called in the military. He expects this cold-blooded tactic—a tactic he is using to negotiate his wall—to be implemented by the Pentagon.

Now, what does that mean? Apparently, he envisions internment camps, using existing military brigs or other facilities to lock up these families. It sounds like a return to the shameful internment camps of the 1940s, during World War II, one of the darkest chapters in our Nation's history. We know how that ended—with the Federal Government paying more than $1 billion to right a wrong that could never actually be corrected. It was a mistake that we should not even contemplate repeating.

So President Trump first manufactured this crisis at the border, and his new Executive order makes it worse. The only thing President Trump wants to solve is the public relations nightmare he has plunged his administration into.

This is not a PR stunt. These are children's lives at stake. How we respond to this crisis will define the character of each and every one of us. It will define our character as a nation. At this critical moral juncture, I ask each of my colleagues to choose humanity.

To my Republican friends, your voices carry weight in this conversation, especially with this administration in power. Use your voices. Make clear that this Executive order will not end the suffering that this administration is inflicting on vulnerable immigrant families, because in the United States we do not keep children in jails or military prisons. We do not criminalize asylum seekers. We welcome immigrants for their contributions. We seek immigrants for their talents. We proudly remember our own families who came across a border, whether land or water, knowing this country meant a new start.

We are better than this. We must be better than this. The President wants to send a message that immigrants aren't welcome in America. His leadership may be devoid of compassion, but the American people are not. This policy must end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I begin by thanking Senator MERKLEY. Senator MERKLEY, in my view, delivered a wake-up call to the country several weeks ago when he went to the border, and I have been very pleased to be able to join him in this effort.

A few days ago, we visited a detention center in Sheridan, OR. We spoke with a father who had been separated from his 18-month-old daughter. The day before Father's Day, colleagues, Senator MERKLEY and I listened to a father who had been separated from his 18-month-old daughter and had no idea where she was and didn't know when he would see her again. All over the country, as part of this national shame, these stories have been breaking our hearts.

Now, the President has said, for example, that he is turning away gang members. What Senator MERKLEY and I saw last Saturday was that he is locking up innocent people who are in danger because they refused to submit to gangs in their home countries. That is what we heard at the Sheridan prison just a few days ago.

These stories are particularly poignant in our household. The Wydens had the opportunity to flee the evils of Nazi Germany for the safety and the promise of the United States. My father came as a youngster. He barely spoke English. He studied hard, and when the war came he wanted to wear the uniform of the United States more than anything.

He served in our propaganda arm, where his fluent native German was a great value to the war effort because he wrote propaganda pamphlets that we dropped on the Nazis telling them that they had no chance, that they had no opportunity to survive. Unlike the comical efforts of our enemies, who mangled English, the work of young immigrants like my father, wearing the uniform of the U.S. Army, struck at the morale of German soldiers freezing on the battlefield.

My parents were lucky to be able to make a home in our country, and they raised my brother and me here. They did their part to add to the fabric of the United States.

Now, the Wydens were able to come, but not everyone of their Jewish background was so fortunate. Shiploads of Jews fleeing persecution and violence

were deemed undesirable, and they were turned away from America. Let me be clear about what happened. The rallying cry for those who wished to keep people like my Jewish parents out of this country—those who denied Jewish refugees safety in their moment of desperation—was ''America first.''

What happened to those families who turned to the beacon of America for safety and opportunity? Many were forced back to Europe, and many of them ultimately ended up in concentration camps. People don't embark on the harrowing journey to America, much less with kids by their side, unless they are fleeing serious danger and deprivation.

It is with that history that I wanted to join my colleagues tonight on this floor to talk about the heartlessness we see in the Trump zero tolerance policy—thousands of kids, refugees, forcibly separated from their parents. There are reports that border agents lied to mothers and fathers, telling them that their kids were being taken away for a bath, only to have them disappear—a terrifying scenario, colleagues, with grim historical echoes. There are nursing babies taken from their mothers and kids locked in cages for days, regimented like they are criminals facing hard time.

There is a reason that the courts have barred the executive from holding child refugees for more than 20 days. However, it appears the President intends now to ignore the courts and hold children in jails for the foreseeable future.

The administration has gone to great lengths to defend their policy, but they will not stand up and defend it with honest answers. The administration even buried a recent government report showing that refugees are a positive economic force. I gather it is because it just didn't fit the company line.

I will close by saying that in my view a strong leader does not rip kids from their mothers and lock them in cages. A strong leader does not take child hostages to use as political pawns. A strong leader does not lie and mislead the American people about the true nature of the policy he enacts.

In my view, these have been acts of weakness. My view is that the national shame which we have seen over the last few weeks is going to go down as one of the dark moments in American history. It is why it is so important in the days ahead that we come together—Democrats and Republicans—and we restore the greatness of America, which is that we are better and stronger because we stand up for refugees, refugees like the Wydens, who fled Nazi Germany decades ago.

I again thank my colleague from Oregon for his critical leadership on this matter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise on World Refugee Day to thank the American public for standing up against the heartless decision by the Trump administration to separate children from their families at the southern border of the United States. Because the administration's policy triggered our moral gag reflex, you spoke up loudly—everyday citizens, business executives, faith leaders, Governors pulled back Guard troops from missions on the border, and airlines announced they would not facilitate separation of families by flying children hundreds of miles away from their parents. Because of you, the American public, this administration has altered its cruel policy, at least for the time being.

A new Executive order suggests that families will not be separated, but many questions remain. Will they be detained indefinitely? Where will they be detained? What process will be used to determine their fate? Will people seeking to use our legal asylum process be treated like criminals?

The most urgent question I have is this. What is the fate of the 2,300 children you have stripped away from their families? How will you assure that these children are properly returned to parents who are worried to death about them?

Congress has to exercise the most persistent oversight to ensure that these children are restored to their families. An administration that so cavalierly separated them from their parents out of a mistaken belief that the American public wouldn't care about it can hardly be trusted to reunite these families with speed and compassion. We have to stay on the task to ensure that they do.

Much has been said about the trauma inflicted upon these children taken from their parents. I want to say a word about how traumatic it is for a parent to have a child taken away without any idea when or if a child will be returned. Marco Antonio Munoz was a 39-year-old father from Honduras who made the difficult trek to the United States with his wife and 3-year-old boy. They came here in May after his brother-in-law was murdered by a drug gang near Capon. Honduras has one of the highest homicide rates in the world, and they just wanted their family to be safe. The family crossed into the United States on May 12, in Granjeno, TX—a popular crossing point for Central American families and teens who want to turn themselves in and seek asylum in the United States.

I know a little bit about families like the Munoz family. I lived in Honduras in 1980 and 1981 and have returned a number of times, most recently in 2015. The violence in these neighborhoods is severe, driven by gangs connected to a drug trade that has its origins in American demand for illicit drugs produced in Mexico, Central, and South America. The violence in these Honduran neighborhoods has a direct connection to the sad reality of addiction in the United States. When a family like the Munoz family leaves their home, they leave everything behind, and all they have is each other.

When the Munoz family was taken into custody in the United States, Border Patrol agents told them the Trump zero tolerance policy meant they had to be separated, and Mr. Munoz, the father, had a panic attack.

As one border agent said: ''They had to use physical force to take the child out of his hands.''

That is called being a parent. If you tried to take my child out of my hands, I will hold on with every ounce of strength in my body.

They took Mr. Munoz away. They put him in a car to take him to a kennel-like jail, and he fought in the car. He tried to escape when they took him out of the car. When they put him in the kennel, he rattled the cage he was in. They decided the cage wasn't strong enough, so they then transported him to a regional jail in McAllen, TX, and put him in a padded cell. The next morning, when they came to visit him, he was dead in his cell, a victim of suicide, with a piece of clothing wrapped around his neck.

An agent who found him expressed confusion about why Mr. Munoz would ''choose to separate himself from his family.'' It wasn't Mr. Munoz who chose to separate himself from his family; it was a decision by this administration to punish him and his family that separated him from his family, and with no knowledge when or if he would see his wife and 3-year-old son again, he killed himself.

When you have left your entire life behind, and all you have is your family, how can anyone fail to understand how painful it is to lose them?

As we try to reassemble 2,300 families whom this administration has spread to the winds, there will be at least one 3-year-old boy who will not be able to reunite with his father.

I ask this President, I ask the Attorney General, I ask the Secretary of Homeland Security, was it worth it? Was it worth it?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank Senator MERKLEY and others for organizing this important discussion—a discussion designed to reclaim American values. I also want to take this opportunity not just to thank Senator MERKLEY but to thank millions of people from coast to coast—people who are conservatives and progressives, Democrats, Republicans, Independents—for getting on the phone, for calling Members of Congress, for expressing their outrage that in the United States of America today, we have small children who are torn from their mothers and their fathers and locked up in detention cages. All over this country, regardless of one's political view, one understands that is not what this country is about and must never be about.

Tonight, as I understand it, we have Democrats here, but opposition to this

policy is widespread. Let me quote from a recent op-ed that Laura Bush, our former First Lady, the wife of a conservative Republican, wrote. This is what she said:

> Our government should not be in the business of warehousing children in converted box stores or making plans to place them in tent cities in the desert outside of El Paso. These images are eerily reminiscent of the internment camps for U.S. citizens and noncitizens of Japanese descent during World War II, now considered to have been one of the most shameful episodes in U.S. history.

This is former First Lady Laura Bush.

The good news is, because the American people spoke up, because some Republicans finally had the guts to do the right thing and convey their displeasure to the President, Trump has changed his policy. Let us be clear that the Executive order he issued today goes nowhere—nowhere—as far as it should go.

Mr. President, I am going to ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Daily Beast, a publication that came out tonight.

What they say is, there is no guarantee in this Executive order, as Senator KAINE has indicated, that the fate of the 2,400 children currently imprisoned will be changed. There is nothing specific in the Executive order that says those 2,400 kids will, in fact, be reunited with their parents. Presumably, this will apply to future apprehensions where children will be imprisoned with their parents.

Second of all, there is an effort in this Executive order to overturn the 1997 Flores settlement, which limits the government's ability to keep children in detention and orders them to be placed in the least restrictive settings as possible.

If you can imagine it, what this Executive order does is raise the possibility of children being in prison for very long periods of time. Is that better than them being separated from their parents? I guess. But does anybody really believe we should be imprisoning for an indefinite period of time little children? There are better ways to deal with this issue.

What is clear to the American people is that once again we have a President who caused this crisis by undoing existing policy. We have a President who I believe just the other day said: Nothing I could do, it is law.

Sadly, once again, he was lying. It is not Federal law. His decision to separate children from their parents was his decision and his decision alone, as he acknowledges today by announcing an Executive order ostensibly doing away with that policy.

Let me remind the American people that this terrible Executive order he issued separating children from their parents is not the first terrible Executive order with regard to immigration. Let us remember that months ago, Trump created the DACA crisis and put 1.8 million young people in this country—young people who were raised in this country, who are working and going to school or serving in the military—in danger of deportation because of a decision he made.

I say to the President, start working hard on a new Executive order and make that Executive order clear that the 2,400 children, now in jail, separate from their parents, will, in fact, be reunited, and make it clear that we will not keep children in prison for an indefinite period of time.

By the way, while you are at it, why don't you deal with the DACA crisis you created and provide the legal status that 80 percent of the American people want to see for the young people in the DACA Program?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article I referred to from the Daily Beast printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Daily Beast]

TRUMP'S FAMILY SEPARATION ORDER DOES NOTHING FOR FAMILIES HE ALREADY BROKE UP

(By Betsy Woodruff and Justin Glawe)

KIDS ARE THOUSANDS OF MILES AWAY FROM PARENTS WITH NO RELIABLE WAY TO FIND EACH OTHER—AND THEY MAY NEVER AFTER ADULTS ARE DEPORTED.

EL PASO, TX.—Immigrant families won't be separated anymore, thanks to a new order from President Trump, but that doesn't mean families will be reunited.

Trump signed an executive order on Wednesday ending the practice of taking children away from parents who enter the U.S. illegally. Already, though, more than 2,000 children have been separated, according to the government, and advocates and attorneys for them fear they will never see their parents again.

Despite Trump's order, there is no clear, publicly articulated plan to reunite families who are already detained. Parents are held in facilities near the border like McAllen, Texas while their children are sent to foster-care homes as far as New York, Illinois and Michigan. While the adults wait to be deported, their advocates must navigate multiple federal agencies to locate their children.

''The executive order that President Trump signed is no solution,'' said Michelle Brané, director of the Women's Refugee Commission Migrant Rights and Justice program, in a statement. ''First, there are more than 2,000 children already separated from their parents. This EO does nothing to address that nightmare.''

The Department of Health and Human Services will not make a special effort to reunite the children already separated from their families, according to a CBS report.

On Tuesday, an ICE spokesperson told The Daily Beast if a parent asks to be deported with a separated child, the agency will accommodate the request ''to the extent practicable.''

A child immigrant advocate in the Midwest looking after a 6-year-old Guatemalan girl described ''cold-calling'' ICE officials in El Paso and Washington, D.C. to reunited girl with her mother so they can be deported together.

The girl's mother is in ICE custody in El Paso after being turned away at the Paso del Norte port of entry where she sought asylum. The Daily Beast is providing the advocate with anonymity to protect the identity of the mother and child from feared retribution for speaking out.

In her case, the advocate says an Office of Refugee Resettlement agent was helpful in coordinating with ICE, but that isn't always the case.

''There's some actors that are more willing to cooperate than others,'' the advocate said.

The advocate estimated many of the separated children will be in the U.S. six months from now. ''I would say these children will still be here,'' the advocate added.

Even if a foreign government agrees to allow a immigrant back into the country, there is no guarantee that U.S. court cases for the parent or the child will be resolved at the same time, allowing them to return together (Adults are being tried in criminal court, while children are tried separately in immigration courts.)

DHS conceded that parents have been deported without their children.

''When parents are removed without their children, ICE, ORR, and the consulates work together to coordinate the return of a child and transfer of custody to the parent or foreign government upon arrival in country, in accordance with repatriation agreements between the U.S. and other countries,'' the spokesperson said Tuesday.

Chris Carlin, head of the federal public defender's office in Alpine, Texas, told The Daily Beast that he fears some of his clients will never be reunited with their children.

''I think that's a real possibility,'' he said.

Many of the deported parents return to homelessness and poverty, Carlin said, and may not be reachable by the U.S. government who is still holding their child days, weeks or months later.

HHS has put the children of Carlin's clients in foster homes as far away as New York and Illinois, and he said this makes the obstacle of reconnecting children to their parents potentially insurmountable.

''In the cases that I'm personally familiar with, I don't see any evidence of any plan to reunify the parent and the child after the conclusion of the adult's criminal case,'' Carlin said. ''I don't see any evidence of that at all.''

Parents in detention are unlikely to have all the requisite identification documents DHS and HHS demand to prove that a parent and child are in fact related, according to Carlos M. Garcia, an immigration attorney in Austin.

Garcia said none of the people he met with had received any paperwork on how to find their children. However, The Daily Beast obtained an ICE document that is handed out to immigrants once they're detained. It contains several phone numbers for parents to try to find their children. One number notes that the lines are monitored by DHS, possibly scaring away undocumented members of immigrants' families.

''Who knows when they'll be reunified, if they are reunified,'' Garcia said.

A former ICE director told NBC News parents and children may be separated for years, if not permanently. ''You could be creating thousands of immigrant orphans in the U.S. that one day could become eligible for citizenship when they are adopted,'' said John Sandweg, who served as ICE's acting director in the Obama administration from 2013–2014.

The children of parents who have been deported may sometimes be able to gain the legal right to stay in the U.S. if they can make a valid asylum claim, qualify for special immigrant juvenile status, or qualify for a visa for crime victims, according to Ashley Feasley, the director of policy at Migration and Refugee Services in U.S. Council of Catholic Bishops. Her organization works

with children who have been separated from their parents.

''How do we ensure that we can connect a mom that's been deported to make sure she is fully informed of her child's rights and responsibilities under the immigration system, and do so in the timely manner that we'll need to as prescribed by our immigration laws?'' Feasley said. ''That's a big concern of mine.''

Children who have been separated from their parents usually get a brief legal orientation, but most don't have lawyers so they have to face an immigration judge alone. If their parents are deported or in detention, they may have no idea what kind of legal decisions their children face.

''These kids are traumatized,'' the Midwest advocate said. ''The families are heartbroken.''

Mr. SANDERS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who are here tonight and Senator MERKLEY for organizing this evening.

The President has taken a step back from a crisis he provoked, a crisis he caused, and it seems like it is a rare recognition on his part that when a President speaks and a President acts, he speaks and he acts on behalf of the American people, not on his own behalf. The American people could not stand the idea that this country would do what it did to these kids in their name. They could not stand the idea that the whole world would see the separation of children from their parents on the southern border of the United States of America—perpetrated by our own government.

Finally, probably for the first time ever, this President relented to the values the American people share whether they are conservatives or whether they are liberals or something in between that. That is a reason to say I am glad we are moving in that direction.

Maybe another good thing will come out of this, which is that the people who stood up who work for this administration and defended this terrible, inhumane policy in the name of the law and in the name of religion—the Bible—might think harder the next time they do that at a moment of conscience like this one.

As my colleagues have said, it is not clear tonight what is in the policy. I quote a New York Times article that is on the front page of the paper tonight.

It reads:

And a Health and Human Services official said that more than 2,300 children who have already been separated from their parents under the President's ''zero tolerance'' policy will not be immediately reunited with their families while the adults remain in federal custody during their immigration proceedings.

''There will not be a grandfathering of existing cases,'' said Kenneth Wolfe, a spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families, a division of the Department of Health and Human Services. Mr. Wolfe said the decision about the children was made by the White House, but he added, ''I can tell you definitively that is going to be policy.''

So what are they saying—that current kids aren't going to be grandfathered, that the current kids who have been on the TV this week and the week before are not going to have the benefit of this Executive order?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 20, 2018]

TRUMP RETREATS ON SEPARATING FAMILIES, BUT THOUSANDS WILL REMAIN APART

(By Michael D. Shear, Abby Goodnough and Maggie Haberman)

WASHINGTON.—President Trump caved to enormous political pressure on Wednesday and signed an executive order meant to end the separation of families at the border by detaining parents and children together for an indefinite period.

''We're going to have strong—very strong—borders, but we are going to keep the families together,'' Mr. Trump said as he signed the order in the Oval Office. ''I didn't like the sight or the feeling of families being separated.''

But Justice Department officials said it was not clear whether the practice of separating families could resume after 20 days if a federal judge refuses to give the government the authority it wants to hold families together for a longer period.

And a Health and Human Services official said that more than 2,300 children who have already been separated from their parents under the president's ''zero tolerance'' policy will not be immediately reunited with their families while the adults remain in federal custody during their immigration proceedings.

''There will not be a grandfathering of existing cases,'' said Kenneth Wolfe, a spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families, a division of the Department of Health and Human Services. Mr. Wolfe said the decision about the children was made by the White House, but he added, ''I can tell you definitively that is going to be policy.''

The president signed the executive order days after he said that the only way to end the division of families was through congressional action because ''you can't do it through an executive order.'' But he changed his mind after a barrage of criticism from Democrats, activists, members of his own party and even his wife and eldest daughter, who privately told him it was wrong.

Stories of children being taken from their parents, audio of wailing toddlers and images of teenagers in cagelike detention facilities had exploded into a full-blown political crisis for Mr. Trump and congressional Republicans, who were desperate for a response to those who have called the practice ''inhumane,'' ''cruel'' and ''evil.''

The president's four-page order says that officials will continue to criminally prosecute everyone who crosses the border illegally, but will seek to find or build facilities that can hold families—parents and children together—instead of separating them while their legal cases are considered by the courts.

But the action raised new questions that White House officials did not immediately answer. The order does not say where the families would be detained. And it does not say whether children will continue to be separated from their parents while the facilities to hold them are located or built.

Officials on a White House conference call said they could not answer those questions.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, the headline of the article reads: ''Trump Retreats on Separating Families, but Thousands Will Remain Apart.''

We need to know, and that, obviously, isn't going to be acceptable to the American people if that is what it is.

The last point I want to make tonight, because I know I have other colleagues here, is that it does not help matters when the President is completely allergic to the truth on any dimension but especially on this one.

Today, at the White House, in front of all of the cameras and in front of the Republicans he invited there—he didn't invite any Democrats—this is what he said in lamenting the fact that he couldn't do a deal with Democrats.

This is the President:

We're having a lot of problem with Democrats.

They don't care about lack of security, they would like to have open borders, where anybody in the world can just flow, including from the Middle East—from anybody anywhere they can just flow into our country. Tremendous problems with that. Tremendous crime caused by that. We are just not going to do it.

That is what he said is our position.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I was on the Gang of 8 in 2013 that negotiated what was called the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Enforcement Act of 2013. The first two words in that title are ''border security.'' It got 68 votes on this floor. Every single Democrat voted for it. I want the American people to know what is in it because they will never hear from the President as to what was in it:

There is $46 billion dollars for border enforcement; $30 billion to hire and deploy nearly 20,000 new Border Patrol agents, doubling the total number, a doubling of the number of Border Patrol agents; $8 billion for a fence along the southern border at least 700 miles long; $4.5 billion for new surveillance technologies, including air and marine surveillance so we could see every inch of the border, so we would know what was happening there; $2 billion to enact recommendations of a newly established southern border security commission; $750 million to expand the E-Verify; the remaining $1.5 billion dollars for administrative costs to the Departments of State, Labor, Agriculture, and Justice.

That was the border security bill we passed in 2013, and that is the border security bill we should pass today. The only reason it is not the law of the land today is that the House would not let it come to a vote. Had they let it come to a vote, had the Speaker allowed it to come to a vote, it would have passed.

I think, collectively, we should go back to that work and see if we can't actually solve the problem rather than just play politics with it or, in the case of what we have just seen, rather than play politics with the lives of the children on the southern border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the President's Executive order about the separation of family policy and about the incarceration of family policy that has now replaced it. There are details that are unknown at this point about how this program will be working as we go forward, but we know enough right now to have the most serious and significant concerns about the President's Executive order.

Every great nation—even the greatest Nation in the history of the world like the United States of America—has moments of extraordinary shame, times when it loses its moral compass, and it simply takes the wrong direction. We can remember a number of them in our own Nation's history. One of them was the internment of Japanese children who were thrown into World War II-era detention camps and imprisoned, in effect, with their parents. Almost every lawyer in the United States of America and most citizens know the name Korematsu, and that is because it was a moment of shame for this country.

Ending family separation—the process of tearing children away from their moms and dads—is a welcomed and humane step, but the solution should not be the indiscriminate and indefinite detention of children. Family separation should not be replaced by family imprisonment. There is no moral advantage to incarcerating children as opposed to tearing them away from their parents. In fact, it is not only immoral, it is illegal. The courts have said so on a number of occasions—in 1997, in the Flores case, which is now well-known to everyone, but more recently, in fact, as recently as 2016. The reason goes to the core of our constitutional principle about how and when and whom we imprison, how we take liberty away from people.

