



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018

No. 122

House of Representatives

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give you thanks for giving us another day.

Once again, we come to You to ask wisdom, patience, and peace for the Members of the people's House. As they encounter their constituents over this weekend, endow them with grace and understanding, especially of those issues which are most pressing.

Please keep all who work for the people's House in good health, that they might faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them in their service to the work of the Capitol.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BOST. 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. 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GOMEZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF BRADEN VARNEY

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a hero of the Sierra and mourn his tragic loss.

Braden Varney, age 36, gave his life Saturday night fighting the Ferguson Fire, which continues to ravage the forests near Yosemite Valley and threaten the communities of Mariposa County.

A second-generation bulldozer operator with CAL FIRE, he was all alone that night, cutting firebreaks to stop this monster fire, when his dozer overturned in treacherous terrain. He was well-known to the people of Mariposa, being involved in many civic activities. Braden leaves behind a grieving widow, Jessica, and two small children, Malhea, age five, and Nolan, just 3 years old.

Our firefighters face mortal peril when they leave the safety and comfort of their homes and families to put themselves in harm's way. They literally place their lives between our communities and the fires that can

consume them. They know the danger better than anyone. Yet, they do what they do anyway.

Mr. Speaker, to the Varney family, I can only express our profound respect, admiration, gratitude, and sympathy on behalf of all of those who Braden died to protect.

FREE WILLIAM NGUYEN

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, William Nguyen is a 32-year-old from my district. His graduation from graduate school was last week, but he missed it because he was jailed while vacationing in Vietnam, imprisoned after taking part in a peaceful demonstration.

I am here to stand up for my constituent and ask that he be treated humanely. This young man is a son, brother, and a friend to many. I see his passion for justice in the millennials I represent. Will is part of a generation that cares deeply about the world beyond our borders. They are advocates for the most vulnerable, voices for the voiceless, and now William needs our voices. He needs our collective resolve to help him through this difficult time.

Will's case has unified Democrats and Republicans to work together on his behalf. For weeks, we have done everything to build diplomatic efforts needed to bring him home. Today, I am asking all Americans, regardless of their politics, to join us in supporting the Nguyen family. Keep them in your thoughts, in your hearts, and in your prayers.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PAUL STOUT

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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6561

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, a young marine from Murphysboro, Illinois, gave his life on the front lines during World War I.

Paul Stout graduated in 1916 from Murphysboro High School and then enlisted in the Marine Corps in February of 1918. In June of 1918, he was deployed to the front lines. At age 20, he was killed in action in France in July of 1918. For his heroic actions, he was awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze Star with a V device for valor.

The Paul Stout American Legion Post 127 is my hometown American Legion Post in Murphysboro. It is named after Private Stout. I had the opportunity this last year to visit the battleground at Belleau Wood, where he fought just a month and a half before passing in a battle later on farther into France. I can tell you it was a truly moving experience.

Although memories may fade over time, we must never forget those who served and gave their lives in defense of freedom and liberty in every war across this great globe.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BRONSON KALILOA

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Hawaii County Police Officer Bronson Kaliloa, who died yesterday after being fatally shot Tuesday night during a traffic stop in Mountain View.

Bronson was just 46 years old, a father of three, a graduate of Waimea High School on Kauai, a 10-year veteran of the police force and a public servant recognized by his community, fellow officers, and family and friends as one-of-a-kind because of his dedication to service, his kindness, and heart of aloha.

He was part of the Puna Patrol Division, who, over the last few months, have been working around the clock to support their community in crisis, due to the ongoing volcanic activity and lava flow, helping residents who have been displaced from their homes, businesses, and farms.

We mourn with the community of Puna, the Hawaii Police Department, and Bron's ohana he left behind: Casey, Samson, Grace, and Nathan. We can never forget the sacrifices our law enforcement officers and their families make every single day to serve and protect.

YOUTH EXCHANGE AND STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM

(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 recognize the Kennedy-Lugar Youth Exchange and Study Abroad program, otherwise known as the YES program.

Sponsored by the Department of State and funded by Congress, the YES program is celebrating 15 years of connecting the world.

Established after the September 11 attacks, high school students from across the country spend an academic year in countries with a significant Muslim population. The students live with a host family, attend a local high school, and engage in activities to learn about their host country's society and values. In turn, the students share American culture and values with the people of their host country.

I recently met with a YES program participant from Pennsylvania's Fifth District, Jocelyn Krieger from Port Matilda. This past academic year, Jocelyn lived and learned in Bosnia. She and numerous other students were able to participate in this important cultural exchange that fosters understanding and collaboration between people of different backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this great program will continue to grow and connect cultures to truly build a global community.

ENDING HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the bipartisan, bicameral EMPOWER Act.

The goal of this consequential legislation is simple: create safe workplaces and a society where everyone can thrive.

We all have the right to work in a safe environment, but over the past months we have heard stories of individuals from all walks of life. We have seen how widespread harassment is, and the culture of silence. In fact, according to the EEOC, it is estimated that 90 percent of harassment incidents never get reported. That is why we need this bill.

The EMPOWER Act outlines what sexual harassment is, creates systems that foster accountability, and removes the fear of retaliation that keeps so many victims from coming forward. By removing that fear of reporting, eradicating deceptive nondisclosure agreements, and increasing transparency, we are taking meaningful steps to make our workplaces harassment-free and creating a culture of respect throughout society.

From Harvey Weinstein to factory floors to Time's Up and the #MeToo movement, we are going from a moment to a movement to action. I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this bill.

SUPPORT FOR ICE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in overwhelming support for the officers who carry out the important mission of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, better known as ICE.

These brave individuals are saddled with the responsibility of facing some of the world's most dangerous and violent criminals, like MS-13 and many who traffic drugs and humans, and others who wish to do us harm.

Yesterday, 35 Members voted against supporting this important area of our law enforcement. Not supporting our law enforcement and ICE is just plain wrong and endangers American lives. ICE ensures the defense and security of the United States through the identification, investigation, apprehension, and deportation of foreign nationals that pose a threat of any kind to U.S. national security.

We are a country of laws, and they must be enforced. I will vote time and again to support these brave officers, and I stand here today to thank them for their service and for the sacrifice that they and their families make each and every day as they keep our communities as safe as possible.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 119, which is a shameful denial of the clear evidence of climate change and its impact on our planet.

Let me be clear. There is no greater threat to the future of this planet than climate change. But instead of offering solutions, Republicans are burying their heads in the sand once again.

Here are the facts. Climate change is real, it is manmade, and every day that Congress fails to act, we are making the problem worse. The cost of inaction is astronomical. If we do nothing it is our grandchildren who will be left with the price tag.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that we can pass policies that dramatically reduce greenhouse gases and build our economy. California, my home State, is 4 years ahead of schedule on our greenhouse gas emission reduction goals and green jobs have grown exponentially. We have over 300,000 people working in the green job industry, by far the most in the country.

So, no, Mr. Speaker, this carbon tax fear-mongering won't work because Americans understand that the true threat to our economy is from climate change, which is already wreaking havoc on our planet.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution and, instead, get to the real work of addressing climate change.