Indefinitely imprisoning children and families is still inhumane and ineffective law enforcement. President Trump's current policies will put children behind bars indefinitely and indiscriminately. Children will experience many of the same enduring of trauma, pain, and harm. The world will continue to watch the United States of America lock up innocent children and throw away the key.

Much like the policy of family separation, this new policy of indefinite and indiscriminate family detention harkens back to those dark days, to those moments of shame in this country during World War II. History will judge us as harshly if we fail to speak out and stand up at this moment of testing. The gaze of history is upon us now. It is upon the President. It is upon every Member of the U.S. Senate.

There are immense costs to this policy—$775 a day, per individual, at these detention camps. Yet the costs are way beyond dollars and cents; they are to the moral image and authority of this country and to our self-image—the accountability to ourselves, to our own sense of morality and humanity.

The world was outraged when it saw children being torn away from parents, and now the President has acknowledged that his heart responded as well. Yet soon—and I would predict very soon—we will see images as striking, as stunning, and as repugnant as those images of taking children away from their parents when we see those images of the detention facilities, cages, and of children—young people behind bars and packed beyond capacity—on military bases and other places that were never designed to be holding facilities. The world will be outraged by those images as well—of the sights and sounds of those children.

We owe this new policy a special scrutiny and a strong sense of outrage if it is what it seems like right now. We cannot remain silent about the children who have been already separated from their parents. Nothing in this Executive order—not a word—provides for the reunification of the thousands of children who have already been separated from their parents. What will happen to them? Where are they? Where are their parents? How will they be reunited? What trauma will they continue to endure? This policy remains as inhumane and cruel for them as it was earlier today or this week.

All of us bear a responsibility in this moment. I urge my colleagues to take this day—World Refugee Day—to commemorate the great work done by brave individuals in this country who help to resettle refugees and the refugees themselves who had the courage and strength to come here after having made the journeys from shores far away and after having overcome obstacles most of us have never confronted.

There are solutions other than putting children into detention camps. There are release programs that involve oversight and supervision. There is also a case management program that has been working, along with other cities' efforts, that has been used for releasing them. We should choose the least restrictive alternative, the least burdensome one that best serves the purposes of law enforcement. Make no mistake, we have that obligation not only as a matter of heart and morality but also of law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I begin tonight by thanking my colleague Senator MERKLEY for his leadership on this issue.

I rise to join my Democratic colleagues and millions of Americans who have been appalled and outraged at the humanitarian crisis that President Trump has created on our southern border.

Make no mistake, these past few weeks have truly been an affront to our American values. By now, we have all witnessed the horrifying reality—the images of children being held in cages, the cries of screaming kids who have no idea where their parents are being taken or if they will ever see them again.

The Department of Homeland Security announced that between May 5 and June 9, the Department took 2,300 children—approximately 70 children per day—from their parents. Pediatricians, psychologists, and health professionals have made clear the lasting harm of these forced separations. According to experts, when children are forcibly removed from their parents, the amount of toxic stress can cause neurons in the brain to be killed off, leaving damage that impacts brain development and can cause long-term behavioral health issues, although no parent needs a doctor to tell them that.

The fact that our government has engaged in this type of physical and psychological damage to children is morally reprehensible. These actions have been unacceptable and completely unnecessary.

Let's be clear. The President created this crisis, and over the past days and weeks, the President and his administration made false claim after false claim, saying that there was nothing they could do to reverse the President's own actions. The fact that the President bowed to pressure and signed an Executive order today cannot undo the trauma that has already been inflicted.

We cannot forget about the children and parents that remain separated tonight, and immediate action must be taken to reunite children with their families. Earlier tonight, there were reports that the Department of Health and Human Services will not—will not—make special efforts to reunite children who have already been separated from families because of the President's actions. We cannot and will not accept this continued brutality. The President must act immediately to reunite these children with their parents. Surely the U.S. Government is capable of that.

In the United States of America, we must work to secure our border in a manner that reflects our values, and I am committed to working with anyone on comprehensive bipartisan immigration reform.

Separating children from their families was an abhorrent policy to pursue, and it will forever mark a dark and shameful period in our country's history.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator MERKLEY for bringing us all together to address what is, I think, as my colleague Senator HASSAN has said, one of the dark marks in the history of our country.

I rise today to call attention to what has clearly been a human rights abuse committed by the U.S. Government, and that is the outrageous and inhumane separation of children from their parents at the border. This morning,

thousands of children woke up without their parents, not knowing where they were, not knowing when they would see them again, not knowing the adults who surround them, having no relationship of trust with these people who have removed their ability to be in the arms and embrace of their parents. This is simply inhumane, and it is unacceptable.

Even with the Executive order from the President of the United States, that number will be the same tomorrow. Those 2,000-plus children will be in the same situation tomorrow that they were in today and the day before and the day before and the day before that.

Over the last few months, the Department of Homeland Security has separated more than 2,000 children from their parents at the border, many of them younger than 4 years old. Let's be clear about what that point is and that moment is in this stage of human development. Age is more than a chronological fact. There are phases of childhood that can never be replaced—phases of childhood that when that child experiences trauma, he or she will have lifelong impact; phases of life during which a child is so innocent and needs love and needs nurturing and needs that love and nurturing from their parents. It cannot be replaced by anyone else, and certainly not by the cage in which they are now being held.

So let's look at where we are. It is a child's worst nightmare, a nightmare that is displayed, as my colleagues have discussed, in the stories of a child who was apparently ripped from her mother's breast while being breastfed. There are nightmare stories of a 3-year-old who was torn from the arms of his father and the father being so distraught that he took his own life.

We should tell the truth. We have to speak the truth. The American public knows the truth. Let's speak truth here in the U.S. Senate. Let's speak truth as leaders and acknowledge the lifelong consequences of the separation we visited upon these children and their parents. The American Medical Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics have weighed in on this topic, and what they have said is that family separation in these cases, not as a general matter—it is generally true—but specifically in these cases it will cause lifelong trauma. They have indicated there is empirical evidence of the fact that it is likely to cause significant harm to the brain structure of these children and will affect these children's long- and short-term health.

Let's be clear. A society is judged based on how it treats its children. A society is judged based on how it treats the least among us, and we will be judged harshly. History will judge us harshly because of what this administration has done.

As I stand here at this moment, hours after the announcement of the Executive order on this issue, I find it shocking that the Executive order fails to acknowledge that over 2,000 children are currently, at this very moment, without their parents. I find it shocking that the Executive order fails to acknowledge, take into account or even concern itself with the fact that tonight there will be over 2,000 children who will go to bed, who will go to sleep without a kiss goodnight from their mother or their father. There are 2,000 children in our country tonight who will go to bed without a hug from their parents. The 2,000 children tonight will go to bed asking: Where is my mommy? Where is my daddy? This is an outrage.

It is an outrage—not to mention these children are innocent and have committed no wrongdoing whatsoever. Let's be clear.

Thankfully, the American people have been speaking out over these last many weeks, and that is the only reason the administration finally had to acknowledge that politically it could not survive its misdeeds. There has still been no acknowledgment by this administration that it visited this policy upon itself and, after urging from every type of person from every walk of life, still held steadfast in supporting this policy. Then it started to snowball, and they couldn't stand by it any longer, but it was only because of the pressure, only because of the relentless coverage by journalists who went to Texas, who went to California and the activists who stood outside of those detention centers and demanded that there be justice and humanity in this system, and it was because of that activism and because of those people speaking out that finally this administration did what was necessary to end the thing that it started around the separation of these children. But this is not enough.

The reality is that there is nothing about this Executive order that addresses those 2,000 children who are currently without their parents. There is nothing about the administration's stated policy as of today that indicates any plan to reunify those children with their parents.

Let's look at the effect of this Executive order. The effect is there is still indefinite detention of families in America because of this administration's policy. So now we are going to go from babies in cages to babies with their mommies in cages.

Let's be clear about the effect of this Executive order. Millions more taxpayer dollars will be used to expand detention camps on top of the billions of taxpayer dollars that have already poured into this detention system.

Let's be clear about the effect of this Executive order. The so-called zero tolerance policy that created this problem in the first place is still in effect. It is still in effect.

Let's be clear about this Executive order. The effect is to suggest that a mother fleeing the murder capital of the world—which is what the zero tolerance policy suggests—that a mother fleeing with her child from the murder capital of the world should be treated as being a threat to our safety that is equal to being a member of a transnational criminal organization. As a prosecutor for most of my adult life, I find that absolutely disingenuous and absolutely wrong on a moral level, on an ethical level, and devoid of any reference to real fact. But I am not surprised, given the administration's track record on this issue.

If you look at what has been coming out of this administration in terms of its policies, it paints a constellation of attacks on immigrant women, immigrant children, and immigrant families. Let's look at the constellation before us and what has been going on.

Let's just look at how this administration has changed the policies about detention of pregnant women. Before this administration acted on this subject, it was the policy of the U.S. Government to place pregnant women in the least restrictive place, where they could be able to get the kind of prenatal care they so desperately need and deserve. This administration rolled back those protections of pregnant women.

Let's look; there used to be a policy that gave a presumption that pregnant women would not even be detained and should be in less restrictive situations, but this administration changed that policy.

Let's look at how the Office of the Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office have raised serious concerns about oversight and conditions in the detention facilities. There is nothing about this Executive order that addresses those concerns.

Let's look at a complaint filed just last year by numerous organizations, such as the Women's Refugee Commission, that documents insufficient medical care and inhumane conditions for pregnant women in ICE custody—all of which is why I have been proud to work with Representative JAYAPAL to introduce the DONE Act, which will slash ICE detention beds by using alternatives to detention and would increase badly needed oversight of these facilities.

Let's look at another policy. There are reports that the Department of Homeland Security is looking at decreasing the standard of care for children in detention facilities—decreasing the standard of care. These standards govern the types of meals that a child must eat in order to be healthy. These standards govern the kind of recreation a child should receive, again, in order to be healthy, and just this past month, the Attorney General of the United States announced a decision that makes it nearly impossible for victims of domestic violence, over 90 percent of whom are women, to seek asylum in the United States.

Let's look at one final policy that makes this administration's priorities around children very clear—the fact that they have ended DACA. We have talked about this extensively. We have talked about how the American Government made a promise to these

Dreamers, these young people, and this administration has failed to keep that promise.

So what we see is an administration that is engaged in an act of complete hypocrisy, pretending to care about families and children, when in fact, they have a track record of policies that are specifically damaging to families, women, and children.

In conclusion, there is no medical or logical reason that dictates or requires this administration to detain more pregnant women, and it has to stop. There is no evidence that says you should reduce care for children in detention facilities. That has to stop. There is no reason not to have a plan to reunify the 2,300 children who will go to sleep tonight torn from their parents and alone. There is no reason, and it has to stop. This is not reflective of who we are as a country. We are better than this.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I really appreciate the comments of my colleague from California. She brings her background as a prosecutor, as attorney general to bear, as well as the heart of an American who understands that it is not within the scope of America's history or of our traditions or of our culture to treat those who are fleeing persecution by then persecuting them when they arrive on our shores. It is quite the opposite. Thank you for your comments tonight.

Thank you to my colleagues who have spoken before, the 13 Members of the Senate who came and spoke this evening, sharing some very powerful stories. In several cases, they told powerful stories about their own family history, about their own parents or grandparents coming here to the United States of America, placing themselves in a situation. They spoke about how they might have suffered if President Trump had been in office when their families came to the shores of the United States and if they had been separated from their parents when they arrived.

It really helps sometimes to put yourself in the shoes of others, to recognize that outside of our Native Americans, virtually all of us have roots that involve families fleeing persecution, fleeing civil war, fleeing religious oppression, fleeing starvation, and coming here to the United States of America. When they came to the United States, they knew that the general principle of our country was to treat them with respect and dignity.

It has always been symbolized by Lady Liberty. Lady Liberty says: ''Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.'' That quote is the one we all know from Emma Lazarus. Her poem inscribed on the Statue of Liberty has some other powerful lines, like this one: ''From her beacon-hand glows worldwide welcome.'' That has been the attitude of America. She says ''the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door!''

Well, that golden door, Lady Liberty's torch lighting the path, has been desecrated by President Trump because he has a new inscription, a new message he wanted to send. That message is called a deterrent. If you are fleeing oppression abroad and you wash up here on the shores of the United States of America, we are going to put you in handcuffs, we are going to throw you in prison, and we are going to take away your children. That is hardly the powerful vision of respect and dignity that has been the hallmark of how we treated those fleeing oppression throughout our history.

Pregnant and fearing for her unborn baby's life, a woman fled a death threat from a drug cartel in Honduras. She made her way to America, delivering her baby girl, Andrea, along the way. On Sunday, a group of seven Members of Congress—myself included—met her and her baby. We had gone out on the bridge to see what was going on because we had heard that our American border guards were blocking those seeking asylum from coming across that bridge. They were demanding to see papers of people on the pedestrian bridge, saying: You have a visa, fine. You have a passport, fine. You have no papers and you are seeking asylum, you are not welcome. You may not enter.

I found it hard to believe that we would treat those fleeing persecution, seeking asylum, in that manner, but I heard from others that was the case, and there were articles in the newspaper. We went out there, and we saw it firsthand.

Here is this mother with her baby girl. We were able to talk to her because when we came off the bridge and went into the Hidalgo Port of Entry, through those doors, they had a variety of counseling rooms there. One room was holding 10 or so individuals.

I said: Have you let in anyone who is seeking asylum?

They said: Oh, yes.

I said: Can we meet that person?

They said: Yes.

They brought her out to us with her little girl. She sat down. I sat down beside her.

We asked her some questions.

Why are you fleeing from Central America?

She said: My family took a loan from a private bank. The private bank has a relationship with the drug cartel or criminal empire that runs that part of the city. We can't repay the loan. We had been told that I am targeted to be killed. I was safe as long as I was pregnant, but as soon as I delivered, I would be at high risk. With a month to go in my pregnancy, I fled. I fled to protect the life of my child and my life. I fled.

Unfortunately, her uncle was killed. She escaped, but her uncle was killed. I think we all have to conclude that her fear was very real. There she is, 8 months pregnant, taking the journey from Honduras north up through Guatemala, through Mexico, to get to the United States, stopping along the way to deliver her baby.

I think about the journey of Mary and Joseph with Mary pregnant, seeking shelter, a place to deliver her child, Baby Jesus. She was let in, given accommodation, taken care of, welcomed.

This woman was largely on her own, as far as I could make out. She continued north with her newborn, and she made it to our border finally, escaped the drug cartel, escaped the death threat, and delivered her baby. She made it through Guatemala and Mexico. She got to our shore—the shore so long symbolized by Lady Liberty and her beacon of hope and welcome. She got to the border, and she tried to cross the pedestrian bridge, and she was stopped. She was sent back. She said she tried multiple times to get across that pedestrian bridge, and she was rebuffed again and again.

I said to her: How did you get across the bridge?

We had been out there. We had seen the border guards stopping those without papers.

How did you get across?

For just a moment, an absolute smile lit up her face. She said that as she was sent back time and again, she would study the situation, and she saw that there were people out washing the windows on the car bridge.

She said: I had a plan.

She went out and she borrowed a squeegee from one of the car window washers who were washing car windows and asking for tips. She washed windows all across the bridge, making her way through the cars to the United States of America, and then she was able to open that door to the port of entry in Hidalgo.

That is how hard it was for one young woman with a 65-day-old child in her arms to get the opportunity to seek asylum in the United States of America.

It troubles me to reread the transcript of Secretary Nielsen, who proceeded to say that there is no reason for people to cross our borders; all they have to do is come to the port of entry. That is all they have to do. But she is in charge of this program of slow-walking those seeking asylum to only let in a few at a time and send them back time and time again.

There was an attorney who was doing pro bono legal work for immigrants. On my first trip down 2 weeks ago before last Sunday, she told me that when she got out to that bridge, there were some 40 families sleeping on the bridge, waiting to be allowed to come in.

When I went on Sunday with the congressional delegation, we said we wanted to go out on the bridge.

The officer said: Well, there is nobody on the bridge.

I asked: Why not? They were there 2 weeks ago.

He said: There is no one on the bridge. You can go out and see for yourself.

Well, here is why there was nobody on the bridge: There is nobody on the bridge because they are not being let past the American border guards to come to the American side of the bridge.

This pro bono immigrant advocate and attorney said that those folks are trapped in a terrible, no-win situation because if they return to the Mexico side, the gangs in that city know they are easy prey. She recounted how some had been kidnapped and then their families had been extorted to get the money to free them. It is almost better for somebody to be on the bridge waiting than to be sent back to the Mexican side.

Those who run out of patience and end up crossing the border by going across the nearby river—the bridge is actually over the Rio Grande River. If they do that, then the administration says: You have committed a crime. We are going to lock you up and take your children away.

Another young woman we met on this trip was hanging her head with hopelessness and resignation. She told us she had presented herself for asylum at an official port of entry because she heard the right thing to do was to ask for asylum. Despite doing it at a port of entry, she was charged with illegally crossing the border. Now she sits in an ICE detention center with no idea where her child is, no communication with her family, no legal representation. Will she ever see her toddler again? She doesn't know. I don't know. Do you know whether she will ever see her child again?

Another mother we talked with was panicked over her child's health. She said that her child had medical conditions. When the border guards took the child away, they didn't get any of the information from her about how he needed to be cared for. She is deeply disturbed. She was pleading with them to take the medical information. She still doesn't know where her child is. She doesn't know how he is going to be cared for. How is that mother going to find out about her son's health?

Here is what we know. This policy, which was run as a pilot project last summer, was officially sanctioned with a policy memo on April 6 and was officially announced on May 7. This policy of separating children from their parents is an extraordinarily egregious assault on the welfare of the parent, and it inflicts massive trauma on the child. The American Academy of Pediatrics describes it this way: ''irreparable harm.'' It is harm that cannot be fixed.

Our colleague from Hawaii shared the story of family separation when her mother was not able to bring all of her children with her when she escaped domestic violence and came to the United States to start a new life and the lifelong impact that this has had on her brother.

Well, here is a piece of the puzzle we should spend a lot of time thinking about. Attorney General Sessions just changed the policy of the United States about what qualifies for asylum. So my colleague from Hawaii, whose mother fled domestic violence, would no longer qualify for an opportunity for asylum in the United States of America. She would have been turned away and sent home, back to the horrific circumstances from which she escaped, and my colleague today would not be a U.S. Senator, sitting here helping us to understand this issue through her personal, powerful experience. That mother, the window washer who carried her baby, Andrea, 65 days old, she told us, in one arm and a squeegee in the other, washing windows to get across and finally bypass the American border guard so that she could present her case for asylum—she was fleeing a gang. A drug cartel is defined as a gang, so she is not eligible for asylum—a change that was just made by Jeff Sessions unilaterally. This was an established policy to serve thousands of families fleeing from oppression overseas, and they have just lost their legal standing to be able to present their cases.

I was distraught about this Executive order that came out. It is very vague. The President—was he ready to stand up and take responsibility for the policy he implemented? Was he ready to say: I thought it was right, and here is why. I hear the American people. I hear the Southern Baptists. I hear the evangelical leaders. I hear the United Methodists. I hear the citizens profoundly disturbed by the treatment of children from every corner of the United States, from every part—from Alaska to Florida, from Maine to Southern California, and across Hawaii. I hear them, and I am going to do better. I am going to change this. I am going to modify what we do.

Did he take responsibility? No.

He titled it ''Affording Congress An Opportunity To Address Family Separation,'' and then he proceeded to say nothing about actually uniting the families he has already separated. There is not a thing in here about actually remedying the harrowing plight that he has now put several thousand families into—and counting. The last count I heard was 2,300, and that was days ago. Where are we now? There are 2,500 families separated, children separated from their parents.

What do we know about this situation in which the existing children are going to be united or not united? We have an article from the New York Times that my colleague from Colorado referred to this evening. It answers the question very plainly. I have heard various analyses saying that this Executive order fails to address what is going to happen to the current children, those children who were sent far away from their parents and their parents are incarcerated. The parents are in prison far away. Where are the children? Far away. What is going to happen to them? This doesn't say.

It does say that it is the policy of this administration to maintain family unity, as if it has always been the policy of the administration to maintain family unity. It doesn't announce that they are reversing the previous policy. It doesn't announce a new policy. It says that it is the policy to maintain family unity.

If it is the policy to maintain family unity, then why do I have this in my hand, this article from the New York Times, quoting Kenneth Wolfe, a spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families?

Realize this: When the Department of Homeland Security takes children away from their parents, it then ships them out to a different agency, the Administration for Children and Families, which is a part of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which is part of the Department of Human Services. So the children are torn away by Homeland Security, and then they are put in a different department over here, a subsection called the Administration for Children and Families. So here is the spokesman, and he says: ''There will not be a grandfathering of existing cases.'' ''Cases''—what a word to describe children ripped away from their parents. They are cases; no ''grandfathering of existing cases,'' he said.

He goes on to say: ''I can tell you definitively that is going to be [the] policy.'' Well, I can tell you definitively, I am going to fight that policy. I am going to fight that policy of failing to reunite these families after the administration says that it is policy to keep families together and then says: But not all the children we have already harmed.

This is pretty disturbing, but it is only the half of it. What is the other half? The other half is that the administration has not given up on its strategy of deterrence based on injuring children. It is a strategy laid out by Jeff Sessions, supported by Chief of Staff John Kelly, with Steve Miller chiming in to say: This will work. They want to deter people from seeking asylum here in the United States of America by mistreating those who arrive and try to seek asylum. They use the word ''deterrence'' to send a message of what will happen to you if you try to come here.

There is no moral code in the United States of America or in the world that would support hurting children to send a message to families still overseas. There is no religious tradition on this planet that supports injuring children to send a message overseas. But here we have Mr. Wolfe speaking definitively that nothing is going to be done for those children, those more than 2,000 children who have been separated from their parents.

Moreover, the other half of the policy is that for those now coming in, it will

be the official strategy of the United States of America to incarcerate the children along with the parents. That is the plan. We have already gone down that path in the past. Experts have already weighed in, saying that incarcerating children with their families—they may not be separated, but they are incarcerated. They can't go to school. They can't play on the playground. To continue this policy of deterrence, that is another strategy of injuring children. That is deeply, deeply disturbing, and it is profoundly unacceptable.

We have done this before. We have put families together in prison camps. We did it in World War II. We took our Japanese-Americans, and we put them into prison camps. It was a profoundly disturbing chapter in our history. Now the President says that is his new plan—to put families together in prison camps.

So, no, I am not happy that the President has ended the policy of family separation because he hasn't ended the strategy of harming children. The fight must continue. The pressure must continue. The weighing in by religious group after religious group needs to continue. The legal challenges need to continue. The debate here on the floor of the Senate needs to continue. We cannot accept family prison camps here in the United States of America.

I was struck by the fact that we had a program that was working pretty well. That program is called the Family Case Management Program. Here in my hand is the report from the Office of the Inspector General of Homeland Security. This is the inspector general's analysis of the Family Case Management Program to keep families together and out of prison and to make sure they show up for their hearings, their asylum hearings. This report is from just a few months ago, November 30, 2017.

For those who want to look it up online, just look up OIG—for Office of the Inspector General—-18–22. That is OIG–18–22, and you will immediately see a copy of the inspector general's report. It takes a look at this program, the Family Case Management Program, which addresses this challenge in a whole different way.

Here is what it says, in summary:

> As of March 30, 2017, ICE reported that it expended $17.5 million in program costs to enroll 781 active participants in FCMP—

the Family Case Management Program—

> across all five locations. According to ICE, overall program compliance for all five regions is an average of 99 percent for ICE check-ins and appointments, as well as 100 percent attendance at court hearings.

It doesn't get much better than 100 percent of people showing up for their court hearings. This didn't require a family prison camp. This got 100 percent by treating people with respect and having a case manager who actually spoke their language check in with them, making sure they had their cell number and their home number and knew where they were living, and making sure they knew the date and understood the importance of showing up both for their check-ins and appointments and their court hearings.

They didn't have 80 percent show up for their court hearings; they didn't get 60 or 40 percent. They got 100 percent.

So there is no argument—no argument—that you have to incarcerate people to have them show up for a hearing, and there is no morality in continuing to injure children in order to send a message of deterrence to people overseas.

Then we have the plan, through all of this incarceration, to build prison camp after prison camp. We have a picture of the tents.

There are children in this new prison camp that is near El Paso, TX. They ran out of room. They ran out of room at Casa Padre. Casa Padre is a big former Walmart that was serving as a detention center for children—children who were unaccompanied minors and children who were separated from their parents. They said earlier this year that they had 300 children there, and in April they had 500 children there.

When I went down there 2 weeks ago and stood outside that Walmart, trying to gain entry after having been denied a waiver to visit it with less than 2 weeks' notice, I said that I had heard from refugee advocates that there were hundreds of kids behind those doors in Walmart—hundreds—and there might even be as many as 1,000 children behind those doors. Even as I said those words, I thought: That is not possible. It is not possible that 1,000 children are locked up in that Walmart.

What did we find out 2 weeks later? A congressional delegation going down and getting a waiver to be able to visit—there weren't 1,000 children there. There weren't 1,100 children there, not 1,200, not 1,300, not 1,400. They had gotten a special adjustment to their permit to allow 1,500 children to be in that Walmart. There were 1,500 children sleeping, living, spending the day, apparently trying to go to class—1,500 in this one building. They said they actually were at capacity. They said: We do have a few slots. But it was something like 1,467 kids. So maybe they had one busload that they could add.

That is why the government is building this tent city—for all the children they are detaining, for all the children they are ripping away from parents.

Now the administration says: We will take these same tent cities, these same prison camps, only we will put whole families in there. By the way, for those children we see in this picture—the almost 1,500 boys I saw at Casa Padre—they don't get to be united with their families because Kenneth Wolfe, the head of the Administration for Children and Families, says that there will not be a grandfathering, meaning those kids are out of luck. For as long as their parents are incarcerated, they are out of luck.

Now, a lot of parents were told: You are only going to go through a court proceeding. It will just take a day or two, and you will be united with your children. That, in many cases, is a lie. If they were asserting asylum, the administration has decided to keep the parents incarcerated until their asylum hearing which, at this point, could be many months into the future, sometimes over 1 year into the future.

There is one woman who said that she came here expecting to be able to assert her asylum claim. She didn't know if it would be judged to breach the standard for asylum in the United States, if she would have enough evidence to demonstrate legitimate fear of return and that she had been persecuted before she came. She didn't know if she would meet those standards, but she said: What I have learned is that my child has been shipped off. She actually said ''children.'' She had several children. She said: It may be that I will be in prison for a year. So I have two choices. One is to give up my asylum claim and be shipped home; the other is to be in prison for a year. She said: For my children's sake, I will ask my sister to adopt my children. She was trying to find some decent way, with asylum blocked and threatened with a year in jail, just to get an asylum hearing.

For those Members of the Senate who have family histories with people who have come from abroad—and I would say it does include every single Member of this Senate; I don't think a single Member of this Senate is 100 percent Native American; so every Member here has a family history with all of these branches going out for generations—imagine your grandfather, your great-grandfather, your great-great-grandmother, and what would have happened if they had arrived in the United States and they told them: You must leave your children aside and be in prison for a year, knowing what harm it will do to your children, and knowing that at the end of the year you might not be granted asylum anyway when you got that hearing.

So let's wrap this up. I believe that we must return to the vision of the Statue of Liberty. I believe that our Nation is a Nation that deeply resonates with the understanding that when those individuals flee persecution—they flee persecution—they should be treated with respect and dignity when they arrive on the shores of the United States.

We absolutely must not go to a family policy of incarceration. That is handcuffs for all, and it is completely unacceptable. We had, under family separation, handcuffs for the parents, and now the administration proposes handcuffs for all of the people and to put them in prison.

This must not stand. We must resist it with every particle of our being and

return to treating those who flee persecution with graciousness and fairness and dignity.

Thank you, Mr. President.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 21, 2018, at 9:45 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DINO FALASCHETTI, OF MONTANA, TO BE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE RICHARD B. BERNER, RESIGNED.

### NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RODNEY HOOD, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2023, VICE RICHARD T. METSGER, TERM EXPIRED.

### BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

KATHLEEN LAURA KRANINGER, OF OHIO, TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE RICHARD CORDRAY, RESIGNED.

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JOHN FLEMING, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, VICE ROY K. J. WILLIAMS.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL A. HAMMER, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

### MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

JULIA AKINS CLARK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS EXPIRING MARCH 1, 2021, VICE ANNE MARIE WAGNER, TERM EXPIRED.

### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

PETER GAYNOR, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JOSEPH L. NIMMICH.

### EXPORT–IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

KIMBERLY A. REED, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT–IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE FRED P. HOCHBERG, RESIGNED.

### UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MARK MONTGOMERY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE R. DAVID HARDEN.

### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

ROBERT L. WILKIE, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE DAVID J. SHULKIN.

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. MARK D. KELLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. TIMOTHY J. MADDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. JEFFREY L. HARRIGIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. CHRISTOPHER P. WEGGEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS A. BUSSIERE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. KENNETH S. WILSBACH

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. STEPHEN M. TWITTY

### IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5044:

*To be general*

LT. GEN. GARY L. THOMAS

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

*To be major*

SAMUEL B. ALBAHARI
RICCARDO C. PAGGETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

*To be major*

JOHNMARK R. ARDIENTE
NATHAN A. GUNTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

RYAN J. BERGLIN
JEREMY O. JACOBSON
JAMES A. NARDELLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

*To be major*

DAVID L. BURRIER
WILLIAM T. CIGICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

JOSHUA V. ARNDT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

CHRISTOPHER Z. FARRINGTON
DAVID J. GRISDALE
BRYAN Z. LIPE
ANDREW J. MCKINLEY
MONICA I. RIVERA
RANDY J. SHED
MICHAEL P. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

RODERICK W. SUMPTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be major*

DANIEL TORRES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

MICHAEL P. ANTECKI, JR.
MICHAEL L. ARNER
MICHAEL B. AVENICK
PETER C. BAKKE
BRIAN A. BEAM
RAYMOND W. BLAINE
CLAYTON D. BOWERS
JAMES D. BROWNE, JR.
JAMES A. DAHL
KIRK J. DANIELS
MATTHEW B. DAVIS
ADAM J. DYKSTRA
ROBERT P. FARRELL
DAVID A. FELDNER
CARL L. FRIEDRICHS
ALEXANDRA L. HOBBS
JUSTIN M. HORGAN
THOMAS M. LACY
MATTHEW C. LINDSEY
LECARL B. LOCKLEY
JUSTINO LOPEZ
MARLON T. MALLORY
SCOTT W. MCCARTHY
COREY G. MCCOY
SHEILA MEDEIROS
BETTY P. MYRTHIL
RYAN M. NACIN
PHILIP L. NESNADNY
TAMISHA R. NORRIS
SEAN M. OHALLORAN
BENJAMIN L. QUIMBY
JONATHAN S. RITTENBERG
JASON R. SABOVICH
TIMOTHY J. SIKORA
RYAN G. TATE
JAMES N. TURNER
TIMOTHY P. UNGARO
ZACHARY R. VOGT
JASON WATERS
MARK M. YEARY
SAMUEL S. YI
D014175

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

LISA M. ABEL
ELLIOTT ACEVEDO
KENDALL P. ADAMS
ROMAINE M. AGUON
DAVID G. ALEXANDER
JAMES P. ALLEN
JASON A. ALLEN
JORGE ALMODOVAR
DOMINIC L. AMANTIAD
MATTHEW T. AMSDELL
JARMARLE O. ARNOLD
KATIA S. AROSEMENA
SAUL A. ARROYO
FIDEL ARVELO
BRIAN H. ASTWOOD
DANIEL J. AZZONE
ERIC J. BANKS
MARK E. BEERBOWER
SEAN M. BELL
WILLIAM R. BENNETT
KEVIN R. BENTZ
DAVONNE L. BIVINS
FORREST L. BLACK
LISA D. BLACK
NIKKI M. BLYSTONE
JASON P. BOOK
BRYAN J. BOYEA
SIDNEY N. BRADDY
FELICHIA S. BROOKS
JAMARCUS A. BROOKS
CHRISTOPHER A. BROWN
DREWRY L. BROWN
ROBERT M. BROWN
JEFFREY W. BUCKNER
GREGORY A. BUTLER
PAUL E. CACCIA
TOMAS F. CAMPBELL
ANGEL M. CARDENAS
CHRISTOPHER L. CARTER
RIAN M. CARTER
THOMAS A. CARVER
STEPHEN C. CHENG
SHAWN M. CHUQUINN
HWAJIN CLARK
MARK J. CLEARY
JAY C. COATS
HUGH H. COLEMAN III
MARSHALL E. COOPER
BARBARA P. COOTE
MARWIN Z. CORTES
CHARLES H. COSTELLO
BRANDY M. CULP
ISAAC V. CUTHBERTSON
SHAWN O. DANIEL
ROSA V. DELAGARZA
RUDY L. DELAROSA
ERICH O. DELAVEGA
AMALIO DELEON, JR.
JONATHAN L. DELOACH
KARLETON M. DEMPSEY
SUSAN M. DEPIESSTYER
JOAQUIN H. DEQUINTANAROO
MAYRA I. DIAZ
JOHN R. DICKENS

STANLEY L. DIEHL II
MICHAEL P. DIETZ
CHARLES M. DIGGS
KATARINA DLUGOSZ
LEE W. DOGGETT
SEAN P. DONOVAN
HEATHER D. DORAN
ROBERT B. DOSPOY
DAMIAN E. DOUGLAS
CORBY R. DUNCAN
DAVID A. DYKEMA
THERESA A. ECHEVARRIA
MARLON U. ELBELAU
JOEEN FIGUEROARODRIGUEZ
DAVID P. FLEMING
GUSTAVO FLORES
SARAH L. FORSTER
JACKEY L. FORTENBERRY
ALAN R. FOWLER
SAMANTHA J. FRAZIER
RICARDO FREGOSO
DANIEL M. GALLOWAY
HANEDA L. GARNER
COURTNEY J. GARY
DANIEL S. GONZALES
FERMIN GONZALES, JR.
SEAN M. GREEN
KARIN R. GRESHAM
JOHN G. GUBITOSI
ANGELA L. HABINA
JEFFREY P. HALLADAY
VINITA E. HAMBRICKBROWN
DAVID J. HANKINS
TODD A. HANZES
ARON T. HAUQUITZ
ROBERT J. HEATHERLY
LARRY W. HESLOP
BRANDON J. HILL
JOHN P. HOLCOMBE
MICHAEL D. HOPKINS
MELISSA A. HORVATH
KERRY M. HOUCK
SHEILA L. HOWELL
STEVEN E. HUBER
BRADLEY W. HUDSON
SONIA I. HUERTAS
JAMES T. IANITELLI
BRENT R. IRISH
ONWE R. IVORY
INA S. JACKSON
MARTY L. JACKSON
HARLEY P. JENNINGS
JEFFREY L. JENNINGS
ALICIA J. JOHNSON
JAMES S. JOHNSON
JOSHUA M. JOHNSON
TROY S. JOHNSON
ANDREW R. JOHNSTON
TYRONE JONES, JR.
ROBERT F. JORDAN
LEAH M. KENFIELD
BRIAN B. KIBITLEWSKI
JASON M. KNAPP
ANDREW J. KOCSIS
TERRANCE L. KRATZ III
JAMES E. KYLE
NAIM R. LEE
CALEB A. LEWIS
KEVIN M. LINZEY
JONATHAN D. LIPSCOMB
CHRISTINA L. LOGAN
OYYIF K. LOGAN
MICHAEL T. LONG
JOSEPH L. LUCHETTA
KARL H. LUDEMAN
JENNIFER A. LUDWICK
BETH L. LUTHER
HUNG T. LY
PATRICK T. LYONS
RACHELLE M. MACON
JASON S. MALONE
CHARLES C. MANNING
CHARLES L. J. MARKLEY
DAVID MARSHALL, JR.
DEDRICK J. MARSHALL
GREGORIO MARTINEZCHAVEZ
ZORAIDA I. MATHER
JOSHUA W. MATTHEWS
BRADLEY M. MAY
JOSEPH J. MCCARTHY
JOHN F. MCGEE
JAMES S. MCKENZIE
SCOTT P. MCLENDON
MATTHEW T. MCMANNES
CARPER H. MCMILLAN
MICHAEL S. MCVAY
JOSE A. MEDINA
ERIC MENDOZA
KEVIN H. MENSING
KEVIN L. MERCER
CARLOS J. MERINO
DEMOND J. MERRICK
MATTHEW D. MEYER
MICHAEL A. MIGNANO
REBECCA A. MILKOWSKI
JAMES R. MILLER
KARMA A. MILLER
MICHAEL J. MILLER
ROY N. MILLER
STEPHEN E. MILLER
JERRY D. MOIZE
BERNARD K. MONROE
ADAM B. MOODIE
LILIU P. MOODY
TIMOTHY S. MOON
KERRY J. MOTES
PARKER S. MOYE
WILLIAM R. MULKEY
TROYJOHN C. NAPUTI
PHUONG H. NGUYEN
VINH B. NGUYEN
KATHRYN M. NILSEN
KELLY M. NOCKS
BRENT A. ODOM
AKANINYENE A. OKON
AYOKUNLE O. OLADIPOFANIYI
CARLOS C. OQUENDO
CHRISTOPHER T. ORLOWSKI
RICARDO ORTIZROSARIO
MICHAEL L. OSMON
JOHN P. OSULLIVAN
JOSHUA PANEK
ERIC J. PARTIN
MICHAEL C. PAVLISAK
JAMIE C. PEER
JESUS A. PENA
LEONEL A. PENA
ERNESTO PEREZ
JESSICA R. PERRITTE
DAVID N. PETERS
EDWARD R. PHELPS, JR.
ADRIENNE M. PREM
GARY L. PRICE
ALBERT A. PRIDE
BRIAN L. PURDY
JENNIFER E. RATAJESAK
PHILIP S. RAUMBERGER
TORRIONNE RECHE
RICHARD I. REEVES II
CESARIO J. RENDON
PAUL R. C. REYES
HASSAN K. REYNOLDS
CHRISTOPHER M. RICHARDSON
JANINE A. ROBINSONTURNER
CARMEN J. ROSADO
PEDRO J. ROSARIO
JOHN M. ROY
EDWARD R. RUNYAN
JEROME RUSSELL, JR.
CHADRICK M. RYG
MAXIMO A. SANCHEZGERENA
PAUL F. SANTAMARIA
EDGAR O. SANTANA
TOSHIHIDE SASAKI
AMELIA H. SCHULZ
CHARLES M. SEABERRY
JOHN D. SEITZ
MAX V. SELF
SCOTT L. SHAFFER
SCOTT D. SHANNON
JONATHAN I. SHARK
ALEX B. SHIMABUKURO
JAMISON R. SMITH
STEVE C. SMITH
THOMAS C. SMITH
TEX W. SOTO
CHERYL N. SPARKS
BENJAMIN A. STEADMAN
ALAN L. STEPHENS
CHRISTOPHER R. STEWART
TODD F. STULL
JONATHAN M. SWAN
DELARIUS V. TARLTON
AARON C. TELLER
KRALYN R. THOMAS, JR.
MICHAEL E. THOMAS
SHANNON N. THOMPSON
LASHANDA M. THORNTON
TONY L. THORNTON
SOON M. TOGIOLA
MARYGRACE P. TOMOMITSU
RICKEY J. TORRES
CHRISTOPHER M. TRAMONTANA
BRIAN M. TRAVIS
JAY S. VANDENBOS
JOSHUA M. WALTER
DAVID D. WALTERS
OLIN L. WALTERS
DOUGLAS R. WARREN, JR.
MICHAEL C. WATSON
CHAD B. WATTS
HEATH R. WEAVER
WILLIAM G. WEAVER
MARCUS J. WHITE
KEMAU A. WHITTINGTON
ALLIN L. WHITTLE II
GREGORY W. WILEY
OLRIC R. WILKINS II
ADAM C. WILLCOXON
LISBON J. WILLIAMS, JR.
JEFFREY L. WITHERSPOON
EDWARD K. WOO
SIMEON J. WOOD
CHRISTOPHER C. WURST
TRACI J. B. YAMADA
TRACY L. YATES
RAYMOND K. YU
SARAH K. YUN
JOSEPH C. ZABALDANO
CODY L. ZACH
D011081
D012500
D012612
D013025
D013276
D014169
D014651

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

DREW Q. ABELL
CHRISTINA R. ACOJEDO
JONATHAN M. ADAMS
ROBERT N. ADAMS
GREGORY J. ADY
KWADWO AGYEIAYE
SABRE M. AJYEMAN
JARED J. ALBRIGHT
MICHAEL A. ALLARD
DEAN P. ALLEN
JASON E. ALLEN
NATHANIEL A. ALLEN
IVAN M. ALVARADO
ALFRED C. ANDERSON, JR.
STEPHEN C. ANG
ROMAE M. ARAUD
JIMMY ARCHANGE
JOSE A. ARIAS
MICHAEL E. ASTIN
JARED D. AUCHEY
BRIAN C. BABCOCKLUMISH
MILES A. BAKER
ERIC A. BALOUGH
JAY T. BAO
CHARLES V. BARRETT
ROBERT A. BARRY
CLIFTON D. BASS
JOHN A. BAUMANN
ERIKA P. BEAM
JONATHAN H. BECKMANN
ERHAN BEDESTANI
JASON M. BELKNAP
STEVEN R. BELTZ
TIMOTHY M. BENNETT
PHILIP R. BERRY II
BRIAN L. BERTHELOTTE
MAYA C. BEST
TIMOTHY N. BIBLE
JONATHAN E. BISSELL
KEVIN E. BLAINE
WILSON C. BLYTHE, JR.
BENJAMIN C. BOEKESTEIN
ELIZABETH A. BOITANO
JOEL M. BORKERT
CRAIG M. BOUCHER
ZAHI K. BOURJEILI
CHRISTOPHER O. BOWERS
SONYA A. BOWMAN
DAVID H. BRADLEY
BRADFORD M. BRANNON
JASON C. BRAY
LENNY T. BRAZZLE
JAMES L. BREDEMAN
JEFFREY J. BRIZEK
STEWART N. BROWN
JOHN M. BRUGGINK
CARRIE A. BRUNNER
DANIEL J. BURKHART
MICHAEL J. BURNS
PHILIP M. CALA
KEITH J. CALDWELL
EBONY CALHOUN
ROBERT H. CALLAHAN
JOSHUA P. CAMARA
MATTHEW J. CAMEL
KYLE I. CAMPBELL
THOMAS G. CAMPBELL III
GABRIEL CAMPUZANO
JASON E. CANNON
ROBERT J. CARPENA
ANDREW M. CARRIGAN
ROGER A. CARVAJAL
LEE J. CASTANA
JERROLD D. CASTRO
MATTHEW L. CAVANAUGH
ROBERT P. CHAMBERLAIN
ANDRUS W. CHANEY
JAMES T. CHASE
SAPRIYA CHILDS
JASON J. CHOI
KIP M. CHOJNACKI
ANTHONY W. CLARK
ERIC A. COLLINS
JAMES B. COLLINS
JENNIFER G. COLLINS
CHRISTOPHER A. CONNOR
NOAH B. COOPER
SETH T. COTTRELL
DENNIS A. COX
MATTHEW A. CRAWFORD
STEVEN R. CREWS
CATHERINE B. CROMBE
JAMES A. CRUMP
RIVERA E. CRUZ
LUIS S. CRUZRAMOS
SHAWN P. DALRYMPLE
JASON W. DAVENPORT
EVERETTA J. DAVIS
ROGER S. DAVIS
CHRISTOPHER P. DEAN
ALICIA R. DEASE
TRISTAN P. DEBORD
ANDREW W. DECKER
WENDY K. DEDMOND
PARSANA DEOKI
CHRISTOPHER M. DICKINSON
DAVID DILLY
CHARLES R. DIXON
RYAN M. DONALD
NICHOLE L. DOWNS
ERIN T. DOYLE
CHRISTINA L. DUGAN
NICKOLAS A. DUNCAN
WILLIAM R. DUNCAN
TIMOTHY J. EASTMAN
NESTOR J. ECHEVERRIA
GREGORY C. EDGREEN
MATTHEW H. ELLETT