□ 0915

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1001, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Pursuant to House Resolution 1001, the concurrent resolution is considered as read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 119

Whereas a carbon tax is a Federal tax on carbon released from fossil fuels;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase energy prices, including the price of gasoline, electricity, natural gas, and home heating oil;

Whereas a carbon tax will mean that families and consumers will pay more for essentials like food, gasoline, and electricity;

Whereas a carbon tax will fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to more jobs and businesses moving overseas;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to less economic growth;

Whereas American families will be harmed the most from a carbon tax;

Whereas, according to the Energy Information Administration, in 2016, fossil fuels share of energy consumption was 81 percent;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase the cost of every good manufactured in the United States;

Whereas a carbon tax will impose disproportionate burdens on certain industries, jobs, States, and geographic regions and would further restrict the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas American ingenuity has led to innovations in energy exploration and development and has increased production of domestic energy resources on private and State-owned land which has created significant job growth and private capital investment;

Whereas United States energy policy should encourage continued private sector innovation and development and not increase the existing tax burden on manufacturers;

Whereas the production of American energy resources increases the United States ability to maintain a competitive advantage in today's global economy;

Whereas a carbon tax would reduce America's global competitiveness and would encourage development abroad in countries that do not impose this exorbitant tax burden; and

Whereas the Congress and the President should focus on pro-growth solutions that encourage increased development of domestic resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 119, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank leadership for bringing this resolution to the floor for consideration. I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 119, which would express the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the U.S. economy.

This resolution will send a clear signal to the American people that we oppose policies that would drive up energy prices for families and for businesses. A standalone carbon tax generally would have such detrimental effects on the economy and would be an unwarranted and transparent grab for revenue.

The adverse economic effects of such a tax would be felt throughout the economy, falling hardest on the most vulnerable: the young, the poor, the elderly, and those living on fixed incomes.

An Obama administration proposal in 2016 for a \$10 tax on every barrel of oil would have translated into an increase at the gas pump of approximately 25 cents per gallon for every American consumer. Similarly, a standalone carbon tax would increase the price of gasoline, natural gas, home heating oil, and electricity.

American families would feel the pain immediately when they buy gas or diesel to get them to their jobs every day. American families would also feel the pain when they turn on the lights or adjust the thermostat in their homes every day.

The cost burden of a carbon tax also would, correspondingly, increase the price of everything consumers buy every day—in short, everything from a carton of milk to a pair of shoes, to a bicycle, to an automobile.

The price increases on goods with fixed demand that would result from such a tax would directly harm millions of Americans whose incomes mean that they must budget carefully in advance to afford just the basic necessities of life.

In addition, a carbon tax would hit at a time when the industries that it targets are just now recovering from a very damaging economic period of our lives.

With a reformed Tax Code built for growth and rollback of burdensome regulations, American businesses and their workers are finally making a comeback, and we are seeing great optimism about our economic future. Now is not the time to debate placing additional burdens on industries that are trying to help us keep the lights on.

This resolution makes clear that we oppose policies that would drive up energy prices, damage the U.S. economy, reduce the American GDP, and hurt American jobs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am discouraged to come to the floor today as we squander the valuable time of this body arguing over a pointless resolution that will accomplish nothing for the people of America, whether it is accepted or rejected—nothing.

Let's be clear about what this resolution does and does not do.

We are not arguing today over whether this body will or will not adopt a tax on carbon emissions. This resolution, and I am quoting, expresses the sense of Congress about a carbon tax.

So what we are trying to achieve, apparently, this morning is a discussion of the mood of Congress. Well, we should hold some hearings about the mood of Congress, because I would submit that it is not a very pleasant time to be working on Capitol Hill. Nothing in this exercise is going to have anything to do with a carbon tax. This is better suited to a high school debate than it is to the United States House of Representatives.

There are plenty of people across the country who need real help and real action from this Congress. Every day, American families, people far from this building, far from this city, are struggling with real problems and real challenges.

They feel their standard of living has not improved. They want to feel some security, security that their jobs will stick around—how about holding some hearings on pensions?—security that they can count on health insurance, security that one day they will be able to retire with dignity, security that they will be able to launch their kids into a successful and happy life.

So, on this Thursday morning, the Republican leadership has brought up a sense of the mood of Congress on carbon. We could choose to bring forward legislation that actually would help American families today. We could help them meet many of the challenges that they have. Instead, we are using our precious remaining legislative days to hold an amateur hour on a debate about something that is not going to happen.

This is a vacuous gesture, empty in every form. It is a political stunt. It is not worthy of the time or the attention of this body.

When I go home and talk to my constituents and my neighbors, they want to hear what I, along with the Members of this Chamber, intend to do to ensure that their hard work still translates into a decent life.

Something around us is clearly out of step. There is a growing anxiety around the country that is bigger than our political differences and divide. It is a building sense that, at some point when we all perhaps were not looking, the system became stacked against ordinary people; the rules changed, and hard work isn't enough any longer to guarantee that you can make it in America.

The unemployment rate, for sure, is low, but 65 percent of Americans worry about having enough money to pay their bills. Yes, we can say this morning that downward pressure on wages, essentially, has kept those wages flat for the American people despite the fact that the unemployment rate is advertised at about 4 percent. One in five Americans has more credit card debt than emergency savings. Less than 40 percent of the people in this country have enough savings to cover a \$1,000 emergency room visit or, for that matter, car repair.

It is plain to see in my own district. We have seen the challenges that the people back in western Massachusetts face every single day. Despite the talk of growth in the stock market—which, by the way, has been going up since October of 2009—their salaries have barely moved.

Home prices have gone up by 9 percent in our market last year. A gallon of gas costs 28 percent more than last year. Electricity bills in Massachusetts are up 21 percent over last year. Childcare, saving for college, and, again, retirement and pensions, healthcare premiums—Mr. Speaker, people are having trouble keeping up. Teachers have to pick up jobs waiting on tables or driving for Uber. Families need to juggle multiple jobs just to get by.

But today's economy, apparently, isn't hard on the top 1 percent in America. Last year, the average bonus on Wall Street—and listen to this number, average—\$185,000. It rose 17 percent after our Republican colleagues passed their tax bill last year. That is three times what most American families bring home in an entire year.

It seems like things used to be easier. Do you know why? Because they were easier. Americans born in the 1940s had a 92 percent chance of earning a higher income than their parents had at age 30. Those born in the 1980s have a 50 percent chance of doing so. The tax bill that Republicans passed last year, without a single hearing in all of 51 days—and not, incidentally, with one Democratic vote—will make things substantially worse for these families.

People don't really need to hear these statistics. Intuitively, they know what has happened. Three out of four Americans are not confident that their

children will grow up to be better off than they were, and they have every right to be worried.

Healthcare used to be easier to afford. The new Republican tax law raised premiums by 15 percent and weakened protections for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions.

Then Republicans wanted to slash \$500 billion out of the Medicare program so that many of our family members who depend on it will be even more challenged.

What have families gotten from the Republicans on healthcare? Higher deductibles, higher costs, and plans that cover much less.

The cost of a 4-year degree at a public college has doubled since 1996. The basic ticket into the middle class is out of reach for too many of our young people today. The ones who do manage to scrape by far too often accumulate debt that makes homeownership or starting a family a long way off.

Other family budget essentials just keep climbing, too. As I noted, gas prices are up 27 percent from last year. Childcare costs rose for the fifth year in a row. This year, a week of infant childcare at a daycare center is \$211.