PATRICK R. ELLIOTT
JOEL P. ELLISON
CARMEN V. ELSTON
JOEL G. ELSTON
PETRUS J. ENGELBRECHT
JAIME A. ESPEJO
MARCUS T. EVANS
JORDON T. EWERS
ISAAC J. FABER
MATHEW A. FEEHAN
JOHN J. FELBER
GARRET D. FETT
EDWARD A. FIGUEROA
CHRISTOPHER J. FINNIGAN
MICHAEL FLEISCHMANN
ANGEL FLORES
DUANE G. FOOTE
ANDREW J. FORNEY
JORDAN M. FRANCIS
JABULANI H. FULLER
MICHAEL M. GACHERU
JOSEPH GAINEY
ELLIS GALES, JR.
VIJAY M. GALLARDO
COREY D. GAMBLE
MICHAEL D. GAMBONE
JASON L. GARNEAU
JONATHAN A. GENDRON
PETE J. GODBEY
SHAWN GOLDWIRE
VICTOR J. GONZALEZORTIZ
CHRISTOPHER D. GOODRICH
ELLIS Z. GORDON
GEORGE C. GREANIAS
MATTHEW A. GREB
VERNON D. GREER
NICHOLAS E. GREGOIRE
ROBERT T. GREINER
ADAM C. GROW
JOSE R. GUANDIQUE
JAMES W. HALE
CARTER J. HALFMAN
VALIANT A. HALLER
KURTIS S. HANSON
TODD J. HARKRADER
AUDRICIA M. HARRIS
GLENROY HASKINS
AMANDA J. HATCH
DORIS J. HAYNES
MATTHEW B. HAYNES
DARTANION J. HAYWARD
JACQUELINE L. HEARNE
ANDREW H. HENDERSON
SHANNA M. HENDRIX
BRIAN HOLLOWAY
STACY M. HOPWOOD
MATTHEW J. HORTON
JARED T. HOWARD
ANDREW P. HUBBARD
MARGARET D. HUGHES
DAVID J. HUMPHREYS
DAMON M. HUNT
CALVIN K. HUTTO
RYAN T. IRWIN
JOSH T. W. JACQUES
VICTOR A. JAFFETT
CHRISTOPHER C. JOHNES
ANDRE E. JONES
KENTON E. JUSTICE
GEORGE S. KAFER
JUAN C. S. KAPLAN
TARL E. KAROLESKI
GARRETT J. KAYE
GRACE K. KELLY
EVELYN M. KEMPE
JOHN A. KENDALL
JASON P. KENDZIERSKI
LOGAN J. KERSCHNER
CHRISTOPHER E. KETZ
ASFANDYAR KHAN
DANIEL K. KILGORE
MATHSTO KINGSADA
CHRISTOPHER R. KLIEWER
KEVIN M. KNOWLEN
MATTHEW A. KOHLER
JEFFRY T. KOONTZ
JEFFREY J. KORNBLUTH
RYAN W. KORT
MICHAEL A. KOTICH
KIP E. KOWALSKI
SUNNY C. S. KUEHL
ALFREDA A. LACEY
ADDISON F. LADIERO
CHARLENE A. LAMOUNTAIN
NICHOLAS A. LANE
MARIA M. LANFOR
ERIK R. LARSEN
LAWRENCE R. LEE
KRISTIAN K. LEIBFARTH
JAMES A. LEIDENBERG
JOHNATHAN L. LEMING
STEVEN E. LEWENTOWICZ
TYRONE A. L. LEWIS
TILISHA C. LOCKLEY
RYAN W. LOOMIS
JOHN W. LORD
ANDREW E. LOVEJOY
DEREK K. LOVELAND
MELVIN E. LOWE
JASON O. LUCKEY
PHILIP X. LUU
AUSTIN C. LY
ANDREW T. MAAS
SEAN M. MADDEN
BARRY L. MADETZKE
JOSEPH E. MALONE
HOLLY Y. G. MANESS
BRITT T. MANOR
TRAVIS J. MAPLES
FEDERICO MARTINEZ II
WILLIAM P. MASON
GERALD A. MATHIS
MITCHELL A. MCCANN
MICHAEL G. MCCLURE
MICHAEL K. MCCOY
KAROLYN M. MCEWEN
JEREMY A. MCHUGH
GABRIELLA M. MCKINNEY
THOMAS P. MCQUARY
KEVIN A. MCQUEARY
ROBERT C. MCVAY
EVA M. MILLARE
DEWEY M. MILLER
JACOB M. MORANO
JOHN F. MORRIS
BRENDAN P. MURPHY
FRANCIS X. MURPHY
CASEY L. C. NAPUTI
JEFFREY M. NICHOLSON
WALLACE C. NICHOLSON
GLIDDEN NIEVES
JENNIFER L. NIHILL
OLIVIA J. NUNN
ROBIN L. OCHOA
KATHERINE M. OGLETREE
AMOS Y. OH
ERIK W. OLSEN
MARCUS D. ONEAL
CHRISTOPHER D. OPHARDT
KATHERINE R. OPIE
FERGAL J. OREILLY
RYAN C. OREILLY
JOHN V. OTTE
DETRICK L. OUSBY
ROBERT B. PADGETT
CARMEN A. PAGLIO
JEFFREY T. PAINTER
ROBERT C. PARMENTER
ERIC L. PARTRIDGE
SCOTT A. PATTON
KATHRYN K. PEGUES
AHLON K. PEOPLES
ANDREW V. PESATURE
NATHANAEL W. PETERSON
TOBIAS S. PETROS
JOSIAH D. PICKETT
ANGELIQUE A. PIFER
DEREK K. PING
CHRISTOPHER D. PISKAI
DARIEN M. PITTS
SCOTT C. POLASEK
MAYDELINE G. PORTILLO
THOMAS S. POWELL
DONALD E. PRATT
ANDREW S. PRUETT
MANOJ T. PUTHENPARAMPIL
GRETCHEN M. RADKE
DONALD L. RAINES
CHRISTOPHER L. RAPP
ZACHARY A. REED
ROBERT G. RHODES
KENNETH C. RICH
MARY A. RICKS
NATHAN A. RIEDEL
JOHN A. RIZZUTO
JEREMY S. ROCKWELL
JOHN P. RODER
JOSHUA L. RODRIGUEZ
MICHAEL G. ROE
WALLACE A. ROHRER
JOHN M. ROSE
DOUGLAS J. ROSS
JIMMY M. ROSS
MATTHEW H. RUFF
GILBERTO RUIZ
SHAWN P. RUSSELL
ROBERTREL A. SACHI
ANTONIO SALAZAR, JR.
SCOTT A. SALMON
LIZETTE SANABRIAGRAJALES
EDDIE N. SANCHEZ
CRAIG A. SANDERS
SELMER C. SANTOS
JEREMY L. SAUER
FRANCIS X. SCHAFER
ROSS T. SCHEINBAUM
MATTHEW J. SCHLOSSER
NATHAN L. SCHMUTZ
CORY N. SCOTT
RYAN C. SHEERAN
KRISTEN M. SHIFRIN
MATTHEW D. SHIRLEY
E. R. SHISLER
MATTHEW R. SHOWN
CASEY D. SHUFF
DAVID F. SIDMAN
CHARLIE SILVA
SILVINO S. SILVINO
DHRAMEN P. SINGH
JASON A. SLUTSKY
ELLIS H. SMITH II
JOSEPH B. SMITH
KEMIELLE D. SMITH
ROBERT L. SMITH
SCOTT J. SMITH
TROY D. SMITH
RICKY SNELL
ROBERT G. SNYDER
ANDREA R. SO
FRANCIS X. SPERL III
ADAM C. SPRINGER
DANIEL J. SQUYRES
LAURA E. STANLEY
JAMES K. STARLING
JONATHAN J. STEIGLER
JEFFREY A. STEINLAGE
JAY D. STERRETT III
ANDREW P. STRINGER
GABRIEL M. SUAREZ
ROBERT R. SUDO
NELSON P. SUNWOO
DAMIAN R. TAAFEMCMENAMY
JOHN W. TAGGART
JAMES C. TETERS II
TRAVIS R. THEBEAU
MICHAEL J. THOMAS
EDWARD T. THOMPSON II
SPENCER T. TIMMONS
ROBERT H. TOPPER, JR.
KEVIN J. TOTH
MELISSA TOVAR
BRADLEY R. TOWNSEND
KIRILL A. TSEKANOVSKIY
JOHN D. TURNER
JAMES R. ULL
MATTHEW P. UPPERMAN
MARK B. VANGELDER
TAMARA B. VANHOOSEPALL
MARK E. VANHORN
BRANDON L. VANORDEN
ALEX VERSHININ
AARON T. VEVASIS
AMANDA M. VIOLETTE
WILLIAM H. WAGGY II
RUSSELL W. WALTER
MALLORY A. WAMPLER
BRIAN A. WARD
ALEXANDER E. WARING
RYAN C. WATERS
JOHN M. WEATHERLY
SOLON D. WEBB
KEVIN J. WEBER
MATTHEW T. WEHRI
CHRISTOPHER P. WELSH
CREYONTA N. WEST
MICKEY M. WEST
DONALD S. WHIFFEN III
JOSEPH S. WIER
JERIMIAH A. WILDERMUTH
DOMINICK J. WILKINSON
DUANE M. WILLIAMS
EUGENE U. WILLIAMS
DERECK K. WILSON
JASON S. WIMBERLY
MICHAEL M. WINN
ADAM M. WINOGRAD
STEVEN W. WOJDAKOWSKI
JASON C. WOOD
TIMOTHY J. WYANT
JOHN C. YUNGBLUTH III
D006024
D010469
D010957
D012294
D012600
D012640
D012795
D012868
D013215
D013311
D013449
D014179
D014294
D014340
D014585
G001131
G001231
G010122
G010139
G010141
G010177
G010242
G010271
G010354
G010393

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

ELI S. ADAMS
JERROD C. ADAMS
JASON N. ADLER
MATT M. ALDRICH
ERIC B. ALEXANDER
MARVIN ANDERSON
BRETT E. ANDRINGA
RENATO E. ANGELES
UZOMA U. ANINIBA
DANIEL A. ANTOLOS
ADAM D. ANTONINI
SYLVIA D. APONTE
NEIL G. ARMSTRONG
BEAU J. ASHLEY
ANDREW P. ASWELL
RYAN S. ATKINS
PETER M. ATKINSON
SCOTTY M. AUTIN
DARBY L. AVILES
MATTHEW P. BAIDEME
JOHN M. BAKER
JAMES D. BALLARD
KENTON R. BARBER
BRETT N. BARDO
CORNELIUS A. BATTS
JOSHUA A. BAUER
ROBERT K. BEALE
SAMANTHA R. BEBB
JOSEPH C. BELL
RICHARD R. BELL

BRET M. BEMIS
CHRISTOPHER E. BERGE
BARBARA A. BERNINGER
JOSHUA M. BETTY
NICHOLAS J. BILOTTA
DOMINIC D. BLACK
DUSTIN A. BLAIR
JARROD R. BLAISDELL
KWAME O. BOATENG
ADAM R. BOCK
GEORGE E. BOLTON, JR.
BRYAN J. BONNEMA
JOSHUA S. BOWES
VANESSA R. BOWMAN
JOHN B. BRADLEY
ADAM R. BRADY
JAMES E. BRANT
JEFFREY O. BREWSTER
DEXTER E. BRICKEN
CHARLES J. BROWN
LARRY G. BROWN, JR.
MARK L. BROWN, JR.
TERRY L. BROWN
ANTHONY H. BRUNNER
MICHAEL E. BRYANT
MARK E. BUSH
PHILLIP B. CAIN
MICHAEL CALDERON
DAMION M. CALVERT
DANIEL G. CAMPBELL, SR.
DEREK W. CAMPBELL
JOHN W. CAMPBELL
MATTHEW C. CAPRARI
MATTHEW C. CARLSEN
SEAN T. CARMODY
CHRISTOPHER L. CARPENTER
CHRISTIAN A. CARR
ALLAN B. CARROLL
CHRISTOPHER J. CARTER
PATRICK W. CAUKIN
WALTER S. CHALKLEY
MATTHEW J. CHAMBLESS
DAVID A. CHARBONNEAU
MATTHEW B. CHASE
WILLIAM B. CHASTAIN
RICHARD T. CHILDERS
BRADY R. CLARK
JAMES D. CLAY
JESSIE R. COLLINS
NATHAN M. COLVIN
BRADLEY T. COMRIE
CHRISTIAN G. COOK
DENNIS A. COOK
ROBERT L. CORNELIUS, JR.
FRANCISCO A. CORTEZ III
CRAIG S. COTNER
MICHAEL J. COTOVSKY
ADA L. COTTO
ANTHONY B. COULTER
SAMUEL V. COWART
YANSON T. COX
TIMOTHY A. CRANE
JAMES L. CRENSHAW
PETER CRUZ
RYAN A. CRYER
FREDERICK M. CUMMINGS
JODY J. DAIGLE
JOSHUA P. DAILEY
DAVID W. DAKE
BRIDGET E. DALZIEL
RANJINI T. DANARAJ
JUSTIN E. DAUBERT
ERIK A. DAVIS
JOHN R. DAVIS, JR.
LARINZOL A. DAVIS
RYAN M. DAVIS
NICOLE E. DEAN
PATRICK M. DEFOREST
DOMINIC P. DEFRANCISCO
CHRISTOPHER R. DERUYTER
JOHN A. DILLS
JOHN R. DIXON
MICHAEL D. DO
GERARDO F. DOMINGUEZ
SEAN T. DUBLIN
SCOTT W. DUNKLE
DAVID M. DURANTE
MICHAEL G. DVORAK
KEVIN M. EASTER
RICHARD E. EATON
JOSHUA E. EGGAR
RYAN L. EISENHAUER
MYCHAJLO I. ELIASZEWSKYJ
SHARON ENGELMEIER
DONALD B. ERICKSON
MICHAEL E. ERLANDSON
ROBERT L. EYMAN
JEFFREY R. FARMER
JON B. FAUSNAUGH
SCOTT M. FERRIS
MARK N. FINNEGAN
BRIAN D. FISHER
THOMAS C. FISHER
CARLOS D. B. FLYNN
PATRICK I. FLYNN
MICHAEL B. FOGARTY
ANTHONY L. FORSHIER
CHRISTOPHER E. FOWLER
STEPHEN S. FOX
NICHOLAS C. FRANKLIN
MELANIE L. T. FUATA
ROBERT K. FURTICK
CAMERON G. GALLAGHER
JASON C. GALLARDO
TIMOTHY R. GARLAND
CHRISTOPHER S. GEMMER
DEMETRIOS A. GHIKAS
CRAIG A. GIANCATERINO
ROBERT M. M. GICHERT
JEFFREY L. GILTZOW
JEREMIAH A. GIPSON
DARREN C. GLENN
JOSHUA G. GLONEK
PAUL D. GODSON
JESSICA D. GOFFENA
JONNY GONZALEZ
MICHAEL H. GOURGUES
PAUL J. GOYNE
EDWARD B. GRAHAM
CORNELIUS O. GRANAI IV
JOSEPH GREEN, JR.
RICHARD W. GREENWOOD
DANIEL A. GREGORY
ERIC J. GUST
KEVIN L. HADLEY
ERIN D. HADLOCK
RYAN P. HANRAHAN
CORRIE A. HANSON
BRIAN C. HARBER
SHAWN P. HARKINS
ROBERT B. HARLESS
ERIC S. HARRISON
JOSEPH M. HARRISON
RICHARD W. HARTFELDER
BRADLEY C. HAYES
JOSEPH D. HEATON
PAUL F. HENDERSON, JR.
ADAM D. HEPPE
TODD R. HERTLING
WALTER L. HICKS
TERRENCE I. HIGGINS
GRANT H. HILL
JAMES R. HOCK
JIM R. HODSON
DANIEL J. HOEPRICH
MATTHEW J. HOFMEISTER
DARRELL P. HOLDEN
JOSEPH P. HOLLAND
JONATHAN T. HOLM
JEREMY B. HOLMAN
STEVEN C. HOLMBERG
NICHOLAS C. HOLTEN
DANIEL J. HORST
BRIAN R. HORVATH
SIDNEY D. HOWARD III
RICHARD E. HULL
DANIEL E. HURD
JUSTIN P. HURT
CHRISTOPHER M. INGENLOFF
MATTHEW J. INGLIS
BENJAMIN E. JACKMAN
LACREDERICK R. JACKSON
PRESTON JACKSON
RAHSAAN H. JACKSON
SAMUEL A. JACKSON III
ERIC G. JAMES
REGINALD A. JAMO
GREGORY A. JENEMANN
BENJAMIN D. JOHNSON
GEORGE H. JOHNSON III
JAMES O. JOHNSON
KIMBERLY D. JOHNSON
MICHAEL A. JOHNSON
STANLEY B. JOHNSON
JOSHUA W. JOPLING
JEREMY L. KACZOR
PATRICK H. KAINE
CHRISTOPHER R. KANE
JOEL R. KASSULKE
PATRICIA N. KAST
SCOTT M. KATALENICH
PETER J. KATZFEY
BENJAMIN E. KAVANAGH
STEVEN L. KEIL
MATTHEW R. KELLEY
RYAN G. KELLY
JOHN A. KERIN
JAMES K. KERNS
SIMON Y. KIM
JOHN R. KIRCHGESSNER
THOMAS J. KITSON
CHRISTIAN D. KNUTZEN
MICHAEL L. KOLODZIE
ANDREW J. KULAS
JODIE L. KUNKEL
MICHAEL W. KURTICH
JOSHUA A. LADD
THOMAS E. LAMB
CALEB G. LANDRY
RALPH E. LAUER III
ALEXANDER B. LAZATIN
JOHN D. LEITNER
KEVIN R. LEWIS
DAVID D. LITTLE
DENISE R. LITTLE
ANGEL M. LLOMPARTMONGE
CLEMENT D. LOCHNER
BRIAN T. LOONEY
RICHMOND R. LUCE
MICHAEL A. LUECKEMAN
REVEROL A. E. LUGO
VICTOR L. LUNDERMAN
TIMOTHY B. LYNCH
MITCHELL D. MABARDY
PHILLIP D. MADSEN
MATTHEW D. MAGENNIS
MICHAEL L. MAGILL
MATTHEW L. MAKARYK
CHRIS B. MANGLICMOT
RICHARD MANSIR
TODD B. MARABLE
MICHAEL A. MARCHETTI
MATTHEW D. MARFONGELLI
WILLIAM D. MARSHALL
MICHAEL R. MARTIN
LUIS D. MARTINEZ
MATTHEW C. MASON
ANTHONY D. MASSARI
FRANK F. MAXWELL
CARRICK E. MCCARTHY
JOSEPH A. MCCARTHY
RANDY L. MCCLENDON
KEVIN MCCORMICK
KIRSTEN S. MCFARLAND
HEATHER R. MCGRATH
SCOTT A. MCGRATH
PAUL M. MCMANUS
ROBERT M. MCTIGHE
ERNEST D. MEADOWS
RAUL M. MEDRANO
ERIC MEGERDOOMIAN
LUKE E. MERCIER
VIRAK A. METCALF
SAMUEL A. MEYER
RINGO L. MIDLES
MICHAEL J. MILAS
NICHOLAS D. MILKOVICH
MATTHEW R. MINEAR
NATHAN N. MINOTT
ROBERT C. MISKE
CHRISTOPHER A. MOLINO
MATTHEW M. MOLLY
JASON M. MONCUSE
RICHARD A. MONTCALM, JR.
PAUL J. MORIARTY
CHRISTOPHER V. MORO
DANIEL C. MORRIS
JOHN L. MORROW
JACOB K. MOULIN
TIMOTHY J. MURPHY
DERRICK D. MURRAY
DAVID NASH
DAVID J. NELSON
MICHAEL S. NELSON
SAMUEL J. NIRENBERG
HANY S. NOUREDDINE
MICHAEL W. ODONNELL
ETHAN A. OLBERDING
TYLER B. OLIVER
ABRAHAM N. OSBORN
JASON B. PALERMO
EUGENE W. PALKA
BRIAN D. PANARO
DALE A. PAPKA
ANTHONY W. PARKER
JAMES R. PASCOE
JEFFREY L. PAULUS
MICHAEL S. PENN
ANDREA M. PETERS
DERRICK A. PETERS
TRUC T. PHAM
ANTONIO M. PITTMAN
TODD L. POINDEXTER
ADAM F. POOLEY
DONALD R. PORTER, JR.
SIMON J. POWELSON
JOSHUA S. POWERS
MATTHEW R. PRESCOTT
JUSTIN M. PRITCHARD
RYAN N. PROPST
RYAN J. PURSEL
PATRICIA R. QUIGLEY
MATTHEW F. QUINN
ROBERT P. QUINT, JR.
RENEE E. RAMSEY
ROSEMARY M. REED
WALTER A. REED IV
RYAN T. REICHERT
DUKE W. REIM
JOSE A. REYES
MARLON S. RINGO
REINALDO RIVERA
CORY L. ROBERTS
KELVIN N. ROBINSON
KENDALL A. ROBINSON
NICHOLAS D. RYAN
MATTHEW C. SACRA
VICTOR S. SALYER
BRIAN A. SANSOM
MICHAEL A. SARRO
EDWARD B. SAUTER
DANA L. SAVAGE
PETER V. SCHMITT
CHRISTOPHER J. SCOTT
RYAN J. SCOTT
THOMAS J. SEARS
KENNETH P. SELBY
JOEL C. SEPPALA
MICHAEL W. SERVER
HOUSTON B. SHEETS
JASON M. SHICK
LAURA E. SHIPLET
LEAH C. SHUBIN
BENJAMIN L. SHUMAKER
KEVIN W. SIEGRIST
JOSEPH E. SIMS
JOSEPH M. SINCERE
NICHOLAS C. SINCLAIR
ARCHIE L. SMITH
MATTHEW J. SMITH
JASON S. SNELGROVE
DANIEL P. SNOW
JAMES M. SNOWDEN
STACY R. SOUTTER
MICHAEL V. SOYKA
COLE A. SPITZACK
LLOYD E. SPORLUCK
JAMES T. STARTZELL
SCOTT D. STEELE
KRISTIN E. STEINBRECHER
PATRICK M. V. STEVENS

VAUGHN D. STRONG, JR.
DANIEL R. STUEWE
JOSEPH D. SWINNEY
MARVIN E. SWITZER, JR.
NICHOLAS R. TALBOT
JASON M. TAYLOR
JOSHUA D. TEITGE
CHRISTOPHER D. TERRILL
HANS J. THOMAS
MARLON A. THOMAS
RUSSELL B. THOMAS, SR.
JOHN D. THOMASON
ANTHONY R. THOMPSON
MICHAEL R. THOMPSON
NICHOLAS R. THOMPSON
ROBERT L. THOMSON
BRANDON E. THRASHER
DANIEL S. THRELKELD
JOHN C. TISSERAND
WENDY R. TOKACH
TODD M. TOMPKINS
KEVIN E. TOMS
BENJAMIN L. TORPY
JEREMY W. TRENTHAM
MICHAEL J. TRUJILLO
CURTIS J. UNGER
ROBERT L. VANAUKEN
MATTHEW R. VANGILDER
JAMES S. VCHULEK II
ADRIAN VILLA
ISRAEL VILLARREAL, JR.
JASON T. VINCENT
JAMES W. WADE
DAMON T. WAGNER
CHRISTOPHER E. WALSH
ROGER A. WANG, JR.
DANIEL J. WARD
ELIJAH M. WARD
STEPHEN P. WARD
PHILLIP S. WARREN
JASON B. WASHBURN
ELIZABETH A. WEAVER
DAVID A. WEBB
BRIAN H. WEIGHTMAN
ALEXANDRE E. WEIS
KEVIN G. WERRY, JR.
HARRY B. WHITE
JACOB E. WHITE
WILLIAM G. WHITE
BRYAN S. WHITTIER
DAVID G. WILLIAMS
EDWARD E. WILLIAMS
KEITH R. WILLIAMS
WESTON T. WILLIAMS
JEREMIAH J. WILLIS
TAMEKA R. WILSON
JASON M. WINGEART
BRIAN R. WINKELMAN
CONOR M. WINSLOW
LUKE A. WITTMER
ERICA J. WITTY
GABRIEL M. WOLFE
ROBERT W. WOLFENDEN
JERRY L. WOOD, JR.
GUY F. WORKMAN
SHANNON R. WORTHAN
ADAM WOYTOWICH
SCOTT R. YANDELL
JONATHAN T. YASUDA
ROBERT W. YERKEY
PETER C. ZAPPOLA, JR.
MICHAEL E. ZIEGELHOFER
KURT P. ZORTMAN
D010870
D011034
D011285
D011754
D011805
D012594
D012613
D012711
D012725
D012874
D013090
D013271
D013679
D013863
D013940
D013959
D014007
D014083
D014147