Mr. Speaker, there are concrete actions that we might take right here in this Chamber to support these families. We could spend today working on college affordability. How about some pension hearings to talk about what is happening in the central States as well as the challenges that retirement faces for the American family? And how do we help more people afford that first home or help their parents, once again, prepare for a secure retirement?

We are nearly out of time to get things done in this Congress. We are down to less than 25 legislative days before the midterm elections. If we plan to do anything about the pressing issues facing Americans, this is the time to step it up. But, instead of trying to broker solutions or offer ideas, the Republican leadership has opted to hold a shadow debate.

It doesn't matter how this vote turns out. Let me repeat that. It doesn't matter how this vote turns out. The outcome is going to be identical. Nothing on this issue will change because of what we are doing this morning. Nothing will change.

That contentment with the status quo may be fine for my Republican colleagues, but it is not going to help the families whom I represent. In fact, it pretty much reinforces their doubts about the very work of Congress.

Listen, if you want to debate a carbon tax, let's hold some hearings. Let's hold some discussions about a carbon tax. Let's find out what it would mean for the economy. We might use that moment to test what offshore drilling does for oil as part of the carbon tax discussion or for the families in western Massachusetts. Let's find out what impact it would have on fossil fuel emissions and economic growth. Let's think strategically about how it might

affect our geopolitics. If you want to have this debate, then let's have a real debate through hearings in the regular order.

This resolution is really meaningless. The outcome will be nothing, no matter what the final vote turns out to be. It is a waste of all of our time this morning, and we ought to be devoting that time to meeting the challenges that the American people expect us to meet.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution. This anti-carbon tax resolution expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax will be detrimental to the United States economy and certainly is not a waste of anyone's time.

As a physician, typically, what I like to do is examine the risk and benefit analysis of any treatment plan, and I apply that same standard to a situation like this.

□ 0930

I want to know the risk and benefit of any new tax that might be considered. A carbon tax would raise costs on everything Americans buy, from electricity and gasoline to food and everyday household products, with little or any benefit.

Mr. Speaker, when we introduce a new tax or consider a new tax, I want to know who it would impact the most. Who I think this would impact the most is that single mom I delivered about 10 years ago. She has 2 children at home. She is working 60 hours a week. This is going to impact her more than anybody else, because she is just trying to get by with the income she is making.

This is going to drive the cost up for her children's school lunches. It is going to drive the cost up for her gasoline to get to and from work. That single mom will be impacted by this carbon tax.

This resolution will put Congress on record against a carbon tax, which would result in massive job losses, lead to higher prices for American families and small businesses, and jeopardize America's energy security.

Mr. Speaker, this President and this Congress have been fighting for American energy dominance, and a carbon tax would undermine that goal. I am so proud of what my producers back home have done in the oil and gas industry to have a cleaner product. What the refineries are doing today compared to when I was growing up, a little boy in El Dorado, Kansas, living between two refineries, I am proud of how the electrical generation has improved ecologically as well.

This resolution will affirm the position of Congress that a carbon tax

would counter the goals of American energy dominance, economic growth, and national security.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be real clear. There is not a carbon tax bill before us today. This is a political stunt, and this stunt comes at the same time that the Republican majority is undermining access to affordable healthcare for all our constituents.

They are working with this administration to sabotage the healthcare marketplaces and drive up prices, legislating away coverage and protections for our constituents. They have gutted resources that help people enroll in the plans that are best for them. They are expanding junk healthcare plans that don't provide care if you are sick or injured, that can charge more for pre-existing conditions, that charge more for older people.

Their scam of a tax bill eliminated the individual mandate, driving healthier folks away from coverage. That means risk can't be spread and prices go up. Kids born with heart problems or young adults diagnosed with cancer will pay a penalty for the rest of their lives.

On top of all of that, the administration has frozen the risk adjustment payments, which prevent insurance companies from cherry-picking only the healthiest people to cover.

According to PricewaterhouseCoopers, Republican sabotage efforts will increase the cost of health insurance by as much as 24 percent this year alone.

These are some of the issues that are hurting the middle class now, and these are some of the issues that we should be focusing on. We should be holding hearings on these issues.

If you have concerns with other issues, have hearings on them. But don't bring some political malarkey on the floor and pretend that we are doing something for the American people.

This is a failure by the majority party. We should be working for our constituents on real bills that are before us now.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding and for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support as the lead author of H. Con. Res. 119, along with my colleague from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. Speaker, the question is real simple, and that is, do we support or oppose a carbon tax? I think the case is very clear by anybody who looks objec-

tively at what a carbon tax will do to the economy. It will be devastating to our manufacturing base. It will kill jobs. I think most devastating, Mr. Speaker, it would raise and increase costs for families all across this country.

If you look at this chart right here, it talks about the estimate, what this would do to families. There would be an increase by an estimated \$1,900 per family on the cost of things that they buy all across this country.

The resolution is simple. It says: "Be it resolved by the House." That is, it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

"Yes" or "no," it is a clear "yes" vote if you are concerned about families. Why don't we talk about some of the groups in support. The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste says that: "A carbon tax would harm the U.S. economy by raising the cost of all goods and services, imposing an unfair burden on the lower and middle class, and deterring new investment, thereby killing jobs."

Why don't we listen to what the American Farm Bureau Federation said about a carbon tax: "Agriculture is an energy-intensive sector, and a carbon tax levied on farmers and ranchers would be devastating."

Then, Mr. Speaker, let's listen to what Grover Norquist from Americans for Tax Reform said: "A carbon tax would kill American jobs by the millions."

Why would we want to allow the possibility? Believe me, there are some people in Washington who are talking about trying to bring a carbon tax. To act like, oh, there is no talk about it at all, clearly, there are people here in this Chamber that want to impose a carbon tax. Let's be clear about how devastating that would be to the American economy.

Everybody gets to take a position on this today, Mr. Speaker. You are either for a carbon tax or against it. I would urge strong support for H. Con. Res. 119.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the Farm Bureau says about the tariffs on agricultural products across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), my neighbor and good friend, a well-informed member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me associate myself with the remarks of Mr. NEAL and talk about what a fraud this whole process has become.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Louisiana, but can you imagine never having a hearing on this. Let me tell you who would like to come to that hearing: Jim Baker, a devout, you know, liberal. You have George Shultz, Martin Feldstein, Greg Mankiw, Hank Paulson, Art Laffer,

Gary Cohn, Rex Tillerson, to name a few, who say that Congress ought to at least be open to looking at a carbon tax.

According to the other side, it is a choice between a carbon tax or not a carbon tax. They don't talk about passing on the benefits to the consumer. They don't talk about the transition that is needed or strengthening the pension funds or even from the standpoint of an infrastructure bill that they have never addressed in 8 years while China moves ahead of us every single day. Nothing gets done in the House of Representatives.

Here we have a fake debate and fake legislation that is going nowhere instead of actual, real hearings. We don't have real hearings on Social Security and its outcome. We don't have real hearings on gun violence. We don't even have real hearings here on the state of what is going on with this administration and the FBI and our intelligence people.

This is the sad state of affairs that we find ourselves in. So if you see frustration on this side of the aisle, it is primarily because, in the most demonstrative democracy in the world, not even a hearing, a suggestion about bringing experts to talk about what this could possibly do. What a sham.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I came down to the floor today to address the resolution we have talked about regarding the carbon tax, but since then, I think something else has come up.