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

MICHAEL T. ANDERS
MARK C. ANDRES
AARON ANGELL
MATTHEW T. ARCHAMBAULT
JAMES M. ASHBURN
JOHN A. ATILANO II
ARIEYEH J. AUSTIN
MICHAEL S. AVEY
TODD E. BAJAKIAN
MATTHEW S. BALINT
FRANKLIN F. BALTAZAR
ELLIS H. BARNES IV
JEREMY D. BELL
LAWSON F. BELL
BENJAMIN A. BENNETT
ANDREW M. BEYER
DANIEL D. BLACKMON
JOSHUA R. BOOKOUT
JARED D. BORDWELL
DAVID D. BOWLING
JEFFREY A. BRACCO
JAMES A. BRADY
KENNETH J. BRAEGER
JEFFERY J. BRAGG
KARST K. BRANDSMA
BRUCE A. BREDLOW
COREY A. BRUNKOW
ROBERT K. BRYANT
ALEXANDER L. BULLOCK
MATHEW F. BUNCH
DAVID R. BUNKER
JEFFREY T. BURGOYNE
STEPHEN E. CAPEHART
DANIEL A. CASTRO
JEREMY J. CHAPMAN
CARL A. CHASTEEN
VARMAN S. CHHOEUNG
CURRAN D. CHIDESTER
BRENT A. CLEMMER
AARON K. COOMBS
WILLIAM N. CRAIG III
MICHAEL P. CRANE
ERIC D. CRISPINO
PAUL B. CULBERSON
JOHN K. CURRY
MATTHEW W. DALTON
JASON S. DAVIS
ANDREW J. DEATON
SCOTT M. DELLINGER
NICHOLAS J. DICKSON
ROBERT J. DUCHAINE
ANTWAN L. DUNMYER
JAMES R. DUNWOODY
THOMAS P. EHRHART
JAMES R. EMBRY
CHRISTOPHER T. FAHRENBACH
STEPHEN A. FAIRLESS
MARK D. FEDEROVICH
EUGENE J. FERRIS
DEREK S. FINISON
CHAD R. FOSTER
WILL B. FREDS
THOMAS L. GALLI
THOMAS M. GENTER
JOHN E. GIANELLONI
JUDSON B. GILLETT
PETER C. GLASS
ANDREW R. GRAHAM
TRAVIS M. HABHAB
SAMUEL HALL
MATTHEW J. HARDMAN
MATTHEW F. HARMON
REGINALD R. HARPER
DAMON K. HARRIS
DAVID J. HASKELL
RALPH R. HEIDEL, JR.
BRIAN J. HENDERSON
MARK R. HIMES
TODD W. HOOK
MATTHEW R. HOWELL
JAMES D. HOYMAN
TIMOTHY D. HUMMEL
MATTHEW L. ISAACSON
JOSEPH A. JACKSON
KEVIN L. JACKSON
ROBERT L. JENKINS
MICHAEL C. JENSIK
MICHAEL S. JOHNSON
JASON A. JOHNSTON
MICHAEL A. JOHNSTON
JACKIE K. KAINA
CHARLES W. KEAN
DON M. KING
BRYAN G. KIRK
MICHAEL F. KLOEPPER
JASON M. KNIFFEN
STEPHEN J. KOLOUCH
JASON A. LACROIX
JONATHAN C. LAUER
GERALD S. LAW
THEODORE J. LEONARD
HEATHER A. LEVY
KIRK M. LIDDLE
BRENT W. LINDEMAN
MATTHEW W. LUZZATTO
CHRISTOPHER S. MAHAFFEY
AARON M. MARTIN
ALICIA M. MASSON
EDWIN D. MATTHAIDESS III
KEVIN E. MCHUGH
TRAVIS L. MCINTOSH
WILLIAM B. MCKANNAY
DAVID M. MCNEILL
JUSTIN T. MEISSNER
DANIEL G. MILLER
HAROLD E. MILLER
JABARI M. MILLER
YVONNE C. MILLER
KENNETH D. MITCHELL
CORNELIUS L. MORGAN
RYAN J. MORGAN
JAMES A. MOYES
ALEXANDER C. MURRAY
JEREMY S. MUSHTARE
LOI M. NGUYEN
DAVID W. NOBLE
DENNIS E. NUTT
STEPHEN W. OWEN
MICHAEL D. OWENS
IAN C. PALMER
JOSEPH H. PARKER
GITTIPONG PARUCHABUTR
DAVID J. PASQUALE
ROBERT S. PERRY
STEPHEN C. PHILLIPS
JOHN M. POOLE
JAYSON H. PUTNAM
LYNN W. RAY
JAMES V. RECTOR
JAMES C. REESE
JUSTIN Y. J. REESE
MONICA M. REID
JENNIFER A. REYNOLDS
JOSEPH C. RICHEY
PATRICK M. RODDY, JR.
CHAD M. ROEHRMAN
MATTHEW B. ROGERS
CURTIS L. ROWLAND, JR.
JASON M. SABAT
BRYAN D. SCHOTT
RYAN D. SEAGREAVES
JOSHUA P. SEGRAVES
THOMAS J. SIEBOLD
PETER M. SITTENAUER
THOMAS B. SMITH
NEIL N. SNYDER IV
NATHAN R. SPRINGER
PAUL W. STAEHELI
DONALD E. STEWART
RUSSELL C. STEWART
MICHAEL C. STULL
FRED W. TANNER
RHETT A. TAYLOR
TERRY R. TILLIS
EDWARD S. TWADDELL III
SHAWN P. UNDERWOOD
ERIC A. VANEK
TONY K. VERENNA
SCOTT M. VIRGIL
MICHAEL P. WAGNER
LELAND W. WALDRUP II
MATTHEW W. WEBER
RYAN K. WELCH
GABRIEL D. WELLS
MICHAEL R. WEST
JOHN D. WILLIAMS
EARL D. WRIGHT, JR.
RYAN B. WYLIE
JAMES R. YASTRZEMSKY
MICHAEL A. ZOPFI
D005492
D010675
D010067
D014325
D014361
D014380
D014519
D014523
D014641

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

MICHAEL J. ADAMSKI
JEREMIAH A. AESCHLEMAN
ERIC A. ANDERSON
JORGE A. ARREDONDO
CHRISTOPHER A. BACHL
STEPHANIE A. BAGLEY
DANIEL J. BARNARD
TIA L. BENNING
ERIC R. BJORKLUND
MATTHEW R. BOCKHOLT
MICHAEL A. BONURA
MARIA C. BORBON
RANDY BOUCHER
STEPHEN C. BROWNE
MICHAEL L. BURGOYNE
CHRISTOPHER J. BYRD
PETER H. CHAPMAN
TEDROSE H. CHARLES
JASON P. CLARK
SPENCER J. CLOUATRE
GEORGE I. CORBARI
JEFFREY A. COULON
ANTHONY J. COVERT
DAVID F. COY
NICOLE H. CURTIS
MARC D. DANIELS
KEITH W. DEGREGORY
JONATHAN S. DUNN
MATTHEW D. EBERHART
ERIC J. EBERLINE
BRIT K. ERSLEV
TANYA T. ESTES
MARCUS M. FERRARA
IAN E. FRANCIS
ALEXANDER S. FUERST
COREY S. GERVING
DOUGLAS F. GIBSON
JEREMY J. GRAY
JASON P. GRESH
CHRISTIAN A. HAFFEY
MAURICE S. HAJJAR
MICHAEL L. HALL
ERIC HARTUNIAN
MARVIN G. HAYNES IV
RYAN C. HELLERSTEDT
ARMANDO HERNANDEZ
AARON T. HILL, JR.
JONATHAN W. HUGHES
EARL J. HUNTER
AMANDA L. IDEN
KEE Y. JEONG
ALTON J. JOHNSON
ROBERT L. JONES III
MICHAEL R. KALOOSTIAN
GALEN R. KANE
EDWARD W. KENDALL
MATTHEW R. KENT
MARVIN L. KING III

ERIC T. KISS
NED A. KRAFCHICK
JACOB M. KRAMER
JOHN P. KUNSTBECK
MICHAEL J. KUZARA
MICHAEL E. LEE
KURTIS A. LEFFLER
ANDREW M. LEONARD
MICHAEL LEWCZAK
JORIN C. LINTZENICH
CHARLES C. LUKE
KELLY G. MACDONALD
MARK H. MADDEN
CHRISTOPHER D. MARCHETTI
CRAIG A. MARTIN
MICHAEL W. MARTIN
CHRISTOPHER T. MAYER
HEATH L. MCCORMICK
WILLIAM S. MCNICOL
ALEXANDER S. MENTIS
DANIEL R. MILLER
BASEL M. MIXON IV
NICHOLAS MONTALTO III
JARROD P. MORELAND
ANDREW A. MORRISON
DAVID J. MULACK
JOSEPH D. MUNGER
JOHN J. MYERS
TODD A. NAPIER
KEVIN M. NEUMANN
ANTHONY J. NEWTSON
CHI K. NGUYEN
CURTIS W. NOWAK
CHRISTY L. H. NYLAND
PAUL S. H. OH
TIMOTHY R. OSULLIVAN
STEPHEN M. PARRISH, SR.
REBECCA D. PATTERSON
STACEY D. PATTERSON
SHAW S. PICK
ANTHONY F. POLLIO, JR.
THOMAS S. PUGSLEY
JORN A. PUNG
KAREN F. RADKA
PETER J. RASMUSSEN
STANLEY M. REED, SR.
SCOTT M. SANFORD, SR.
MATTHEW J. SCHREIBER
THOMAS A. SCOTT
SCOTT B. SEIDEL
JEFFREY A. SHEEHAN
NICHOLAS R. SIMONTIS
BRENT O. SKINNER
SUSAN A. SMELTZER
CHARLES D. SMITH
ERIC J. SMITH
JAY B. SMITH
MICHAEL L. SMITH
THOMAS W. SPAHR
WILLIAM J. STARR, JR.
KEVIN C. STEYER
JAMES M. SWARTZ
MOMOEVI S. TAWAKE
MATTHEW A. TEMPLEMAN
CHRISTIAN G. TEUTSCH
MICHAEL S. TOKAR
CHRISTOPHER L. TOMLINSON
JOHN S. TRANSUE, JR.
BRETT J. VERNETTI
ROBERT D. WAGNER
CHRISTOPHER D. WASHINGTON
EDWIN B. WERKHEISER II
CHRISTIAN L. WERNER
JOHN F. WHITFIELD, JR.
ANNEMARIE R. WIERSGALLA
JOSEPH E. WILLIAMS
TROY A. WILLIAMS
PATRICK E. WORKMAN
WALTER D. ZACHERL
MARK M. ZAIS
TIMOTHY M. ZAJAC
ANTHONY E. ZUPANCIC
D001025
D011309
D013109
D013961
D014349
D014511
D014545
G001345
G010241

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM
ROBERT S. ADCOCK
TROY V. ALEXANDER
TODD J. ALLISON
JASON M. ALVIS
MATTHEW K. ANASTASI
WILLIAM C. ARNOLD
ELLIS R. BAKER
MICHAEL A. BAKER
BRAD A. BANE
LOYD BEAL III
BRIAN D. BEINER
DEREK A. BIRD
CATHERINE M. BLACK
KEVIN D. BOUREN
TERRY D. BRANNAN
ANGEL M. BRITO
CAPRISSA S. BROWNSLADE
LAHAVIE J. BRUNSON
WOODWARD H. CALDWELL
LACHER M. CAMPBELL
EDWIN L. CHILTON II
STEVEN M. CLARK
OCTAVIA T. COLEMAN
TRENTON J. CONNER
DOUGLAS W. COPELAND
MYRTA I. CRESPO
FRANKIE J. CRUZ
SHANE R. CUELLAR
BRADLEY T. CULLIGAN
STEVEN M. DOWGIELEWICZ, JR.
KIMBERLY K. FUHRMAN
JOHN R. GAIVIN
TIMOTHY M. GALLAGHER
MILES T. GENGLER
ANTHONY R. GIBBS
PETER L. GILBERT
SETH C. GRAVES
JEREL R. GRIMES
TODD W. HANDY
FREDERICKA R. HARRIS
RAPHAEL S. HEFLIN
MARK P. HENDERSON
CARL L. HENNEMANN
JUSTIN S. HERBERMANN
JOSHUA D. HIRSCH
RUSSELL V. HOFF
SCOTT E. HOLDEN
JOEL R. HOLMSTROM
IAN W. HUMPHREY
LATONYA N. JORDAN
LOUIS J. KARNES
SEAN P. KELLY
RUSSELL W. KLAUMAN
JOHN W. KREDO
BRIAN D. KUHN
MICHAEL F. LABRECQUE
ROBERT L. LEIATO
MICHAEL L. LINDLEY
MICHAEL E. LUDWICK
SCOTT A. MADDRY
SCOTT J. MADORE
JOHN J. MAHER
TRAHON T. MASHACK
CARL E. MASON
AMBROSE U. MBONU
MICHAEL R. MCBRIDE
JEFFREY A. MCCARTNEY
PATRICK J. MCCLELLAND
ERIC A. MCCOY
CHRISTOPHER M. MCCREERY
TIMOTHY D. MCDONALD
CHARLES W. MCPHAIL
ROBB A. MEERT
CHRISTIAN B. MEISEL
BURR H. MILLER
ERIN C. MILLER
SAMUEL S. MILLER
DANIEL MISIGOY
JARRETT S. MOFFITT
ROBIN W. MONTGOMERY
ALTHERIA M. NILES, JR.
DONNIE NOWLIN
RYAN P. OQUINN
MICHAEL N. PARENT
JONATHAN M. PATRICK
JAMES R. PECKHAM, JR.
JASON D. PEREZ
LETSY A. PEREZMARSDEN
RICHARD H. PFEIFFER, JR.
MICHAEL P. POST
CLYDEA M. PRICHARDBROWN
BRUCE R. PULVER
RYAN L. RAYMOND
NICOLE U. REINHARDT
CHRISTINE H. RICE
TRINA RICE
ROBERT B. ROCHON
HECTOR ROMAN
EVANGELINE G. ROSEL
JOHN C. ROTANTE
JAY C. SAWYER
BRYANT L. SCHUMACHER
RICARDO L. SIERRAGUZMAN
CHRISTOPHER W. SNIPES
KELLY K. STEELE
MARK W. SUSNIS
MARK R. TAYLOR
CHESLEY D. THIGPEN
DOUGLAS C. THOMPSON
TRACY L. WADLE
JASON B. WAMSLEY
MARIO A. WASHINGTON
JAY J. WILLIAMS
AARON M. WOLFE
BRIAN P. WOLFORD
ABEL E. YOUNG
D012970
D014311

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

GARY W. BROCK, JR.
MICHELLE B. BRONELL
MICHAEL F. DEROSIER
STEPHEN S. HAMILTON
RATASHA L. JACKSON
WILLIAM R. KEATING
MATTHEW J. LENNOX
CHRISTOPHER J. LONGO
KELVIN E. MOTE
JOSEPH A. PUSKAS II
MATTHEW J. SHEIFFER
ROBERT M. THELEN
ANDREW D. WHISKEYMAN
JOHN M. WILSON

## WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on June 20, 2018 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

KIMBERLY A. REED, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT–IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE WANDA FELTON, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON OCTOBER 3, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATION OF JEFFREY D. TILTON, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 12, 2018.

RONNY LYNN JACKSON, OF TEXAS, TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE DAVID J. SHULKIN, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 16, 2018.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, due to adverse weather and numerous flight delays and cancellations in North Carolina, I was unable to vote yesterday during Roll Call 269, the motion to suspend the rules and pass as amended H.R. 5687, the Securing Opioids and Unused Narcotics with Deliberate Disposal and Packaging Act of 2018, as well as Roll Call 270, the motion to suspend the rules and pass as amended H.R. 5676, the Stop Excessive Narcotics in our Retirement Communities Protection Act of 2018.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call 269 and Yea on Roll Call 270.

## HONORING FULTON CHAPTER NO. 35, ORDER OF THE EASTERN STAR, ON THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Fulton Chapter No. 35, Order of the Eastern Star, on their 100th Anniversary.

On September 21, 1917 Chapter No. 35 was founded by first Worthy Matron Anna Christian and first Worthy Patron Howard B. Lang. While the chapter has roots in Fulton, the dedicated members live throughout Missouri and surrounding states. There were 22 original signers who saw the vision of what the Fulton Chapter No. 35 could become. These signers were: Lena Newkomm, Julia Ann Neal, Anna Christian, Charles H. Christian, Selena Loveng, Bertie Fay Jackson, J. Roy Jackson, Gertrude Clatterbuck, Edgar Clatterbuck, Norma Lang, Howard B. Lang, Gertrude M. Brown, Jella D. Brown, Doyle S. Brown, Lulu Beaven, Theodore Beaven, Marie Le Noir, William Meng, John R. Pratt, Harry H. McIntire, Alice Koontz, and Elmer L. Koontz. Currently, the Fulton Chapter No. 35 is 102 members strong.

The members of this Masonry organization are dedicated men and women who consistently represent the spirit of fraternal love and the desire to work together to benefit mankind. Their hard work and charity is constantly felt by the community and dearly appreciated by the many lives they have and continue to touch.

They have been active in many charitable causes to benefit the community: Callaway Relay 4 Life, MoChip, Cancer Research, and the Masonic Home to name a few. Since the foundation of the organization, the lessons shared at the meetings have remained scriptural, the purpose beneficent, and the teachings moral. This type of teaching is a nod to the founder of the Order of the Eastern Star, Dr. Robert Morris, who had the vision of using beautiful and inspiring Biblical examples which in turn would be the noble principles Eastern Star members are encouraged to emulate. With this vision, the environment within the Eastern Star organization is dedicated to charity, truth, and loving kindness.

I ask you to join me in honoring Fulton Chapter No. 35, Order of the Eastern Star on their 100th Anniversary.

## IN RECOGNITION OF PAT RIORDAN

### HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the career and service of Green Bay resident, Mr. Pat Riordan.

A St. Norbert College graduate, he was appointed chief executive officer of Nsight in 1975 and oversaw the 1987 launch of the wireless provider, Cellcom. Nsight evolved from a modest company providing cellular services to Pulaski, Wisconsin, to a robust business supplying wireless services to Northeast Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Mr. Riordan's leadership as CEO was incredibly valuable, and the impact he has made on the industry in Wisconsin is indelible. His extensive knowledge of the industry has earned him many key positions on boards and organizations including the Wisconsin State Telecommunications Association, Associated Carrier Group, and Ha Ha's Hero Foundation, to name a few. Adding to his accolades, Mr. Riordan received the Outstanding Achievement Award from the Rural Carriers Association in 2008.

As we pause to look back on the ways Mr. Riordan has impacted Northeast Wisconsin, it is without a doubt that Mr. Riordan himself continues to look forward. Upon his retirement as CEO, Mr. Riordan will assume a new role in looking to future trends. He will be tasked with thinking three to five years out and charting how to best incorporate new emerging employee skill sets.

Mr. Riordan's applications of extraordinary skills and knowledge of his industry have helped grow his company and brand. His commitment to both his company and to his community are worthy of the highest commendation.

## MICKIE MAY LEVIN: CLEATS FOR A CAUSE

### HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important values that we strive to teach our children is to give back to others. Well, it's time for us adults to go back to school, as 13-year-old Mickie May Levin is teaching us a thing or two about generosity.

This year, Levin had her bat mitzvah, and in preparation for this rite of passage, she decided to undertake a service project that would give back to her local community in the spirit of Jewish tradition. In brainstorming ideas, she kept returning to soccer, a sport that she had already fell in love with. She played on her school team, and she enjoyed how the sport brings people together from a variety of backgrounds.

From her own time on the field, she understood the importance of having a good pair of cleats on your feet during a game, particularly when the rain started to come down. She also knew that she and many of her friends had pairs of gently used cleats piling up in their closets and garages—at that age, kids outgrow clothes and shoes very quickly. An idea was thus born: she would collect these cleats and donate them to kids who couldn't afford to buy them.

Levin started out small, asking around her friend group and eventually placing yellow cardboard boxes labelled "Cleats for a Cause" around her school and elsewhere in her community. She then started reaching out to individuals and organizations, asking if they had any shoes to spare. Her donations soared after Tarik Guendouzi, the director of the boys' teams for Rise FC, responded and told her that his club wanted to help. Although Levin provided just one cardboard box, the families of the club brought so many shoes that she had to utilize her mother's pickup truck to transport them all back to her house.

Levin then gave the hundreds of shoes she had collected to the All Nations Sports Academy, an organization in Houston that provides underprivileged children opportunities to play soccer. The young kids received them jubilantly, taking the field with new shoes on their feet and a noticeable swagger in their step.

Mr. Speaker, Mickie May Levin has a heart of gold, and she leads by example in making an impact in her community. It is because of the generosity of individuals like Levin that our country is what it is today. Young and old, we can all learn something from her about kindness.

And that is just the way it is.

## IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE AZERBAIJAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

### HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Republican of Azerbaijan for the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, which was celebrated on May 28, 2018.

In the Republic of Azerbaijan, May 28th is known as the ''Republic Day''. This past Republic Day celebrated the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, the first secular parliamentary republic in the Muslim VVorld.

In 1991, the United States recognized Azerbaijan as an independent state following the collapse of the Soviet Union, and established diplomatic relations the following year. I would like to highlight that, over the last 26 years, Azerbaijan has established itself as a reliable friend of the United States. Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, Azerbaijan has been a critical ally of the United States in combating international terrorism through several joint U.S.-Azerbaijani operations in Afghanistan, the Balkans, and Iraq.

On a more international level, Azerbaijan has strong economic, military, and strategic ties to Israel, representing one of Israel's greatest allies in the region. Azerbaijan's energy sector is also key to combating Russian influences across the region. Altogether, the country plays a critical role in the diversification of energy routes, and helps support allies of the United States' allies by doing so.

I would like to formally congratulate the Republican of Azerbaijan for the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, and I look forward to continued strong relations between the United States and Azerbaijan for many years to come.

## JOINT TASK FORCE TO COMBAT OPIOID TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

### HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 19, 2018*

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my committee's bill, the Joint Task Force to Combat Opioid Trafficking Act.

Dangerous narcotics and other synthetic opioids are fueling a drug epidemic that is destroying people's lives.

According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), about 115 people die every day from an opioid overdose. Just think about that—115 people every day.

They are not just strangers. They are moms and dads, brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors.

Most of us know someone who has struggled with substance abuse or drug addiction.

We cannot allow these numbers to climb. We have to reverse this dangerous trend. We need to act together now.

I am proud to say that the Committee on Homeland Security has been taking action on this issue.

Recently, President Trump signed our INTERDICT Act. This bill provides CBP with additional funds and resources to screen and detect synthetic opioids at the border.

Today, we held a field hearing in Pennsylvania to review ways to strengthen coordination at the local, state, and federal levels in our fight against drugs.

We are taking many positive steps, but we must do more.

We can start by passing this bill that establishes a Joint Task Force at DHS to prohibit narcotics, such as fentanyl, and others from entering the United States.

It also strengthens partnerships between federal agencies and the private sector.