We just heard one of my colleagues, I think, kind of belittle Uber drivers and waiters and waitresses. I tell you, when I take an Uber, I don't think it is something that you have to resort to, to take that job. I think it is a very hard job, going all about the city, being able to get along with sometimes difficult people, working nights. Waiters and waitresses, same thing. I have worked in kitchens. I don't think one should say that one has to resort to these jobs.

It is kind of a thing that some Congressmen have around here that I don't like. They become removed, and they sometimes think that they are more important than people doing other jobs.

I think those are both fine jobs. I respect the Uber drivers who drive me around this city. I used to work in a kitchen, and I respect the waiters and waitresses. I don't believe one should describe working as an Uber driver or a waiter and a waitress as something people have to resort to. They are fine jobs.

Now, I guess I came down here for the carbon tax. I will point out that I think the carbon tax, if implemented and people throw it out there, the carbon tax will fall on the average guy the most. It is something that falls on people who drive a car, which will be a regressive tax. It falls on people who heat

their homes, which will be a regressive tax.

It bothers me, particularly when disproportionately it comes from the party that purports to represent the average guy, that when they think of a new tax to apply out there, they are going to promote a tax that disproportionately affects the average guy, because everybody has a heat bill, almost everybody has a car.

I think, among the other things that would cause a damper on the American economy, I don't like taxes that disproportionately hit the average guy.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody was demeaning the work that people do, on this side. I think we were talking about the challenging nature of our economy. I don't think the gentleman would dispute the fact that the gig economy has created a downward pressure on wages.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the voice of Chicago and a well-known and well-regarded member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong opposition to this resolution, which is nothing more than political posturing. This nonbinding resolution does nothing to control increases in healthcare premiums.

Republican actions have wreaked havoc in the healthcare market, driving up healthcare costs for Americans, especially older Americans. This nonbinding resolution does nothing to limit skyrocketing drug prices after giving tens of billions of dollars in tax cuts to the drug industry.

The Chicago Fire Department was in to see me this week, and they talked about the high cost of drugs. For example, the cost of nitroglycerin tripled over 4 years from \$37 to \$120. The cost of naloxone more than doubled during this time period. If the Chicago Fire Department is having trouble paying for pharmaceuticals, then you can imagine what smaller entities would be experiencing.

This resolution does nothing to increase jobs, nothing to help parents afford the high cost of childcare and college. It is indeed a do-nothing resolution. That is exactly what it does. I will vote against it.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of my colleague's resolution, H. Con. Res. 119, which expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States.

A carbon tax is a tax on the American consumer and our economy. A carbon tax would significantly—I want to repeat that—significantly drive up the cost of the fuels that drive our way of life, and result in millions and millions of jobs lost.

This burden would be unfairly shouldered by the lower and middle class in-

comes. The nonpartisan—I want to say that—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, in 2013 stated: “A carbon tax would increase the price of fossil fuels in direct proportion to their carbon content. Higher fuel prices, in turn, would raise production costs and ultimately drive up prices for goods and services throughout the economy.”

A study from the National Association of Manufacturers found that a carbon tax could drive up gasoline costs between \$6 and \$14 per gallon, and lead to as many as 21 million jobs lost, a continually shrinking economy, and lowering our Federal revenue, all without doing anything to improve global greenhouse gas emissions.

□ 0945

Just yesterday, the House passed my amendment to prohibit funds from implementing the Obama administration's social costs of carbon rule.

The facts are clear. A carbon tax is not the way to protect our environment and economy. The social costs of a carbon tax far outweigh the potential benefits.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a very knowledgeable woman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 119. This resolution is nothing more than an election year stunt by Republicans to distract from the growing list of issues they failed to address this Congress.

Let me be clear: This vote is a sham. If Republicans truly wanted to debate the merits of a carbon tax, they would allow the Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings with expert testimony and robust discussion. In fact, multiple members of our committee have already introduced bills that tackle the ever-pressing issue of climate change, which is impacting the health and well-being of American families and future generations more and more each day.

This is not just a Democratic concern either. There is even a Republican carbon tax bill expected to be introduced in the coming days.

Instead, here we are, wasting what little time we have left this Congress, debating a pointless resolution while there are urgent problems waiting to be resolved. Congress should be passing legislation to address the double-digit increases in healthcare premiums caused by the repeal of the individual mandate by the GOP tax scam or reuniting immigrant children with their parents.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this vote is a wasted opportunity and just another example of Republicans placing political expedience over regular order.

As a member of both the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition and the bipartisan Climate Solutions Caucus, I would love to participate in a real debate about how we can address climate change. My constituents are

clamoring for us to act. But if Republicans are going to continue to ignore and deny the existence of this crisis, the least they can do here, in Congress, is to use this time to legislate, not electioneer.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of the resolution, and I thank my good friend and colleague from Louisiana, STEVE SCALISE, for bringing it to the floor.

The carbon tax is one of those endlessly recycled bad ideas. A carbon tax would put a tax and increased costs on coal, oil, and gas carbon dioxide emissions from power plants and other sources.

In simpler terms, a carbon tax is a tax on productivity. As anyone with the slightest familiarity with economics will tell you, the more you tax something, the less you get of it. It is just common sense.

Late last year, Congress was able to deliver historic tax reform. Just 7 months after we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, nearly every economic indicator is showing record-breaking success.

The free market has been unleashed again, and our economy is thriving as a result. We are on pace for a quarter of economic growth that we haven't seen in more than a decade.

Imposing a job-killing carbon tax minimizes the gains we have made and will stunt our economic growth. Of course, the carbon tax would run counter to the goals of American energy dominance and national security, another priority this administration and this Congress have been able to make great progress in.

A carbon tax would have a negative effect on consumption, investment, and jobs; increase the cost of coal, natural gas, and petroleum products; and lead to lower real wage rates, lower labor productivity, and decreased worker incomes.

Imposing a carbon tax on hard-working Americans sets the Nation backward. After all the accomplishments we have made in the last year and a half, that is something we simply should not tolerate.

A carbon tax asks the entire Nation to make enormous sacrifices, and the only thing we get in return is falling behind our competitors in the global marketplace.

We have a broad array of leaders across the spectrum in the economy who support and agree with these principles.

Harry Alford, president of the National Black Chamber of Congress, said: “Our great Nation is at a crossroads. We can continue to reduce regulations and watch our economy rise with the recent tax reform. Bringing unnecessary hurdles before us like a

carbon tax will preclude that growth and hurt our economy immensely."

I have pages and pages of these.

Heather Higgins, CEO of the Independent Women's Voice, said: "A carbon tax would be devastating to millions of American women and their families, causing their electricity bills and transportation costs to skyrocket, as well as suppressing their wages."

Chet Thompson, president of the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, said: "Energy is the engine of progress. Making it more expensive will hurt our economy and disproportionately impact middle- and low-income families who can least afford it."

If we had time, Mr. Speaker, I could be here all day. I have pages and pages of these quotes in support of the principle that we are advocating here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, we have to support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a well-regarded member of the Ways and Means Committee. We are certain he will add clarity to this debate.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this very troubling week, when these same Republican enablers here in Congress have endangered our national security by failing to confront Donald Trump's surrender to Vladimir Putin in Helsinki, today, we again witness their total indifference to another very serious national security concern. Unfortunately, just as their refusal to stand up to Trump's denial of this ongoing Russian aggression won't make it go away as a grave threat to our democracy, neither will their ignoring the national security challenge of climate change eliminate reality.

In recent years, the war, the challenge, that these Republicans have been most willing to fight is the war on reality. They particularly find troubling any scientific fact that conflicts with their last campaign rally or their rigid ideology.

This Administration actually prohibited the Centers for Disease Control from including, in its budget documents to Congress, the terms "evidence-based" or "science-based." They don't want to rely on science as fact. They have questioned and harassed scientists across America so much that you have to begin to wonder whether they still believe in gravity.

Across America, we are seeing, with our own eyes, what they refuse to acknowledge: soaring temperatures, severe and erratic records being set in our weather, massive 100-year floods that seem to recur every 100 months, deep freezes, and ravaging hurricanes that dumped 60 inches of rain in one short period of time on the City of Houston.

Often at the same time that these disasters are occurring in other parts

of America we see: record droughts, and wildfires destroying thousands of acres, livelihoods, and homes. All across the country, particularly in the southern States, seldom seen diseases, like West Nile virus and Lyme disease, are afflicting more and more of our neighbors.

During the lifetime of my grandchildren, I know that my home State of Texas, America's number one greenhouse gas polluter, is on schedule to become a very different place, with more of the State looking like the Sonoran Desert. At the same time, our coastal areas, like those that stretch all the way to New England, will find themselves submerged and major metropolitan areas subject to serious harm from storm surges.

Meanwhile, we will see, not in the future, but right now, thousands of premature deaths every year because of air pollutants that are associated with carbon emissions.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, around the world, the very severe impact of climate change has already been identified as a major contributing factor to the disaster in Syria, conflict in Africa, and what is becoming a growing number of climate refugees. Trump's own Defense Secretary has acknowledged the need to address climate change and the impact on our military.

The Scientific American has reported that climate change presents a significant and direct risk to the U.S. military, its readiness, operations, and strategy.

We must treat this as a national security threat. When you have a security threat, you don't just rely on one weapon. A carbon tax that is revenue neutral, that does not take any new tax revenue than the tax it replaces, is one of the tools that should not be rejected without even having a hearing to evaluate it.

The likelihood of a carbon tax in our future will not be changed by this silly resolution. But as Republicans continue to reject all ways, any ways, of addressing the climate change national security challenge, the future of our planet and our families remains endangered every bit as much as they endanger us by yielding to Vladimir Putin.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), who was an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Majority Whip SCALISE for his work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, as the lead cosponsor on this legislation, I, obviously, rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 119.

Throughout the years, despite what we are hearing from the other side, there have been numerous efforts pro-

moting a carbon tax. There have been bills debated in committees; hearings held; and, subsequently, time devoted on the House floor. None were passed. Carbon taxes, however, create uncertainty in the marketplace.

Such a tax might reduce the amount of energy produced from coal and natural gas. I understand that. But as you have heard, it will also raise the cost of everything else Americans consume: gasoline, diesel fuel, food, clothing, and supplies. All would become more expensive.

We heard also that CBO and Stanford studies have warned that a carbon tax is the most regressive tax that could be implemented. And its impact on the poor and the middle class is at a rate of twice others.

This is a simple resolution stating that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and it is not in the best interest of this country.

Now, just last Congress, this very same resolution passed 237-163, and it is our hope that this year's effort will reflect the same bipartisan level of support.

Thanks to tax cuts and regulatory reform, America's economy is clearly on the rise. Implementing a carbon tax at this juncture could very well put the brakes on that progress.

So instead of reverting to put an ideologically driven tax on everything, there are better ways to address environmental concerns. We could invest strategically in research and innovation to deliver clean energy technologies, like has been done at NET Power, Petra Nova, or Longview. We could provide incentives, like 45Q, to capture and utilize carbon emissions. Or, lastly, we could advance energy efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, America doesn't need more taxes. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, to my friend RICHARD NEAL, I understand the frustrations of this debate and some of the processes, but this gives us a chance to come down to the floor and just talk about the basic policy of: Is a carbon tax good, or is it not good?

I can't speak to the process. All I can talk about is the policy.

Congressman DOGGETT was down here talking about national security issues. I deal with this quite a bit in my role as the chair of the Baltic Caucus and doing some NATO Parliamentary Assembly things.

Let me just speak briefly about a concern of what a carbon tax does in international energy fights and disbursements.

Here I hold a picture—and I wanted to get it on the chart, but I wasn't able

to—of an LNG terminal called Independence. Now, this terminal is in Lithuania, and they are able to decrease their reliance on Russian natural gas because they have built this import terminal.

□ 1000

They are able to now have two folks in which to import natural gas, thus relieving themselves of being extorted by the Russian Federation. A carbon tax would increase the cost of our exported goods to countries like Lithuania, making them more susceptible to energy extortion by the Russian Federation.

So in an international debate of an energy policy which the Russian Federation does extort—how do I know this? I know this because, in the early days of the reestablishment of freedom, a U.S. company bought a refinery in Lithuania.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield the gentleman from Illinois an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So the Russians didn't like a U.S. company buying an old refinery, so what did the Russians do? They turned off the flow of oil.

So just in the international world, if we want to help our allies decrease their reliance on imported crude oil from the Russian Federation or, in this case, liquefied natural gas, a carbon tax will make that more difficult. So that is why I think it is important that we have this debate on the international perspective.

I also know that a lot of the organizations that are important to me—the American Energy Alliance, Americans for Tax Reform, the Farm Bureau, Western Energy Alliance, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, National Black Chamber of Commerce, Competitive Enterprise Institute, and FreedomWorks—all support the resolution that says a carbon tax is kind of the wrong way to go because it increases costs on everybody, from the goods that we sell till we transport them to the market, across the board.

So I appreciate the time. And again, we want to be the world leader in oil and gas exports, and a carbon tax will prohibit us from being able to do that.

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

I want to compliment the previous speaker, my friend, Mr. SHIMKUS, on the notion of process, calling up the notion of process.

So here we have had a debate where we have sparred for the better part of an hour, and we are debating a topic on which there have been no hearings.

Now, let me guess. This is consistent with how the tax bill was done in, incidentally, 51 days, without a hearing or without a witness.

So we are being asked to vote on something today, here, on which there has been no opportunity to place the magnifying glass of critical scrutiny on

the proposal that is in front of us because, the truth is, what is in front of us is a question about the mood of Congress.

I think all 435 of us could testify to what the mood of Congress is right now, so I don't think it would be one of the more challenging events that we would confront.

But the idea that this is brought in front of the Congress without any opportunity for anybody to examine the underlying legislation and the thrust of what the regular order might impel contributes to the frustration that the American people feel about the institution and its priorities.

So as we have wrapped up this debate over a piece of legislation that will accomplish zip, zero, nothing, it literally does not matter how the vote turns out because the sole purpose of this resolution is to express, once again, the mood of Congress.

I am happy to express the mood of Congress any time that they want, happy to have a hearing on the mood of Congress if that is what they think might get us to a more sound proposal of energy independence, the use of renewables. But no, instead they bring up a piece of legislation here that is going to test how we feel about things this morning.