This is a unifying cause. Stopping the flow of drugs into our country will allow more Americans to follow their dreams and build a bright future.

I would like to thank Congressman LANGEVIN and Congressman PETER KING for their leadership and hard work on this issue. And I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 2018, I was unavoidably detained due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 269, and YEA on Roll Call No. 270.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 2018, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''YEA'' on No. 269 and 270 and I would have voted ''NAY'' on No. 271.

## BACKUP IS COMING FOR HOUSTON'S FIRST RESPONDERS

### HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Harvey pushed Houston first-responders to the limit. While groups like the Cajun Navy and other private citizens provided invaluable support to the Houston community in helping with emergency relief, peace officers and firefighters were underequipped to deal with the massive flooding that displaced thousands from their homes. With only old and decrepit boats at their disposal, they were forced to conscript canoes and kayaks.

To put it simply, they needed more boats.

The Houston Fire Department requested 20 boats from the city to help bolster their water rescue fleet, but the city was strapped for cash and could not feasibly pay for 20 boats on their own. Luckily, one group decided to step up and help.

The 100 Club donated 14 new rescue boats to first responders in Houston and Harris County. The group gave the Houston Police Department and the Harris County Sheriff's Office five boats each and the Houston Fire Department four. This will provide a much-needed boost to the fleets of these departments, who are now only in need of just a handful of boats from the city.

The 100 Club has a history of helping Houston's finest. The organization has provided millions of dollars in financial aid to the families of fallen officers, scholarships and grants to officers and fire fighters, and equipment for first responders. After observing the water rescue efforts during the hurricane, the group began conversing with the authorities in Houston, who all highlighted the need for more rescue boats.

Mr. Speaker, our first responders provided invaluable assistance to the Houston community during and after Hurricane Harvey, despite their lack of equipment. After all, the tools do not make the man. But the gracious donation by the 100 Club will allow these selfless individuals to serve their communities more effectively. The generosity shown is just another example of why the greatest people on earth live in America: they will always help each other.

And that is just the way it is.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Tuesday, June 19, 2018, due to cancellations and delays to my scheduled return flights to Washington.

If I had been able to vote, I would have voted as follows:

On H.R. 5687, the SOUND Disposal and Packaging Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

On H.R. 5676, the SENIOR Communities Protection Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

On the Journal Vote, I would have voted ''nay.''

## DR. TODD GRAHAM PAIN MANAGEMENT, TREATMENT, AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

### HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 19, 2018*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6110, the Dr. Todd Graham Pain Management, Treatment, and Recovery Act of 2018. Introduced by my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative JACKIE WALORSKI, this legislation would direct the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to conduct a review on how to improve the use of non-opioid treatments for pain management for Part A and B Medicare beneficiaries.

The opioid crisis has been devastating communities across the nation for far too long. We need to take immediate steps to reduce the overprescribing of opioids and ensure patients have access to non-addictive pain management options.

Among the actions we can take to prevent addiction is to remove perceived financial incentives for doctors to prescribe generic opioids instead of non-opioid alternative drugs and medical devices, which are typically more expensive. I am pleased to see the text of my bill, H.R. 5778—Promoting Outpatient Access to Non-Opioid Treatments Act, incorporated into H.R. 6110, to address this issue. The legislation instructs CMS to identify possible payment barriers in the Medicare program and consequently asks the Secretary to consider appropriate revisions to the reimbursement structure. It is a commonsense solution to guarantee doctors have the best tools available to deter opioid dependence.

By examining ways to expand the use of non-opioid alternatives in Medicare, we can help cut the problem off at the source, while still being sensitive to patients' pain management needs. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this bill and urge its immediate passage.

## HONORING WULFGANG LAWSON

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Wulfgang Lawson. Wulf is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 288, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Wulf has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Wulf has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Wulf has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Wulfgang for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

## RECOGNIZING CARMEN DEVRIES FOR HER STATE TITLE IN THE CLASS 1A 400-METER DASH

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carmen DeVries, as the Illinois High School Association (IHSA) Class 1 A 400 meter dash gold medalist in the 2018 track and field state championships.

This was DeVries' fourth trip to the state championships, and she was determined to go home with a gold medal her senior year. She persevered and completed the 400 meter dash with a first place time of 57.04 seconds. In the same competition, she also achieved a bronze medal in the triple jump, stretching for 37ft., 4¼ inches in the Class 1A triple jump. DeVries also earned her personal best time in the 400 meters with a time of 57.95 seconds, which set the new school record at Lena-Winslow High School. I want to commend this student athlete on her tremendous accomplishments and work ethic. It takes a great deal of discipline and talent be awarded such titles. The great state of Illinois is very proud that our small towns produce giant athletes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again formally acknowledge Carmen DeVries on winning the first place title in the IHSA state competition for the 400 meter dash. I join the community in congratulating her and we look forward to seeing her future achievements.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. KATHERINE M. CLARK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last night inclement weather caused travel delays, and as a result I missed roll call vote number 269. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

## HONORING AARON D. NERO, JR.

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Aaron D. Nero, Jr. Aaron is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 288, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Aaron has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Aaron has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Aaron has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Aaron for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

## TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT NICHOLAS CORDES

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nicholas Cordes of Avoca, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. Nicholas is a member of Boy Scouts Troop No. 97 in Avoca, and he is a student at AHSTW High School in Avoca.

The Eagle Scout designation is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about 5 percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. Nicholas's Eagle Scout Project was the painting of the large picnic shelter in Avoca's Edgington Memorial Park. The work ethic Nicholas has shown in his Eagle Project, and every other project leading to his Eagle Scout rank, speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Nicholas and his family in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call votes 269, 270 and 271 on Tuesday, June 19, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call votes 269 and 270, and Nay on Roll Call vote 271.

## HONORING PATRICK STEINKAMP

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Patrick Steinkamp. Patrick is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 288, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Patrick has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Patrick has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Patrick has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Patrick for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

## IN RECOGNITION OF DIXIE HORNING

### HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize one of the most gifted and effective leaders I have met, had the distinct honor to work with over several decades, and am proud to call a dear friend. Dixie Horning is retiring from her leadership roles as Executive Director of the University of California, San Francisco National Center of Excellence in Women's Health and Associate Chair for Finance and Administration for the Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences, after 20 years of service with that esteemed institution. Her transformational work at UCSF followed 30 years of transformational public service in Texarkana, Arkansas, Lafayette, Louisiana and Washington, D.C.

Dixie is a master at building communities, designing public policy, administering complex programs, and managing organizations and people.

Dixie has been honored by UCSF with two prestigious Chancellor's Awards recognizing her service above and beyond her appointed roles. The Chancellor's Award for the Advancement of Women recognized her contributions to success of many individuals through her coaching, mentoring and sponsorship of UCSF staff, faculty, high school young women and leaders of community organizations. Dixie's vital efforts to advance and improve UCSF's partnerships with its community, with an emphasis on the sharing of power in these relationships, was recognized by the Chancellor's Award for Public Service. Dixie's contributions to our network of National Centers of Excellence in Women's Health cannot be understated. She traveled across this big country of ours guiding and supporting other Centers in transforming women's health and healthcare.

There is no task imaginable Dixie couldn't tackle. To understand why she is so effective it helps to understand her life philosophy—what I like to call the Five Dixie Principles: 1. Earn leadership through presence and performance. 2. Practice active skill transfer to build sustainability: everyone has something to learn and everyone has something to teach. 3. Don't go anywhere unless invited. 4. Prepare a place at the table for all stakeholders. If a stakeholder is not yet ready to join, don't delay, begin the work but leave the seat open for future participation. And 5. Long term change requires long term presence. Those have been Dixie's ingredients for long term and sustainable success.

Dixie started her remarkable career in Texarkana, Arkansas in the early 1970s. She was hired as a gym recreation program coordinator in the Model Cities Program, an initiative of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. She embraced the goals of developing new anti-poverty programs, achieving community integration, building better local government, engaging citizens in meaningful ways and translated them into reality. She built ten major parks, established the first domestic violence shelter, created art museums for children and community centers for seniors. She launched six non-profits that provided day care, sports and education. She established transportation access for those who are differently abled. She served on commissions for issues as diverse as juvenile justice reform, sexually transmitted diseases, childhood education, and sports in prisons. Her success attracted more resources from private public partnerships and was noted as model program for the State by the Department of Parks and Tourism. Dixie was named by President Reagan to serve on his Advisory Council on the Outdoors.

Twenty years later, the Mayor of Lafayette, Louisiana recruited Dixie to replicate the programs she had created in Texarkana. She moved and did exactly that. She collaborated with the leaders of the Southern Mutual Help Association who were dedicated to uplifting agricultural communities. Together they created a model for community transformation and economic sustainability that focused on the removal of structural systems that reinforced poverty.

From Louisiana, Dixie moved to Washington, DC and became the Executive Director of the Gray Panthers. She worked with its founder Maggie Kuhn to eliminate age discrimination and change our view of aging and older Americans. She also worked with the Coalition that lobbied for the Violence against Women Act and renewal of Title IX.

Throughout her work across this country Dixie has been an active participant in women's history. She attended the 1st UN International Women's Conference in Mexico City in 1975 as a delegate from the rural women's caucus. She went on to serve on the planning committees for the next three UN international women's conferences in Copenhagen in 1980, Nairobi in 1985 and Beijing in 1995. Dixie led the Beijing and Beyond taskforce. In Washington, Dixie served on National Council of Women's Organizations, including a term as its President. In 1988, Dixie was selected to carry the Torch at the Parade to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the 1913 Suffragette March for the Vote. She served as the Chair of the Board of Directors of the National Women's History Project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor my friend Dixie Horning, an exceptional champion of social justice and fierce feminist advocate for all women and girls. While we don't exactly know what she will do in this next chapter in her life, we can be sure it will transformational and lead to a better future for us all.

## RECOGNIZING EMILY OFFENHEISER ON HER STATE TITLE IN DISCUS THROW

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Emily Offenheiser, a senior from Stockton Senior High School, for earning the Class IA Illinois High School Association (IHSA) first place championship in discus throw.

Emily Offenheiser has often been recognized as a star athlete playing several sports such as basketball, softball, shotput, and discus. In 7th grade she began discus and has qualified for the state championships four times since. She has demonstrated a tremendous dedication to track and field, and in the recent state championship accomplished a personal best discus throw of 151–08, which decided her victory. Additionally, she earned second place in the Class IA IHSA shot put championship and was also named the WREX news Athlete of the Week. It takes a tremendous amount of commitment and hard work to be presented with such tremendous accolades. Emily has demonstrated leadership, admirable determination, and I am proud that she represents the Stockton community. I look forward to watching her advance in her athletic career as she begins her college education.

Mr. Speaker, it is once again my honor to formally congratulate Emily Offenheiser on winning gold, and the rest of Illinois joins me in wishing her great success in the future.

## IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. LISA THOMAS

### HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mrs. Lisa Thomas, the deputy director at Child Development Resources (CDR) and community activist who has positively impacted the lives of many children during her tenure.

Mrs. Thomas began her career interning at CDR in 1978 while pursuing a psychology degree from the College of William and Mary. After graduating with a master's degree in social work, Thomas joined CDR full-time in 1986. During her time at CDR, Thomas participated in a variety of the organizations missions including serving as the Interim Executive Director. In 1998, Thomas was appointed Deputy Director and Head of Children's Services. In this role, Thomas oversaw all the services CDR provided to its families and youth clients. Thomas worked with state and local coalitions to provide support for early childhood services and served on my First District Education Advisory Council. Thomas was crucial in evolving CDR from a focus on children with disabilities into a broader early childhood development center.

Thomas also worked with various nonprofit organizations including the Hope Family Village, which provides support to caregivers of children with mental health issues, and served as the president of the Historic Triangle Safe Kids Coalitions. Thomas also worked with the One Child Center for Autism where she developed a program to support over 100 children a month in the Williamsburg area and served as a mentor to many children through the Big Brothers Big Sisters program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in thanking Mrs. Thomas for her leadership and selfless devotion to the children of our community.

## HONORING CHRISTOPHER STEINKAMP

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Christopher Steinkamp. Christopher is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 288, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Christopher has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Christopher has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Christopher has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Christopher for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

## HONORING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MR. JORGE RAMIREZ

### HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jorge Ramirez on the occasion of his retirement as president of the Chicago Federation of Labor. Jorge's reputation as an esteemed and extremely effective leader is well-deserved after 8 years as president and 12 years on the board of the CFL. He fought for and succeeded in making life better for hundreds of thousands of workers and their families.

Jorge Ramirez is the son of Mexican immigrants who grew up on the Southwest Side of Chicago near Midway Airport. His father was a meat packer in Chicago's Back of Yards neighborhood during the 1960s, working long hours for limited pay and with limited rights. Eventually his father and fellow workers formed a union, knowing that they were stronger together than they were alone. Jorge continued this tradition and found his own way into the industry, first joining the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union Local 1546 in 1988 where he served as Executive Director.

Since his election as the first Latino President of the Chicago Federation of Labor in 2010, Jorge Ramirez worked closely with stakeholders and cultivated a mutual respect with them, avoiding layoffs, improving health insurance for union workers, and stabilizing Chicago's pension funds. He was critical in ushering in a higher minimum wage for the city starting in 2019, guaranteeing a much better standard of living for so many workers. Jorge's work was also crucial in establishing a new five-year contract between the city of Chicago and the Coalition of Unionized Public Employees. That agreement alone benefited approximately 20% of the city's employees, including motor truck drivers, plumbers, laborers, and members of the building trades. Most recently, he led the charge for an $8.5 billion O'Hare Airport expansion plan—an effort that will both modernize one of Chicago's aviation hubs and create over 60,000 jobs.

In addition to his accomplishments with the Chicago Federation of Labor, Jorge is an active community leader, as well as a devoted husband and father. His roles have included positions with the Cook County Health and Hospitals System Board of Directors, Chicago Infrastructure Trust, the Cook County President's Council of Economic Advisors, and Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. Philanthropically, he has donated his time to the Mercy Home for Boys and Girls, the United Way of Metropolitan Chicago, and the Archdiocese of Chicago Office for Immigrant Affairs. All the while, Jorge and his wife, Catrina, have raised four amazing sons for whom he bakes as a hobby; his specialty being cheesecake.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Jorge Ramirez. His resilience and commitment have helped countless people improve their lives and the lives of their families. I congratulate him on his accomplishments, thank him for his service, and wish him well in his future endeavors.

## TRIBUTE TO ELSIE EHRENS

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Elsie Ehrens of Council Bluffs, Iowa on the occasion of her 100th birthday. Elsie celebrated her birthday on May 19, 2018.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Elsie's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Elsie has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-five Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Elsie in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Elsie on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 15, 2018 I missed the following votes due to needing to attend to a close family member in the hospital.

For Roll Call Vote 267, the amendment offered by Congressman THORNBERRY, I would have voted "yes."

For Roll Call Vote 268, final passage of the Stop the Importation and Trafficking of Synthetic Analogues Act, I would have voted "yes."

## HONORING GEORGE MATTHEW COCKERTON

### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. George Matthew Cockerton, a veteran school administrator, who is retiring after serving twenty-seven years in the Kelseyville Unified School District.

Mr. Cockerton was born in Oakland, CA, and has two adult children, Cori and Ryan. He attended California Polytechnic State University in San Louis Obispo and California State University, East Bay where he received his Bachelor's degree in Kinesiology and his teaching credential. He also earned a Master's degree in Education and an Administrative Credential from the University of San Francisco and received a Tier II Clear Administrative Credential from National University.

Mr. Cockerton began his career in education as a Physical Education teacher, Athletic Director and Coach in 1985. In 1991, he became the Vice Principal and Athletic Director of Kelseyville High School. Mr. Cockerton was the Principal of Mountain Vista Middle School from 1996 to 1997. He has been Principal of Kelseyville High School since 1997. He is a member of the California Association of Teachers and the Association of California School Administrators. He was also a member of the Coastal Mountain Conference, a local high school sports league, for twenty-seven years and served as president for two years.

Mr. Cockerton has been active in our community. He is a long time coach for Westshore Little League Baseball and has served on their board. He is also a coach for Westshore Youth Football, where he has been the President of the organization.

Mr. Speaker, George Matthew Cockerton has served his community honorably as a school administrator and coach. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

## CELEBRATING MARDELL URISH'S 93RD BIRTHDAY

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mardell Urish, who in her 93 years on earth, has lived an inspiring life as one of the nurses in the Cadet Corps in World War II.

Ms. Urish raised a farm family of six with the help of her beloved husband, Richard. Throughout her life, she has run two assisted living facility businesses, and still runs one today. Her dedication to ensuring that the elderly have a home has undoubtedly enriched

our community and the lives of those she has touched.

It is because of dedicated women such as Ms. Mardell Urish that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally honor Ms. Mardell Urish's life and her service to this great country.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. DARIN LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 19, 2018, I experienced delays traveling from Peoria, IL to Washington, D.C. Unfortunately, due to a delayed and then canceled flight, I did not make it to D.C. in time for the 6:30 p.m. vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 269; yea on Roll Call No. 270; and nay on Roll Call No. 271.

## HONORING THE TOWNSHIP OF MONTCLAIR'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Township of Montclair, County of Essex, New Jersey, on the occasion of its 150th Anniversary.

The story of Montclair as a settled community begins with the Crane family. Azariah Crane, his wife Mary Treat Crane, and their son Nathaniel, built a home in 1694 near the present intersection of Orange Road and Myrtle Avenue. Other pioneers arrived soon after, and the frontier settlement of Cranetown came into being in what is now the southern part of Montclair.

During the Revolutionary War, First Mountain in Montclair provided observation points for following the movements of the British to the east. A strong tradition holds that both George Washington and the Marquis de Lafayette were in Cranetown briefly in October of 1780. The boulder at the comer of Claremont Avenue and Valley Road marking the site of "Washington's Headquarters" is one of Montclair's better-known landmarks.

Beginning about 1800, several developments led to the transformation of Cranetown into a small commercial center. One development was the opening of a general store by Israel Crane. Further, in 1806, Crane led a group of businessmen in obtaining a charter from the State for building the Newark-Pompton Turnpike. Constructed over the next several years, the turnpike came through Montclair as Bloomfield Avenue and vastly increased the flow of commerce. Israel Crane broke new ground as well in opening a wool mill on Toney's Brook. Other small industries followed. Also important for the economic development of the area was the completion of the Morris Canal in 1831. In 1812, the Bloomfield ward of Newark became a separate township, which included the future Montclair. The village of Cranetown now became known as West Bloomfield and a post office was established under that name.

The most decisive event for the emergence of Montclair was the coming of railroads. By 1860 West Bloomfield was becoming a commuter town with its own marked identity and influential residents persuaded the post office to adopt the name Montclair.

The population of the community grew rapidly as New York businessmen and their families began building homes along the mountainside. The new residents sought to create in Montclair a model "country town" with convenient access to the city. Their vision was shared by a notable artist colony that began forming in the 1870's. A central figure was the landscape painter, George Inness. Able and dedicated community leaders endowed the town with superior schools, an excellent public library, a distinguished art museum and many large and influential churches.

By the opening of the 20th century, a richly diverse population characterized the community. A new influx of New Englanders was joined by African-Americans from the South and by Irish, Germans, Italians, Scandinavians and others newly arrived from Europe. Great mansions went up, but so did many modest homes. Between 1880 and 1930, Montclair's population leaped from 5,147 to 42,017. The period following World War II was marked by tremendous expansion of the metropolitan area. New suburbs popped up in the hinterland along with shopping malls and corporate offices.

Montclair is home to New Jersey's second largest public university, Montclair State University. Building on a distinguished history dating back to 1908, Montclair State University is a leading institution of higher education in New Jersey. Designated a Research Doctoral University by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, the University's 11 colleges and schools serve more than 21,000 undergraduate and graduate students with more than 300 doctoral, master's and baccalaureate programs. Situated on a beautiful, 252-acre suburban campus just 12 miles from New York City, Montclair State delivers the instructional and research resources of a large public university in a supportive, sophisticated and diverse academic environment.

Today Montclair is a community of about 39,000 inhabitants. Its heritage in education has been enhanced by its innovative public and private school educational programs and the expanded offerings at Montclair State University. Once again it has become a haven for artists and writers. This is a seasoned community whose many old houses enhance its charm, yet at the dawn of a new century, Montclair remains alive to the spirit of the times.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating the Township of Montclair on the occasion of its 150th Anniversary.

## IN RECOGNITION OF CARMINE PALOMBO FOR HIS YEARS OF DISTINGUISHED LEADERSHIP AT SEMCOG

### HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carmine Palombo of the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). His leadership efforts have been critical in serving southeast Michigan for decades.

After receiving his bachelor degree in civil engineering from the University of Detroit Mercy, Mr. Palombo started what would be a lifelong career in southeast Michigan. Since he was young, he has had a deep interest for transportation planning and bettering accessibility throughout the state he loves. He has served in various roles related to transportation planning since joining SEMCOG almost 40 years ago. SEMCOG supports local planning with coordinated intergovernmental resources and serves to improve the quality of transportation systems and encourage economic development. Mr. Palombo has played an integral role in furthering SEMCOG's mission throughout his career.

Mr. Palombo has served as SEMCOG's director of transportation planning for over 20 years and played a key role in many statewide transportation efforts. Throughout southeast Michigan, Mr. Palombo is known for his dedication to his work and keen understanding of the needs of various Michigan communities. He has been at the forefront of Michigan's transit changes over the past two decades and plays a key role in the decision-making processes that occur in communities throughout southeast Michigan. In addition to his work with SEMCOG, he has served as Chairman of the Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council and is a former chair of the Michigan Intelligent Transportation Systems board of directors. Mr. Palombo has had a tremendous impact on the future of Michigan's transportation infrastructure, and we look forward to his continued positive impact on our state in the coming years. We know his next chapter will continue to help all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Carmine Palombo upon his retirement for his leadership at SEMCOG and in the southeast Michigan community. Mr. Palombo's career and efforts have been critical to transit innovation in our state.

## CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOODVIEW ASSOCIATES

### HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to extend my sincere congratulations to the Gianotti family and the residents of Woodview Associates as they celebrate the 40th Anniversary of this very special apartment community.

With a vision well before its time, Howard and Elizabeth Gianotti built Woodview to ensure that they elderly and disabled of their

community would have an affordable, beautiful, and safe place to live as they enjoyed their twilight years. With Howard as the driving force and Betty as the quiet compass by his side, that vision soon became a reality. In Howard's words, he ''wanted to build a place that he would be proud to have my mother live.''

Woodview is well known as a safe, beautiful housing facility, however, it is the special care that they provide to their residents that make it a real home instead of just somewhere to live. Today, their daughter Robbin, along with her husband, Don, and their children Rachel and Don, Jr., continue that legacy overseeing the property and management of what is arguably the most sought after subsidized housing in East Haven, Connecticut.

Caring for our elderly population has become a national issue as America's ''baby boomers'' are growing older, and safe, affordable housing is needed more than ever. Additionally, those who suffer from disabilities are in growing need of facilities which will meet their needs as well. By providing our seniors and disabled with affordable housing, Woodview gives its residents so much more than shelter from the elements—they are giving them pride, comfort, independence and stability.