I think that the mood we should focus on is the mood of the American people. The people I talk to are under stress. They are tired. They are exhausted from working one, two jobs. Labor participation rates at 62.9 percent, 2 million people with opioid addictions, I wonder what their mood is as they listen to the discussion that we have had here on this floor.

They are anxious about their future. They are feeling squeezed because, for years now, the economy has been leaving them a little bit further behind. And I say that about wage growth.

Wages have flatlined for the better part of almost 13 years in America. And now, even as we see some glimmer of hope, the truth is the cost of gasoline and the cost of inflation is going to stagnate their wages again.

So paychecks have been stuck at the same level, and all the things that families need to get by have been getting more and more expensive. Housing, healthcare, college, childcare, utilities, those bills keep growing, but the salaries somehow don't keep up.

Why don't we have a hearing about the mood of people who have not seen any real wage increases—then we would get a better flavor for the debate that we are having today—rather than the mood of Congress on a piece of legislation that has had no hearings and no vetting?

So what about a hearing on the mood of our retirement system?

What about a hearing on the mood of a child's education?

Why don't we begin to talk about some of those issues? Why don't we just have some hearings on some of these issues?

Young people are going tens of thousands of dollars into student loan debt just to try to get a decent start in life. What about their mood?

Seniors are seeing their fixed incomes stretched until they break, forcing far too many to choose between paying for their prescription drugs and their groceries. Let's have a hearing on their mood.

Parents cope with high childcare costs that can eat up most of their paycheck, but the small margin that is left over is important to keep that family going. Let's have a hearing about their mood.

The people I talk to, they are not asking for too much. Their expectations for their families aren't out of line. Nobody is asking for a handout. They are asking for a hand up for opportunity.

Everybody is working hard, but people feel like they are running as fast as they can up the down escalator. Let's have a hearing on how they feel about those costs.

It takes us an unreasonable amount of effort to stay in exactly the same place. Getting ahead feels more challenging and more difficult all the time.

Last December, Republicans passed a catastrophic tax bill that gave away \$2.3 trillion over 10 years—without a hearing, without a witness—in 51 days. What about the mood of the American people as they examine it? And we have seen the mood in public polling.

The legislation we have today could have offered some relief to low- and middle-income families, but Republicans chose to leave them out in the cold. In fact, it did so little for the average family that their cuts won't begin to keep up with the rise in healthcare premiums or, for that matter, gasoline prices at the pump.

Instead, the tax bill heaped giveaways on people who are already completely comfortable and thriving—more concentrated wealth.

The people who elected us sent us here to do a job on their behalf, and we ought to take into consideration their mood. They have hired us to get things done for them, and we all take, I hope, that responsibility seriously.

Our activity today has been unworthy of the trust they have placed in us. It has really been a hoax. They have just wasted all this time arguing over a sense of Congress about a carbon tax and the mood of Congress. I could have told them what the mood was here; they just have to ask me.

This is going to be a pointless vote, meaningless in stature, and there will be no outcome whatsoever. This is political theater. It is not governing like responsible Representatives.

I urge my colleagues in the majority to focus this body on accomplishing things in the future that really might help people who sent us here to do precisely that.

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

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

For many years now, Republicans in Congress have been clear: A new stand-alone carbon tax will raise consumer costs and hurt the economy. It is not a solution to any challenge but, rather, it would create additional challenges.

If American businesses and workers in industries are targeted by a carbon tax, they will suffer economically under such a policy. They are just now recovering from the recession that we went into, and they are just now, because of the tax bill that was passed this past year, just now beginning to see a brighter economic future. We should not debate putting new obstacles in front of them at this time.

Together, we should be focused on working to advance policies that hold down energy costs, improve the U.S. economy, its GDP, and create jobs. That is what we did last year, and that is what we are doing today.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 180, answered “present” 2, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Cook	Harris
Aderholt	Cramer	Hartzler
Allen	Crawford	Hensarling
Amash	Cuellar	Herrera Beutler
Amodei	Culberson	Hice, Jody B.
Arrington	Curtis	Higgins (LA)
Babin	Davidson	Hill
Bacon	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Banks (IN)	Denham	Hudson
Barletta	DeSantis	Huizenga
Barr	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Biggs	Donovan	Hurd
Bilirakis	Duffy	Issa
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Johnson (LA)
Blackburn	Emmer	Johnson (OH)
Blum	Estes (KS)	Johnson, Sam
Bost	Faso	Jordan
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)
Brat	Fleischmann	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Fox	King (IA)
Buck	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Bucshon	Gaetz	Kinzinger
Budd	Gallagher	Knight
Burgess	Gianforte	Kustoff (TN)
Byrne	Gibbs	Labrador
Calvert	Gohmert	LaHood
Carter (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	LaMalfa
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Lamb
Chabot	Gosar	Lamborn
Cheney	Gowdy	Lance
Cloud	Graves (GA)	Latta
Coffman	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lewis (MN)
Collins (GA)	Griffith	LoBiondo
Collins (NY)	Grothman	Long
Comer	Guthrie	Loudermilk
Comstock	Handel	Lucas
Conaway	Harper	Luetkemeyer

MacArthur	Poliquin	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Posey	Smucker
Marino	Ratcliffe	Stefanik
Marshall	Reed	Stewart
Massie	Reichert	Stivers
Mast	Renacci	Taylor
McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Tenney
McCaul	Roby	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Trott
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Turner
Rodgers	Rokita	Upton
McSally	Rooney, Thomas J.	Valadao
Meadows	Roskam	Wagner
Messer	Ross	Walberg
Mitchell	Rothfus	Walden
Moolenaar	Rouzer	Walker
Mooney (WV)	Russell	Walorski
Mullin	Rutherford	Walters, Mimi
Murphy (FL)	Sanford	Weber (TX)
Newhouse	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Noem	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Norman	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Williams
O'Halleran	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Olson	Shimkus	Wittman
Palazzo	Shuster	Womack
Palmer	Simpson	Woodall
Paulsen	Sinema	Yoder
Pearce	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Perry	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Pittenger	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)
Poe (TX)		Zeldin

NAYS—180

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

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Costello (PA)	Lujan Grisham, M.
---------------	-------------------

NOT VOTING—17

Bergman	Fudge	Peterson
Black	Garrett	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Granger	Royce (CA)
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Speier
Crowley	Jones	Walz
Ellison	Lawson (FL)	

□ 1037

Messrs. CARBAJAL and GOTTHEIMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LONG changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for missing this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 363.

Stated against:

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 363.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. I am opposed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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 report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Quigley moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6147 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 151, line 10, after the dollar amount pertaining to the “Fund for America’s Kids and Grandkids”, insert “(reduced by \$380,000,000)”.

Page 215, line 15, after the dollar amount pertaining to the “Election Assistance Commission”, insert “(increased by \$380,000,000)”.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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.

The Russians attacked our democracy. They will be back and we are not ready. The President is unwilling to meet this challenge, but we must be willing to meet this challenge.

The last time our electoral process was called into question post-Bush-Gore, this government spent \$3.5 billion to upgrade our election systems because we treasured the integrity of our democracy. I hope we still do.

Earlier this year, we appropriated \$380 million to the Election Assistance Commission to provide grants for training, equipment, and software which will help States fortify and protect our election systems. This amendment appropriates an additional \$380 million to grants that continue to improve those defenses because our election infrastructure remains outdated, low tech, and nowhere where it needs to be to prevent future intrusions.

In the lead-up to the 2016 elections, the Russians targeted the election systems of at least 21 States and as many as 39. Through the special counsel's investigation, we now have the names of 12 Russian intelligence officers that carried it out.

When President Trump was given the opportunity to challenge President Putin in Helsinki this week, he, instead, condemned his own intelligence agencies while praising the Russian President.

Mr. Speaker, it was embarrassing, it was un-American, and it was a clear sign from the President that he will continue to stand by as President Putin orchestrates additional attacks on our democracy.

This latest episode of capitulation to the Russians was a step too far for many of you. But tweets will not stop the Russians. This moment demands action.

The Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, recently confirmed that the Russians continue to target our elections. Forty-two States continue to use outdated voting machines susceptible to cyber intrusions. Thirteen States continue to use voting machines that fail to produce a paper ballot or record.

The overwhelming demand for assistance is there. The EAC issued a public announcement just 3 days ago that every single State and eligible territory has requested grant funding with almost 90 percent of the existing funds already transferred out. But the amount distributed is only a fraction of what the States need. Election experts believe that the bare minimum required is \$1.25 billion while this bill zeros out those grants.

We now have the chance to do the right thing. Equipped with the new revelations from the Mueller investigation and the realization that President Trump will do absolutely nothing to defend our elections systems from for-

eign interference; and with Russia attempting to cast doubt, uncertainty, and suspicion over the integrity of our election process, now is the time to double down on our efforts to prevent election hacking.

The American people are watching, and we must ensure that we, unlike our President, are on the right side of history during this pivotal moment in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it would be inaccurate to say that this is a vote about process. It is a vote about substance.

In fact, Mr. QUIGLEY's amendment is about one of the most pressing issues of our time. The Director of National Intelligence has said that there is a flashing red danger signal similar to the one that happened before 9/11.

This amendment responds by providing for us to partner with our States to slam the door in the face of the Russian bear or any other adversary who seeks to steal the integrity of our elections.

The flashing red light calls us to action. Surely we can rise above pandering to party and Putin to act on behalf of our freedom and our security.

We have sworn an oath to defend our Constitution and our liberty against all enemies foreign and domestic.

Mr. Speaker, you have the opportunity to do that today. Do so. Vote "yes" on this amendment for your country.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation before us contains two important Appropriations bills: the Interior and Environmental bill and the Financial Services bill.

The first of these two bills, the Interior bill, funds important programs that protect and promote our Nation's resources. This includes vital funding to fight wildfires that threaten our communities across the Nation. The bill also invests in critical infrastructure that ensures American families have access to clean and safe drinking water; and, yes, this bill streamlines our Federal Government, returning the EPA to its core mission and cutting back regulatory red tape.

The second bill, the Financial Services bill, helps make our Nation a safer place to live and helps our economy grow. The bill also targets resources to programs that will boost economic

growth and opportunity, particularly for America's small business people, as well as protects consumers and investors.

In addition, the Financial Services bill helps enforce our laws providing necessary funding to support the Federal Court system, stopping financial and cybercrime, and fighting the opioid epidemic.

Funding these Federal programs is a responsibility given to Congress by our Founding Fathers as part of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, our committee has exercised the power of the purse through robust debate over the past 2 days, and now it is time to move forward with this legislation.

Passage of this legislation will put us one step closer to completing all of our Appropriations bills as we promised in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, these are solid bills. They are worthy of your support. I urge my colleagues to reject the motion, and vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, yeas 232, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

AYES—182

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Clay	F.
Barragán	Cleaver	Engel
Bass	Clyburn	Eshoo
Beatty	Cohen	Espallat
Bera	Connolly	Esty (CT)
Beyer	Cooper	Evans
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Foster
Blumenauer	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Gabbard
Bonamici	Crist	Galleo
Boyle, Brendan	Cuellar	Garamendi
F.	Cummings	Gomez
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Gottheimer
Bustos	DeFazio	Green, Al
Butterfield	DeGette	Green, Gene
Capuano	Delaney	Grijalva
Carbajal	DeLauro	Hastings
Carson (IN)	DelBene	Heck
Cartwright	Demings	Higgins (NY)
Castor (FL)	DeSaulnier	Himes
Castro (TX)	Deutch	Hoyer
Chu, Judy	Dingell	Huffman
Ciilline	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Clark (MA)		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
Loeb sack
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
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)

Bergman
Black
Brady (PA)
Cárdenas
Crowley

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

NOT VOTING—14

Ellison
Fudge
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Jones

Peterson
Richmond
Speier
Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1055

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 2018, I was absent for recorded votes No. 363 and No. 364. I would have voted as follows if I had been present: On rollcall No. 363, I would have voted “no”; on rollcall No. 364, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 199, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—217

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
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
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
McNerney
Meeks
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichart
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rosen
Royce (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
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

Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)

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
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
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

NAYS—199

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciocline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (TN)
Engel

Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Labrador
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
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
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bergman	Ellison	Peterson
Black	Fudge	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Speier
Cárdenas	Jones	Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1103

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am thankful that he is back with us, but at times I wish he weren't as healthy as he is. I am just joking.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes are expected no later than 3 p.m.

On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider several bills aimed at giving Americans more affordable healthcare choices:

First, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, sponsored by Representative ERIK PAULSEN. This bill would perma-

nently repeal ObamaCare's burdensome medical device tax. Doing so will create jobs, promote research, and allow for innovation that could lead to the next generation of lifesaving medical technologies;

Next, the Increasing Access to Lower Premium Plans and Expanding Health Savings Accounts Act, sponsored by Representative PETER ROSKAM. This package would expand access to lower cost healthcare options, encourage healthcare savings, and put a 2-year delay on ObamaCare's health insurance tax, which drives up costs of insurance for almost every American;

Finally, the Restoring Access to Medication and Modernizing Health Savings Accounts Act, sponsored by Representative LYNN JENKINS. This bill would transform and modernize health savings accounts and allow for more innovation in healthcare delivery.

I look forward to the House passing all three of these critical bills without delay.

Mr. Speaker, we also hope to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act. This House is committed to rebuilding our military and ensuring our brave men and women in uniform have the equipment and training they need to successfully carry out their mission.

I want to thank the Armed Services Committee for their hard work on this bill, especially their chairman, MAC THORNBERRY, and I look forward to another big bipartisan vote.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible in the House. As soon as our schedule is finalized, I will be sure to inform all Members.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his exposition of the schedule.

I want to speak briefly to the appropriations process.

I think the Appropriations Committee is fairly close to the completion of its bills. Can the gentleman tell us when the balance of the appropriations bills might be coming to the floor and when we can perhaps expect the next appropriations bill on the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee has now passed all 12 bills out of subcommittee. By next week, all 12 bills will have also cleared the full committee. By passing the Interior and Financial Services bills today, the gentleman knows the full House has adopted for the full-year appropriations half of those, six bills, making up over two-thirds of the discretionary budget authority.

House and Senate conferees on the first package are working to produce a conference report, and I look forward to continuing work on FY19 appropriations in the weeks to come. As soon as the items are scheduled for the floor, I will be sure to inform all Members.