I want to extend a special note of thanks and congratulations to Robbin and her family. Though Howard and Betty are no longer with us, they are ensuring that their legacy continues to leave an indelible mark on this community. I thank them for their invaluable contributions and continued dedication to their residents—they have set a standard of service, compassion, and commitment that inspires us all. Once again, my heartfelt congratulations to them on this remarkable milestone—Happy 40th Anniversary.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. ERIC A. ''RICK'' CRAWFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my flight was diverted to Richmond due to inclement weather surrounding the capital, causing me to miss evening votes. Had I been able to, I would have voted for bills that passed the House last evening on suspension of the rules.

## CHINA MUST END PERSECUTION OF THE FALUN GONG

### HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 2018 marks the 19th year since the Communist government in Beijing banned the practice of Falun Gong. We must remember how the Chinese government has purposefully denied the human rights of so many over the last 20 years.

The Falun Gong movement stands for some of mankind's most respected virtues: truthfulness, compassion, and tolerance. The Chinese government saw this peaceful movement growing, and rather than embrace it, they have taken every possible step to destroy it. So the Communists took away Falun Gong's most basic human right: the right to live and worship freely. The Chinese government's top priority is not its citizens, but staying in power at all costs, even if it means persecuting the most peaceful among them.

Beijing's evil knows no limits. We know they murder many Falun Gong practitioners and harvested their organs for profit. We know this shameful practice is going on, because brave men and women have come forward, including family members, practitioners, and even victims themselves. The evidence is undeniable.

This practice is a billion dollar business for the Chinese government. Organ harvesting is the number one source of revenue for Chinese medical centers. The Chinese government makes a profit while silencing a group it sees as threatening. They think they cannot lose. But they can't silent us. We know what is going on behind closed doors. And we will not remain silent.

Recent reports suggest that tens of thousands of transplants annually are funding the construction of new hospital wings devoted solely to these illicit procedures. The Chinese government recognizes only a fraction of these transplants, they claim most of their transplant organs come from prisoners on death row. The report verified that 712 medical institutions perform transplants in China, but estimates from the Executive Chairman of the China Organ Transplant Alliance are well over 1,000, many of which are undocumented. According to their own staff, some of these hospitals perform thousands of transplants every year.

Obviously, the Chinese Communist Party is lying. Dishonesty is standard practice for the CCP. And yet, we will keep fighting back. This fight has not been easy. Many have loved ones in jail right now. Others have been tortured. Others have simply disappeared.

I applaud all who continue to stand up for what is right. Their presence is a testament that no matter how hard Beijing tries to eliminate the Falun Gong, they will fail. I am proud to stand with them after all they have endured.

As a former judge from Texas, justice is of the utmost importance to me. I feel a duty to speak out against the most egregious wrongs committed against innocent people. The world must recognize China as an enemy of human rights. The Falun Gong practice peace. We must protect the rights given to all of us by our Creator.

And that's just the way it is.

## CONGRATULATING WILLIAM WUNDRAM ON HIS RETIREMENT AFTER 74 YEARS OF HONORABLE SERVICE TO THE QUAD-CITY TIMES NEWSPAPER

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize columnist William ''Bill'' Wundram for 74 years of honorable service to the Quad-City Times newspaper. Mr. Wundram is a pillar in the Quad Cities community, and his knowledge and ability to generate creative ideas will be missed.

Bill Wundram has made a longstanding career of writing stories that are substantive, interesting, and newsworthy for the Quad-City Times. Of his 39 years as a columnist, 36 were spent writing 7 days a week. This has been hailed by many as a marvelous feat for American journalists. Bill has achieved countless accolades: a green space named William Wundram Parkway, becoming the ''Honorary Mayor for Life'' in Davenport, Iowa, and a bronze statue in Bix Plaza in front of the Quad-City Times will forever stand in his honor. As a former journalist, Bill's legacy and contributions have a special place in my heart. He understands what it takes to create a good story, and presents it in a way that is engaging to his audience. His career reached beyond writing, as he connected to the hearts of the people in our community. The skillset and historical knowledge that Bill possesses is something that can never be replaced. Yet at the age of 93, Bill Wundram has decided to rest his pen and enjoy retirement alongside his wife Helen and dog Molly.

It is because of dedicated citizens like Bill that I proudly serve the people of the 17th District of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to formally congratulate William Wundram on a tremendous career. I join the rest of the community in thanking him for the contributions he has made to journalism, and for setting an example of how to live a life of excellence.

## TRIBUTE TO SANDY HILDING

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Sandy Hilding of Shenandoah, Iowa, on her retirement as principal of Shenandoah High School in Shenandoah, Iowa. Sandy has served as principal there since 2008.

Sandy is a native of Fort Madison, Iowa. After graduating high school, she started working at the HyVee Food Store and transferred to Shenandoah, Iowa in the 1980s. She also worked at the Eaton Corporation in Shenandoah, Iowa when she realized her passion was in education and working with children. Sandy received her education degree from Peru State College in Peru, Nebraska. She began teaching mathematics in 1991 at Shenandoah High School and in 2002, she accepted a position as principal/athletic director at Farragut Community Schools in Farragut, Iowa. Six years later, she returned to Shenandoah High School as principal. Sandy has a reputation for working hard and being dedicated to her students and high school.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Sandy Hilding on her career and retirement. Sandy has made a difference by helping and serving others. It is with great honor that I recognize her today. I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in acknowledging her accomplishments in education. I thank her for her service to the Shenandoah community and wish her all the best in the future.

## OVERDOSE PREVENTION AND PATIENT SAFETY ACT, H.R. 6082, AND IMD CARE ACT, H.R. 5797

### HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, today I was unable to vote for two important bills that add to the House's ongoing efforts to combat the opioid and substance abuse crisis in America. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes on H.R. 6082, the Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act, to align 42 CFR Part 2 with HIPAA privacy regulations, allowing doctors to provide the best medical care for patients who suffer from the crippling disease that is substance use disorder. Doctors cannot treat a whole patient with half a medical record. I would also have voted Yes on the IMD Care Act, H.R. 5797 to expand treatment options for patients.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. BOB GIBBS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather conditions, my flight from Columbus, OH to Washington, D.C. was canceled and I was unable to arrive in time for 6:30 p.m. votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 269; YEA on Roll Call No. 270; and YEA on Roll Call No. 271.

## HONORING THE IOVANNE FAMILY AND FUNERAL HOME ON 90 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

### HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a warm heart that I rise today to congratulate the Iovanne family on the 90th Anniversary of Iovanne Funeral Home—a remarkable milestone for this New Haven institution. Now run by the third generation of the family and located in the heart of Wooster Square, the neighborhood of my own childhood, Iovanne's is a bedrock of our community.

Founded in 1928 by E. William Iovanne and his wife, Angelina, the Iovanne Funeral Home was established in a time when wakes and funerals were held in family homes. As time passed and traditions changed, they found a new home at 11 Wooster Place where they continue to operate today. With the unexpected passing of his father, Bill Sr. took the helm of the family business and has served his profession with honor and distinction for more than forty years. Today, Bill Iovanne, Jr., better known in the neighborhood as simply Billy, is the family's third generation to serve as President. Having learned at the feet of his grandmother and father, Billy keeps his grandparents' original motto of ''always treat a person the way you want them to treat you'' close at heart as he and his staff help guide families through the loss of those closest to them.

The Wooster Square neighborhood has always been the heart of New Haven's Italian-American community and is home to many iconic businesses and cultural institutions—Sally's and Pepe's Pizza, St. Michael's Church, Columbus Park, Libby's, the St. Andrew's Society, the Santa Maria Maddalena Society, and, of course, Iovanne's. Each has played a role in the community's rich history and continue to help shape its future. The Iovanne family, particularly Bill Sr. and Billy, are not only neighborhood business owners, they are dedicated and devoted members of the community. They have both long devoted their time and energies to ensuring the preservation of the Wooster Square neighborhood and its Italian-American roots. That is why they were honored by the Greater New Haven Columbus Day Parade Committee in 2012 as that year's Grand Marshalls.

There are few that families trust more with the final celebration of life for their loved ones than the Iovannes. There are no words of thanks for the care and compassion they provide to their clients during that most difficult time. Indeed, when I lost my own mother, Luisa, last year, there was no question as to who I would entrust with her final arrangements. I have known the Iovanne family my entire life and am fortunate to call them family. It is my great honor to have the opportunity to stand today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Bill Iovanne, Sr., Bill Iovanne, Jr. and the entire Iovanne family as they celebrate their 90th Anniversary.

## TRIBUTE TO GERTRUDE AND FRED MATTHIES

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Gertrude and Fred Matthies of Walnut, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 75th wedding anniversary. They were married on June 7, 1943 at the Catholic parsonage in Avoca, Iowa.

Gertrude and Fred's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 75th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 75th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

## IN HONOR OF COACH JACK M. POWELL

### HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man of purpose, sincerity, and high character, Coach Jack M. Powell. Sadly, Coach Powell passed away on May 12, 2018. His funeral services were held on Saturday, May 19, at 2:00pm at First Baptist Church of Eufaula in Eufaula, Alabama.

The Andalusia, Alabama native was born on March 20, 1922, to the union of George Bennie and Lilla Lawson Powell as one of ten children. A graduate of Pleasant Home High School of Andalusia, Coach played basketball in the state tournament for three years before going on to play basketball at Auburn University.

Jack was a highly respected coach who also served as an educator for 40 years while at Lockhart and Eufaula High Schools (1947–1966); Livingston University (1966–1972), and Sparks State Technical College, in Eufaula, Alabama (from 1972 until his retirement). Highlights of his remarkable coaching career include several ''Coach of the Year'' awards and Hall of Fame inductions; numerous district, area, regional, state, and all-star championships; and the establishment of the Tri-State Basketball Try-Out Clinic and Alabama's Junior Pro Basketball League.

He dedicated his life to helping others—especially our most precious resources—young people. He used the season of his life to help others reach their full potential. He was dedicated to his craft as both a teacher and a coach. Coach Powell was well respected by his peers, players, students, and colleagues. He knew that his life would be measured not by wins and losses on a sports field, but by the difference he made in the lives of his students and players.

Jack's faith inspired him to serve through virtually every segment of church life. He served as a Sunday School Teacher for more than 50 years (with his class at First Baptist Church of Eufaula being named after him) and a Sunday School Superintendent. He also served many years as a Deacon and was Chairman of the Deacon Board for 12 years. His walk as a devout Christian was the foundation of his life.

His greatest role in life was that of a dedicated husband to his late wife, Opal, and loving father to his two sons, Doyle and John.

While I did not know Jack personally, I know his son, John, the Executive Director of the American Peanut Shellers Association, which is based in Albany, Georgia. It has been said that the tree is known by the fruit it bears. If that is true, Coach Jack M. Powell was truly a fine and exemplary man, having molded and shaped the character of his devoted and loving son-John. John was a dutiful son and throughout his dad's life, especially in his sunset years, he truly honored his father as administered by the scriptures.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and I, along with more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District in extending condolences to his family, friends and loved ones. To ''God Be the Glory'' for the life of Coach Jack M. Powell for his contributions to the betterment of humankind.

## RECOGNIZING HAYLEY HULS, PAYTON PECKHAM, SARAH LITCHFIELD, AND JORDAN PECKHAM FOR THEIR 1A STATE TITLE IN THE 4X400 RELAY

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Hayley Huls, Payton Peckham, Sarah Litchfield, and Jordan Peckham from Farmington High School, for earning the Class IA title for the Illinois State Championship in the 4x400 relay.

Hayley Huls, Payton Peckham, Sarah Litchfield, and Jordan Peckham took first in finals with a time of 4:02.92 to claim their title as state champions, and I would like to recognize them for their tremendous accomplishment. Their dedication and passion for their sport meant that they were determined to win gold. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. They are an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see them represent Farmington throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Hayley Huls, Payton Peckham, Sarah Litchfield, and Jordan Peckham on their title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing them every success in the future.

## HONORING THE BOROUGH OF BLOOMINGDALE'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Borough of Bloomingdale, County of Passaic, New Jersey, on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

As early as 1700, the Dutch began settling —what is now known today as Bloomingdale, named after the town of Bloomingdale in Holland. In 1734, mineral resources were discovered in Bloomingdale by Cornelius Board. Board was shown the iron deposits by local natives near the Ringwood River by the Sterling Forest. After locating the ore, Board built the first ever small iron furnace in the region. German miners were brought over to work the mine. The mine would change hand two times, first to John and Uzal Ogden and Newark associates, and then to the American Iron Company. This company was London-based, bringing in immigrants from England.

Bloomingdale is most known for is the important role it played in the Revolutionary War. One can find a plaque on the Federal Hill Historic Site that commemorates the Pompton Mutiny on Federal Hill in what is today Bloomingdale. On January 20, 1781, 200–300 Continental soldiers mutinied. Their plan was to march to Trenton to make their demands, which included complaints about food, clothing, and pay. General George Washington decided to make an example of these mutinous soldiers, and they were met by General Howe's army on their way to Trenton. Although they were dealt with harshly, Washington did concede to their demands, admitting that there was a truth behind them.

The aforementioned mining activities in Bloomingdale increased in 1807 when Martin J. Ryerson purchased the mining area from American Iron Company and greatly developed the area by building more furnaces and rolling mills. When he died in 1839, his grandson who shared his name, Martin J. Ryerson, continued the work. He further established the family name in the town by opening a company general store where the Bloomingdale Laundromat is today. A large portion of the store's produce came from the animals of the Ryerson farm, especially pigs. As a result, many ''old timers'' refer to this area of the town as ''Porktown''.

In April 1871, Ryerson continued to expand Bloomingdale's reputation by introducing the New Jersey Midland Railway to the town. The citizens happily celebrated the first train that came into the town. Bloomingdale did not become its own borough until February 23, 1918, when Pompton Township split up to create the three towns of Bloomingdale, Ringwood, and Wanaque.

After World War II, Bloomingdale constructed a housing duplex on borough-owned property to be sold to veterans. In order to honor the men from this region who went to war, a World War II Memorial was constructed by the Borough and the American Legion.

Bloomingdale today is a small town with about 8,000 residents, most of whom are of modest means who own their own homes and are employed by small local businesses. Bloomingdale is proud about its ''American Small Town'' history, as stated by Mayor Jonathon Dunleavy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating the Borough of Bloomingdale on the occasion of its Centennial Anniversary.

## PROVIDING RELIABLE OPTIONS FOR PATIENTS AND EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES ACT OF 2018

SPEECH OF

### HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 19, 2018*

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, the opioid crisis is an epidemic that is impacting every community across the country. It is a crisis that is getting worse and worse.

The chances are that everyone knows someone who has been personally affected—wrestling with addiction, providing support to a loved one in recovery, or simply offering comfort to a friend who may be dealing with loss.

For the second consecutive year, American life expectancy has actually declined. Opioid-related overdoses caused more than 33,000 deaths in 2015 and more than 40,000 in 2016.

It's no coincidence that most people are just prescribed opioids to manage their pain even though the government will also pay for hundreds of medical devices, physical therapy and non-opioid medications.

The fact is many people and providers simply aren't aware of other, equally effective therapies like medical devices, non-opioid medications and physical therapy. We need to change that.

That's why I authored the Medicare CHOICE Act with my colleague Representative KIND. It which is one of the bills in this package H.R. 5775, the PROPER Act.

The CHOICE Act will require Part D drug plans to inform seniors about other, non-addictive pain management therapies that Medicare covers so that when they get injured or have some other type of pain, they will be able to ask their doctor the right questions to make sure that they receive the most effective and least harmful pain management therapy.

Education is important and can be an effective tool for providers and can help make a difference in the fight against opioid addiction.

Representatives BLACK, O'HALLERAN and CROWLEY also have an initiative included in the PROPER Act package to educate seniors about ways they should safely dispose of unused opioids and how providers should take into account the whole patient when discussing pain. I thank them for their important work.

This package has strong bipartisan support and I want to thank my colleagues for working together to get these initiatives moving for action on the House floor.

It will make a difference in addressing an epidemic that continues to bring tragedy and sadness to so many families.

Madam Speaker, I am glad that we are taking action to educate seniors on their alternative pain management therapies, how they can safely get rid of unused opioids, and how providers should look at the whole patient when delivering advice for pain management.

## IN RECOGNITION OF LINDA CARTER'S DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

### HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Linda Carter for her outstanding career in public education. Ms. Carter has served the city of Ann Arbor and its young people well through her work with the Ann Arbor Educators Association.

After graduating from the University of Michigan with two music education degrees, Ms. Carter started a career in Ann Arbor Public Schools. She has taught in every Ann Arbor middle school and most of the elementary schools and took a deep interest in engaging with students, parents and faculty during this time. As a teacher, she catered to the needs of each individual student and helped them achieve success in her class. After years of teaching, Ms. Carter was named vice president of the Ann Arbor Educators Association in 1990 and became president in 1992. Through her work, she has bettered the lives of countless educators.

The Ann Arbor Educators Association represents the educators, administrators and support professionals who work in the Ann Arbor Public School District. As president of the union, Ms. Carter serves as a voice for teachers throughout the district. From negotiating contracts to hosting board meetings, she is a

trusted voice in the southeast Michigan education community and a tireless advocate for education professionals. She is known by her colleagues, local teachers and Ann Arbor officials for her kindness, sharp wit and passion for the education professionals within the school district. Although they may sit on different sides of the table, she is well-respected by the 13 superintendents that she has worked with as president of the union. As a result of her leadership efforts, Ann Arbor Public School teachers are consistently recognized for their excellent work. She has had a tremendous impact on the direction of public education in Ann Arbor, and her hard work and expertise will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Linda Carter for her distinguished career in public education. Ms. Carter has effectively served the city of Ann Arbor and its students through her work with the Ann Arbor Educators Association.

## IN RECOGNITION OF SECOND BETHESDA MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH'S 115TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Second Bethesda Missionary Baptist Church in Albany, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrate a remarkable 115 years. The congregation of Second Bethesda Missionary Baptist Church will celebrate this very significant anniversary with celebratory events from July 9 to July 15 at the church in Albany, Georgia.

Second Bethesda Missionary Baptist Church was founded in 1903 as ''New Church'' by Reverend Dan Mosley; Deacons Peter Scott, William Jackson, and Frank Murray; and several faithful others.

Over the years, the church has been served by a number of spiritual leaders, each leaving their lasting mark on the church in some form or fashion. These leaders include Reverends Dan Mosley, Elbert Thomas, Dozier Scott, William Boyd, Charles Carr, and Jimmy Ewings, Sr.

The strength of the congregation was tested on July 7, 1994, their 91st anniversary, by the horrific flood that devastated Albany, Georgia. Many of the roads were closed and several members were unable to make it to the church, but by the grace of God, none of the church's members were harmed.

In 2001, Pastor Rance Pettibone, Sr. accepted the pastoral invitation and continues to serve as pastor today. He has overseen many internal changes, including the development of the Mission and Vision statements and several new ministries, renovation of numerous areas in the church, installation of the church's sign, and dedication of the church's New Fellowship and Education Building. He and his family not only serve the church's 150 members, but also work hard to serve the surrounding community through their active and expansive ministries.

The story of Second Bethesda Missionary Baptist Church, which began 115 years ago as a small group of people walking in the words of Philippians 4:13 ''I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.'', is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the membership of Second Bethesda Missionary Baptist Church in Albany, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and for serving the community through Him.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather, I was unable to attend votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 269; YEA on Roll Call No. 270; and NAY on Roll Call No. 271.

## RECOGNIZING THE ROCK ISLAND LADY ROCKS FOR WINNING THE CLASS 4A STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rock Island Softball Team, the Lady Rocks, from Rock Island High School, for earning the Class 4A title for the Illinois State Championship in softball.

The Lady Rocks took first in finals to claim their title as state champions, and I would like to recognize them for their tremendous accomplishment. Their dedication and passion for their sport meant that they were determined to win gold. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. They are an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see them represent Rock Island throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate the Rock Island Lady Rocks Softball Team on their title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing them every success in the future.

## HONORING SALVATORE LUCIANO ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

### HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to join the family, friends, and colleagues who have gathered to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to Salvatore Luciano as he celebrates his retirement, marking the end of a nearly 50-year career in public service and Connecticut's union movement.

Sal has dedicated a lifetime to Connecticut's working families. Beginning his career in 1980 as a social worker with the Connecticut Department of Children and Youth Services, Sal spent many years working on behalf of some of our most vulnerable children. Investigating cases of abuse and neglect, Sal worked to ensure their safety and protection. It was also at this time that he began his involvement with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

First serving as a steward in Local 2663, Sal was elected the chapter's President in 1989 and of AFSCME Council 4 in 1999. In 2001, he left state service when he was appointed Executive Director of Council 4 to fill a vacancy. He would go on to win the election outright in 2002 and has held the position he has served in ever since. Headquartered in New Britain, Connecticut, Council 4 represents 35,000 workers in state and local government as well as the private non-profit sector. Sal has led the fight on behalf of his membership, striving to ensure a fair wage, quality, affordable health benefits, and security in their retirement. Sal has been a vocal and tenacious advocate and his presence at Council 4 will most certainly be missed.

Sal's involvement with Connecticut's Labor movement extends beyond his work at Council 4. He is also the Executive Vice President of the Connecticut AFL–CIO and a member of the International Executive Board of AFSCME. He serves as a Vice President of the United Labor Agency, (AFL–CIO) and is a Board Member of the State of Connecticut Retirement Commission. Sal has dedicated much of himself to improving the quality of life of Connecticut's working family—a legacy that will serve as an inspiration to future labor leaders.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Sal for many years and have always considered myself fortunate to have benefitted from his experience and guidance and to call him my friend. Today, as he celebrates his retirement and begins a new chapter, I am honored to have this opportunity to join family, friends, and colleagues in thanking Salvatore Luciano for his outstanding service to Connecticut and our working families. I wish him all the best for many more years of health and happiness.

## HONORING THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF HANOVER'S 300TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the First Presbyterian Church of Hanover, located in the Township of East Hanover, New Jersey, on the occasion of its 300th Anniversary.

While the current First Presbyterian Church of Hanover standing today was built in 1835, the earliest record of the church dates back to September 2, 1718. This church has a long, rich history, and was placed on the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places in 1977.

As the state and country grew, more churches were established in the area, as

seen by the "sister churches" established in Morristown, Madison, and Parsippany. In 1755, the Hanover Church was rebuilt not far from where it currently stands. During the Revolution, the Hanover Church served as a hospital for the quartered soldiers in and around Morristown who had smallpox. Further, uniform buttons of the Continental Army were found during the excavation of the area around the church. This is probably evidence of a common burial ground for the soldiers who did not survive smallpox. Also, the Reverend Jacob Green of the Hanover Church played an integral part in the Revolution in that he was a member of the first Provincial Congress and chairman of the committee that drew up the first Constitution of New Jersey.

The present church building was constructed in 1835 from materials that date back to the church from 1755 and trees cut from the surrounding church property. So although it was built about 200 years ago, the actual wood of the church dates to a time about 80 years earlier than that. In fact, the timbers in the current church that date from this time still have the marks from the hooks that once held up the beds in this temporary Revolutionary War hospital.

The cemetery surrounding the church is also historically significant. The cemetery adjacent to the church is home to the graves of many soldiers from the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Civil War, World War I, World War II, and various other historic figures. Aaron Kitchell, the first Congressman of New Jersey, is buried here, as is David Young, the author of The Farmer's Almanac.

The church went through many renovations and replacements over the years including the addition of a pulpit alcove in 1871 and the addition of an electric organ in 1912. In order to ensure that this important historical building was preserved, a restoration project was carried out from 2005 to 2013, which included installing a new furnace, repairing the structure of the church, and repainting the bell tower. The current building stands as a significant historical monument, as well as a well-maintained religious meeting place for the greater East Hanover community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating the First Presbyterian Church of Hanover on the occasion of its 300th Anniversary.

## IN RECOGNITION OF GREATER UNION MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 20, 2018*

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of Greater Union Baptist Church in Camilla, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrate a remarkable 150 years. The congregation will celebrate this very significant anniversary on Sunday, June 24, 2018 at Greater Union Baptist Church.

Tracing its roots back to the Reconstruction era, the church was founded in 1868 as "Union Baptist Church". Beginning services were held under a "Brush Harbor" at the Old Newton Railroad in Camilla by a layman known as Brother Blind Jack. The first church building was built on a plot of land located at the intersection of Harney Street and Church Street. Throughout the years, this congregation would expand and later become known as Greater Union Baptist Church.

Throughout the years, many ministers have been licensed or ordained from the church, and a number of pastors, deacons, and clerks have contributed to its legacy. Today, Greater Union Baptist Church is led by Reverend E. Matthew Faulk who has done an exceptional job of continuing the great work of his predecessors.

This ardent community of believers has extended its circle to include more and more members as the years have gone by, though it has never lost its essential character. Today, that same faith and spirit shine on through Greater Union Baptist Church, which has undergone several improvements in the past year in order to maintain the beautiful structure of their church building and improve comfortability for their faithful members.

The story of Greater Union Baptist Church, which recounts a group of believers coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship the Lord, is truly an inspiring one that shows the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation who put all their love and trust in God.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Greater Union Baptist Church in Camilla, Georgia for its congregation's enduring commitment despite adversity, to each other and to our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ for over 150 years. May their actions continue to inspire the community in courage, in dedication, and in faith.

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 21, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 26

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Lieutenant General Stephen R. Lyons, USA, to be general and Commander, United States Transportation Command, Department of Defense.

SD–G50

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine prescription drug affordability and innovation, focusing on addressing challenges in today's market.

SD–215

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

Business meeting to markup an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

SD–192

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine legislative proposals to increase access to capital.

SD–538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Teri L. Donaldson, of Texas, to be Inspector General, Christopher Fall, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Science, Karen S. Evans, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Cybersecurity, Energy Security and Emergency Response), and Daniel Simmons, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy), all of the Department of Energy.

SD–366

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the Survivors' Bill of Rights, focusing on implementation and next steps.

SD–226

11 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

Business meeting to markup an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

SD–138

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 3029, to revise and extend the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (PREEMIE Act), S. 1112, to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, S. 808, to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State, S. 3039, to provide funding for the development of a predictive analytics pilot program to help children and families who come to the attention of the child welfare system, an original bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, and the nominations of Scott Stump, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training, and other pending nominations.

SD–430

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism
To hold hearings to examine protecting our elections, focusing on examining shell companies and virtual currencies as avenues for foreign interference.
SD–226

JUNE 27

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider S. 645, to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the effects of broadband deployment and adoption on the economy of the United States, S. 1092, to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions, S. 1896, to amend section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the treatment of availability pay for Federal air marshals and criminal investigators of the Transportation Security Administration, S. 2941, to improve the Cooperative Observer Program of the National Weather Service, S. 3094, to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program, H.R. 4254, to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 to strengthen the aerospace workforce pipeline by the promotion of Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program and National Aeronautics and Space Administration internship and fellowship opportunities to women, H.R. 4467, to require the Federal Air Marshal Service to utilize risk-based strategies, H.R. 4559, to conduct a global aviation security review, and the nominations of Karen Dunn Kelley, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce, Heidi R. King, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, Geoffrey Adam Starks, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, and Peter A. Feldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SD–106

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine how to reduce health care costs, focusing on understanding the cost of health care in America.
SD–430

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine FAST–41 and the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, focusing on progress to date and next steps.
SD–106

Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
SD–G50

JUNE 28

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine legislative proposals to examine corporate governance.
SD–538

# *Daily Digest*

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

***Routine Proceedings, pages S4253–S4311***

**Measures Introduced:** Ten bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3092–3101, and S. Res. 552–555. **Page S4281**

**Measures Reported:**

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2019". (S. Rept. No. 115–280) **Pages S4280–81**

**Measures Passed:**

***American Innovation $1 Coin Act:*** Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 770, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S4293**

McConnell (for Murphy/Enzi) Amendment No. 3041, of a perfecting nature. **Page S4293**

***American Eagle Day:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 553, designating June 20, 2018, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States. **Pages S4284–85**

***National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and Day:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 554, designating the month of June 2018 as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month" and June 27, 2018, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day". **Pages S4285–86**

***Freedom of Muslims of the United States:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 555, recognizing the freedom of Muslims of the United States to exercise their religion and participate in the civil systems of their country. **Page S4286**

**Measures Considered:**

**Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act—Agreement:** Senate continued consideration of H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S4253–57, S4261–75**

Adopted:

By 87 yeas to 9 nays (Vote No. 132), McConnell (for Crapo) Modified Amendment No. 2943 (to Amendment No. 2910), to increase funds for a nuclear demonstration program. **Pages S4254–55, S4256**

By 95 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 133), McConnell (for Baldwin/Portman) Amendment No. 2985 (to Amendment No. 2910), to set aside funds for cooperative agreements and laboratory support to accelerate the domestic production of Molybdenum-99. **Pages S4255–56, S4256–57**

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. 135), Boozman (for Young) Amendment No. 2926 (to Amendment No. 2910), to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the effectiveness of the Veterans Crisis Line. **Pages S4265–72**

By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. 136), Boozman (for Tester/Baldwin) Amendment No. 2971 (to Amendment No. 2910), to prevent the denial of access to records and documents by various inspectors general. **Page S4272**

Pending:

Shelby Amendment No. 2910, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4253–57, S4261–75**

Alexander Amendment No. 2911 (to Amendment No. 2910), to make a technical correction. **Pages S4253–57**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Shelby Amendment No. 2910 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, June 22, 2018. **Page S4275**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a

vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of Shelby Amendment No. 2910. **Page S4275**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:45 a.m., on Thursday, June 21, 2018. **Page S4293**

**Spending Cuts to Expired and Unnecessary Programs Act:** By 48 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 134), Senate did not agree to the motion to discharge H.R. 3, to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act 1974. **Pages S4257–61**

**Appointments:**

***United States Commission on International Religious Freedom***: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 105–292, as amended by Public Law 106–55, Public Law 107–228, and Public Law 112–75, appointed the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: Ahmed M. Khawaja of California. **Page S**

**Nominations Received:** Senate received the following nominations:

Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, for a term of six years.

Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2023.

Kathleen Laura Kraninger, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for a term of five years.

John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

Michael A. Hammer, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2021.

Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2021.

Mark Montgomery, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

6 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army. **Pages S4306–11**

**Nominations Withdrawn:** Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nominations:

Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2021, which was sent to the Senate on October 3, 2017.

Ronny Lynn Jackson, of Texas, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs, which was sent to the Senate on April 16, 2018.

A routine list in the Foreign Service. **Page S4311**

**Messages from the House:** **Page S4280**

**Measures Referred:** **Page S4280**

**Measures Read the First Time:** **Pages S4280, S4293**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S4281–83**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** **Page S4283**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S4277–79**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Pages S4286–92**

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** **Page S4292**

**Record Votes:** Five record votes were taken today. (Total—136) **Pages S4256–57, S4261, S4272**

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 8:45 p.m., until 9:45 a.m. on Thursday, June 21, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4293.)

# *Committee Meetings*

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

## COMBATING MONEY LAUNDERING

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance concluded a hearing to examine combating money laundering and other forms of illicit finance, focusing on how criminal organizations launder money and innovative techniques for fighting them, after receiving testimony from Dennis M. Lormel, DML Associates, LLC, Lansdowne, Virginia; Tracy Woodrow, M and T Bank Corporation, Buffalo, New York; and Chip Poncy, Financial Integrity Network, Fairfax, Virginia.

## NOMINATIONS

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Geoffrey Adam Starks, of Kansas, to

be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, who was introduced by Senator Moran and Representative Cleaver, and Peter A. Feldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

**NOMINATIONS**

*Committee on Environment and Public Works:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of William Charles McIntosh, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Administrator, who was introduced by Senator Daines, and Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, who was introduced by Representative Tom Rice, both of the Environmental Protection Agency, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

**PROPOSED TARIFF ACTIONS**

*Committee on Finance:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine current and proposed tariff actions administered by the Department of Commerce, after receiving testimony from Wilbur L. Ross, Secretary of Commerce.

**USAID RESOURCES AND REDESIGN**

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Agency for International Development resources and redesign, after receiving testimony from Mark Green, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development.

**SUBSISTENCE ACTIVITIES IN NATIVE COMMUNITIES**

*Committee on Indian Affairs:* Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine promoting traditional subsistence activities in Native communities, after receiving testimony from Jennifer Hardin, Subsistence Policy Coordinator, Office of Subsistence Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Roy B. Brown, Northern Arapaho Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyoming; Mary Sattler Peltola, Kuskokwim Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Bethel, Alaska; and A-dae Romero-Briones, First Nations Development Institute, Longmont, Colorado.

**NOMINATIONS**

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, and Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, who were introduced by Senator Scott, Roy Kalman Altman, and Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, and Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

**ELECTION SECURITY PREPARATIONS**

*Committee on Rules and Administration:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine election security preparations, focusing on a state and local perspective, including S. 2261, to protect the administration of Federal elections against cybersecurity threats, after receiving testimony form Matthew Masterson, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; John R. Ashcroft, Missouri Secretary of State, Jefferson City; Jim Condos, Vermont Secretary of State, Montpelier; Steve Simon, Minnesota Secretary of State, Saint Paul; Noah Praetz, Cook County Director of Elections, Chicago, Illinois; and Shane Schoeller, Greene County Clerk, Springfield, Missouri.

**RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN 2016 ELECTIONS**

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine the policy response to Russian interference in the 2016 United States elections, after receiving testimony from Victoria Nuland, Center for a New American Security, and Michael Daniel, Cyber Threat Alliance, both of Washington, D.C.

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 15 public bills, H.R. 6156–6170; 1 private bill, H.R. 6171; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 124; and H. Res. 951–955 were introduced. Page H5362

**Additional Cosponsors:** Page H5363

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 5925, to codify provisions relating to the Office of National Drug Control, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–767, Part 1);

H.R. 3392, to provide for stability of title to certain land in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–768);

H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–769);

H. Res. 952, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–770);

H. Res. 953, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–771); and

H. Res. 954, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–772). **Page H5361**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 9:34 a.m. and reconvened at 10 a.m. **Page H5292**

**Guest Chaplain:** The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Mark Schiftan, The Temple: Congregation Ohabai Sholom, Nashville, TN. **Pages H5292–93**

**Journal:** The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H5293, H5347**

**Motion to Fix Next Convening Time:** Agreed to the Burgess motion that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, June 21st for Morning Hour debate, by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 184 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 272. **Pages H5302–03**

**Suspensions:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

***Coordinated Response through Interagency Strategy and Information Sharing Act:*** H.R. 5925, amended, to codify provisions relating to the Office of National Drug Control. **Pages H5304–25**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 2:42 p.m. and reconvened at 3:45 p.m.

**Individuals in Medicaid Deserve Care that is Appropriate and Responsible in its Delivery Act:** The House passed H.R. 5797, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide under Medicaid services for certain individuals with opioid use disorders in institutions for mental diseases, by a yea-and-nay vote of 261 yeas to 155 nays, Roll No. 276. **Pages H5335–44, H5344–45**

Rejected the Castor (FL) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 190 yeas to 226 nays, Roll No. 275. **Pages H5342–44, H5344–45**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of H. Rept. 115–766, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. **Page H5338**

Agreed to:

Rush amendment (No. 1 printed in part D of H. Rept. 115–766) that expands treatment coverage to individuals suffering from cocaine use disorder (which includes crack cocaine); and **Pages H5339–40**

Kildee amendment (No. 2 printed in part D of H. Rept. 115–766) that adds two requirements to the report that States are required to submit; the first would be information regarding the number of individuals suffering from co-occuring disorders and the disorders from which they suffer and the second would be information regarding access to community care for individuals suffering from a mental illness other than substance use disorder. **Pages H5340–41**

Withdrawn:

Fitzpatrick amendment (No. 3 printed in part D of H. Rept. 115–766) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have provided flexibility for States to allow the State plan amendment to include assessments to determine level of care and length of stay recommendations based upon criteria established or endorsed by a State agency pursuant to 1932(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Public Health Service Act. **Pages H5341–42**

H. Res. 949, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6), (H.R. 5797), and (H.R. 6082) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 225 ayes to 180 noes, Roll No. 274, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 273. **Pages H5294–H5302, H5303–04**

**Overdose Prevention and Patient Safety Act:** The House passed H.R. 6082, to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records, by a yea-and-nay vote of 357 yeas to 57 nays, Roll No. 278. **Pages H5325–35, H5346–47**

Rejected the Pallone motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 175 yeas to 240 nays, Roll No. 277. **Pages H5333–35, H5346–47**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–75 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H5325**

H. Res. 949, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6), (H.R. 5797), and (H.R. 6082) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 225 ayes to 180 noes, Roll No. 274, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 185 nays, Roll No. 273. **Pages H5294–H5302, H5303–04**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 6:57 p.m. and reconvened at 10:30 p.m. **Page H5360**

**Senate Referral:** S. 2269 was held at the desk.

**Senate Message:** Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and appears on page H5294.

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Six yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5302–03, H5303–04, H5304, H5344–45, H5345, H5346, and H5346–47. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 10:31 p.m.

# *Committee Meetings*

## MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on Appropriations:* Full Committee held a markup on the FY 2019 State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill; and the Revised Report on the Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2019. The FY 2019 State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill was ordered reported, as amended. The Revised Report on Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY2019 was ordered reported, without amendment.

## MILITARY HEALTH SYSTEM REFORM: PAIN MANAGEMENT, OPIOIDS PRESCRIPTION MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING TRANSPARENCY

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled "Military Health System Reform: Pain Management, Opioids Prescription Management and Reporting Transparency". Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral Raquel C. Bono, Director, Defense Health Agency; and Captain Mike Colston, M.D., Director, Mental Health Policy and Oversight, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs.

## MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

*Committee on the Budget:* Full Committee began a markup on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2019.

## OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING: REDUCING BARRIERS TO ECONOMIC MOBILITY AND GROWTH

*Committee on Education and the Workforce:* Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development held a hearing entitled "Occupational Licensing: Reducing Barriers to Economic Mobility and Growth". Testimony was heard from Bryan A. Schneider, Secretary, Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation; and public witnesses.

## THE BENEFITS OF TAX REFORM ON THE ENERGY SECTOR AND CONSUMERS

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled "The Benefits of Tax Reform on the Energy Sector and Consumers". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## EXAMINATION OF THE GAO AUDIT SERIES OF HHS CYBERSECURITY

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Examination of the GAO Audit Series of HHS Cybersecurity". Testimony was heard from Sherri Berger, Chief Operating Officer, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Suzi Connor, Chief Information Officer, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Beth Killoran, Chief Information Officer, Department of Health and Human Services; and Greg Wilshusen, Director, Information Security Issues, Government Accountability Office. A portion of this hearing was closed.

## EMPOWERING A PRO-GROWTH ECONOMY BY CUTTING TAXES AND REGULATORY RED TAPE

*Committee on Financial Services:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Empowering a Pro-Growth Economy by Cutting Taxes and Regulatory Red Tape". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## ILLICIT USE OF VIRTUAL CURRENCY AND THE LAW ENFORCEMENT RESPONSE

*Committee on Financial Services:* Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance held a hearing entitled "Illicit Use of Virtual Currency and the Law Enforcement Response". Testimony was heard from Gregory Nevano, Deputy Assistant Director, Illicit Trade, Travel, and Finance Division, Homeland Security Investigations, Department of Homeland Security; Robert Novy, Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Investigations, U.S. Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security; and Thomas Ott, Associate Director, Enforcement Division, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury.

### U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFGHANISTAN

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan''. Testimony was heard from Alice G. Wells, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, Department of State.

### THE TRUMP-KIM SUMMIT: OUTCOMES AND OVERSIGHT

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''The Trump-Kim Summit: Outcomes and Oversight''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS IN SRI LANKA

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled ''Human Rights Concerns in Sri Lanka''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

*Committee on Natural Resources:* Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6106, the ''Common Sense Permitting Act''. H.R. 6106 was ordered reported, as amended.

### HOLDING CUBAN LEADERS ACCOUNTABLE

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:* Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled ''Holding Cuban Leaders Accountable''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ACT; BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT

*Committee on Rules:* Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4760, the ''Securing America's Future Act''; and H.R. 6136, the ''Border Security and Immigration Reform Act''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 7–3, a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6136 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The Committee granted, by record vote of 7–3, a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4760 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The Committee granted a second rule on H.R. 4760. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4760 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Goodlatte and Representative Lofgren.

### COMMUNITIES THAT THINK SMALL AND WIN BIG

*Committee on Small Business:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Communities That Think Small and Win Big''. Testimony was heard from Gregg Bishop, Commissioner, New York City Department of Small Business Services; and public witnesses.

### UPDATE ON IRS AND DOJ EFFORTS TO RETURN SEIZED FUNDS TO TAXPAYERS

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''Update on IRS and DOJ Efforts to Return Seized Funds to Taxpayers''. Testimony was heard from John P. Cronan, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; and Don Fort, Chief, Criminal Investigation, Internal Revenue Service.

## *Joint Meetings*

No joint committee meetings were held.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2018

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

### Senate

*Committee on Appropriations:* business meeting to markup an original bill making appropriations for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and an original bill making appropriations for Financial Services and General Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, 10:30 a.m., SD–106.

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Gordon D. Sondland, of Washington, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, Ronald Gidwitz, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Belgium, Cherith Norman Chalet, of New Jersey, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, and Brian A. Nichols, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zimbabwe, all of the Department of State, 2 p.m., SD–419.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* business meeting to consider S. 2245, to include New Zealand in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of New Zealand, S. 2823, to modernize copyright law, and the nominations of Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, David James Porter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Holly A. Brady, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, Andrew Lynn Brasher, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, James Patrick Hanlon, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana, David Steven Morales, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Lance E. Walker, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine, Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, and Jane Nitze, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and John D. Jordan, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Missouri, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

### House

*Committee on Armed Services,* Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Military Technology Transfer: Threats, Impacts, and Solutions for the Department of Defense'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''Aviation Mishap Prevention-a Progress Report'', 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

*Committee on the Budget,* Full Committee, continue markup on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2019, 9 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

*Committee on Education and the Workforce,* Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled ''Growth, Opportunity, and Change in the U.S. Labor Market and the American Workforce: A Review of Current Developments, Trends, and Statistics'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* Subcommittee on Energy, markup on H.R. 1320, the ''Nuclear Utilization of Keynote Energy Act''; H.R. 6140, the ''Advanced Nuclear Fuel Availability Act''; legislation on the Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act; and H.R. 6141, to require the Secretary of Energy to develop a report on a pilot program to site, construct, and operate micro-reactors at critical national security locations, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services,* Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5970, the ''Modernizing Disclosures for Investors Act''; H.R. 6130, the ''Helping Startups Continue to Grow Act''; and legislation on the ''Improving Investment Research for Small and Emerging Issuers Act'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on Foreign Affairs,* Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Russian and Chinese Nuclear Arsenals: Posture, Proliferation, and the Future of Arms Control'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

*Committee on the Judiciary,* Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, hearing entitled ''Examining The Need for New Federal Judges'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Natural Resources,* Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 4599, the ''Rock Creek National Park Act of 2017''; H.R. 5148, the ''Protect Public Use of Public Lands Act''; H.R. 5149, the ''Unlocking Public Lands Act''; H.R. 5613, the ''Quindaro Townsite National Historic Landmark Act''; and H.R. 5727, the ''Emery County Public Land Management Act of 2018'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 4644, the ''Yellowstone Gateway Protection Act''; and H.R. 5859, the ''Education and Energy Act of 2018'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,* Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled ''State Perspectives on Regulating Background Ozone'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Small Business,* Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Accelerating Agriculture: How Federal Regulations Impact America's Small Farmers'', 10:30 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,* Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing entitled ''PIPES Act of 2016 Implementation: Oversight of Pipeline Safety Programs'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs,* Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''More Than Just Filling Vacancies: A Closer Look at VA Hiring Authorities, Recruiting, and Retention'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

*Committee on Ways and Means,* Full Committee, markup on legislation on the ''Reducing Drug Waste Act of 2018''; H.R. 6138, the ''Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment Transparency Act of 2018''; H.R. 4952, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study and submit a report on the effects of the inclusion of quality increases in the determination of blended benchmark amounts under part C of the Medicare Program; H.R. 3500, The ''Ensuring Integrity in the IRS Workforce Act of 2017''; H.R. 519, the ''Water and Agriculture Tax Reform Act of 2017''; H.R. 6124, the ''Tribal Social Security Fairness Act of 2018''; H.R. 6084, the ''Improving Social Security's Service to Victims of Identity Theft Act'', 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,* Full Committee, hearing entitled ''DIA Roles and Mission'', 9 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing will be closed.

## Joint Meetings

*Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:* to receive a briefing on illicit trade, 1 p.m., SR–485.

*Joint Economic Committee:* to hold hearings to examine the need for United States leadership on digital trade, 2:30 p.m., 2318, Rayburn Building.

*Next Meeting of the* SENATE

9:45 a.m., Thursday, June 21

Senate Chamber

**Program for Thursday:** Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 5895, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act.

*Next Meeting of the* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, June 21

House Chamber

**Program for Thursday:** Consideration of H.R. 4760—''Securing America's Future Act'' (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 6136—Border Security and Immigration Reform Act (Subject to a Rule).

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga, E876, E878, E879
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E871, E872, E873, E875, E877, E878
Clark, Katherine M., Mass., E871
Collins, Doug, Ga., E870
Crawford, Eric A. ''Rick'', Ark., E875
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E874, E876, E878
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E874, E877
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E876
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E874, E877, E878
Gallagher, Mike, Wisc., E869
Gibbs, Bob, Ohio, E876
Graves, Sam, Mo., E870, E871, E871, E871, E873
Green, Gene, Tex., E870
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E871
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E874
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E873
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E869
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E870, E873
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E870
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E877
Poe, Ted, Tex., E869, E870, E875
Price, David E., N.C., E869
Renacci, James B., Ohio, E878
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E870
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E872
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E873
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E872
Young, David, Iowa, E871, E873, E875, E876

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.