As the gentleman knows, this is a different year, as just last year we were

able to pass all 12. But what is different about this year is, over in the Senate, there is action being taken, which is positive for us. That is why we are already into conference.

I look forward to having those conference reports coming back and moving those bills to the President's desk to be signed. I am proud of the fact that two-thirds of all the discretionary spending will have already passed this floor as of this day.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I share his delight that the Senate is moving bills. I would observe that they appear to be moving them in a bipartisan fashion, which I think is positive for an outcome on the appropriations process.

In that vein, I know we are in conference on the MILCON and Legislative Branch minibus. Does the gentleman have any idea when that might conclude and we might be considering that conference?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not know at this time. I know they are continuing to work. As soon as they get their work done, I will advise the Members. I will bring it to the floor then.

□ 1115

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me just mention, we just had a vote, and, obviously, I was disappointed in the outcome. I was the sponsor, probably as the gentleman knows, of the Help America Vote Act, which created the Election Assistance Commission. The Election Assistance Commission bill, the HAVA bill, passed with a big bipartisan vote and was signed, as the gentleman knows, by President George W. Bush in a very bipartisan effort.

The premise was that, for 200 years, the Federal Government had not participated in assisting the States in running Federal elections. I will repeat that. The vote for President, the vote for Senate, and the vote for the House were all done through State administrations with no participation by the Federal Government.

In 2002, the Congress and the President made a determination that we would contribute to making sure that our elections ran correctly. The gentleman will remember the issue of hanging chads and the question of whether or not votes were properly counted. It was of great concern across the aisle. So we passed the legislation.

Unfortunately, however, we have not continued to pursue that. And today's vote, we have a greater challenge today. The challenge in the 2000 election was inappropriate administration, domestically, of our election. The problem in 2016, as Speaker RYAN pointed out and the Intelligence Committee found and the intelligence community has found, was that there was clearly an outside attack on America by Russia, and perhaps others, to undermine the integrity of our elections.

The vote that we held just a few minutes ago was about the Federal Government continuing to partner with the States to ensure the integrity of our election system and its safety from outside attack, interference, and undermining.

I hope, Mr. Leader, that we could visit that issue. I hope the Senate visits that issue. Perhaps we can visit it in conference, and, together, Republicans and Democrats could join together in an effort to work with our partners in the States to ensure the integrity of the administration of our election and to ensure that votes are cast correctly, counted correctly, and reported correctly.

As the sponsor of that bill that was cosponsored, as the gentleman may remember—no, you weren't here in '02—by Bob Ney of Ohio, but overwhelmingly supported on both sides of the aisle, I hope that we could move ahead, in the weeks ahead, as we move toward the November 6 election, to make sure that Americans—Democrats, Republicans, independents, all others, and not only in this country but around the world—have confidence in the results of our election.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the gentleman wants to respond to that. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, there is one part of what the gentleman said with which I disagree. The vote we just had was a motion to recommit. We all know what motions to recommit are.

The good news about this is, last year in the omni, we fully funded the Help America Vote Act. That vote was a different vote. That was a vote that moved on to the President and was signed into law.

Now, of that funding that we fully funded—because we believe, just as the gentleman does, that we want to make sure our elections are fair, honest, and that people do not try to manipulate them—40 percent of that money that we fully funded is still available. The challenge here is that we have 19 States that have yet to apply.

So we should work together to make sure those States are applying, because the money is sitting there, and the money has been fully funded. We want to make sure, in the Help America Vote Act, that it continues, that States apply for that money, and that the elections are safe and sound and honest.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I would simply be constrained to say, I listened to Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I listened to his opposition to the MTR. The pretense that the amendment that was offered is somehow a procedural or nonconsequential amendment is incorrect. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN didn't even try to make the argument. He said it was a good bill; we ought to pass it. Fine. The amendment would have not undermined the bill in any way.

Now, there is a provision in that bill, as the gentleman knows, to, in effect,

undermine the agreement that was made last year, with respect to the funding levels, by putting \$500 million into a grandchild's or a children's fund by the chairman of the subcommittee. It is a little bit like your rescissions.

The gentleman who put that in voted for a \$2 trillion deficit-creating document and put \$500 million in a trust fund to bring down that deficit. I know my friend is happy that that will, at that rate, take 4,000 years to fill that \$2 trillion hole.

So I disagree with my friend that the amendment would have had any adverse effect on the bill that was passed.

Now, I voted against the bill, but the bill passed the House of Representatives. Nothing would have adversely affected that bill. I appreciate what the gentleman said about last year's action, which I supported, which I thought was correct, and which I appreciated the Congress taking.

Next, Mr. Speaker, we had a vote on ICE. The gentleman can argue it one way or the other. I know you criticized us; we criticized you. The fact of the matter is, what it did not deal with—and you will indicate that there was a bill that dealt with this in a fashion. But, again, I would remind you that your pledge, through your Speaker, was to take issues head-on, one at a time, discretely, not confuse them.

I would urge the leader, the Speaker, and the majority party to bring a bill to the floor that deals simply with an issue with which we believe the overwhelming majority of Americans agree: Do not rip children from the arms of their parents. Do not estrange children from their parents for weeks and months. Do not traumatize children, perhaps permanently, by this policy of separating children.

I would hope and urge the majority leader to bring a bill to the floor that would deal with that discrete issue.

Mr. NADLER has a bill, H.R. 6135, to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from pursuing this policy of separating families. JOHN MCCAIN has said that that policy of separation offends the dignity and decency of the American people. That is JOHN MCCAIN, former candidate for President in your party, Mr. Leader, and I would agree with him on that issue.

I would urge the leader to bring a bill to the floor to deal with this issue directly, and I believe—perhaps I am wrong—that it would receive a very significant majority of support in this House.

I would ask the gentleman, is there any plan to bring such a bill to the floor in the near future?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Correct me if I'm wrong, but you voted against the omni, correct?

Mr. HOYER. The omni last year? Yes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. So you voted against the funding—

Mr. HOYER. I am going to reclaim my time, Mr. Leader, for this.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If I can finish, you had stated at the end of your last

statement that you voted for that funding. I was just correcting. By voting against the omni, you voted against the funding for that.

Mr. HOYER. Of course, I supported that policy. Now, the reason I was going to reclaim my time, very frankly, Mr. Leader, I have done some research on bills you voted against. I could go through them and pick out this, that, and the other that everybody in the world was for, and I could say you voted against it. I have not done that.

The reason I have not done it is because I don't think that would be intellectually honest on my part, because I know that there are things I would pick out that you clearly supported but you didn't support some parts of the bill and, therefore, indicated your objection by voting against them, which is exactly what I did in the omni. The gentleman, my friend, knows that to be the case.

My friend brings up CHIP all the time. My friend knows that I have supported CHIP at its very inception and in every step of the way of its development and reauthorization. My friend knows that, but he continues to pretend, because I voted against the omni, that I voted against CHIP. I didn't like the omni. I thought the omni was wrong. Very frankly, I think I was correct in that vote.

Now, the omni passed, and it passed with a very substantial number of Democratic votes. I didn't lobby against the omni with my Members. I did indicate that I did not agree with things you had left out and did not put in the omni, and I, frankly, did not agree with some things that were in the omni.

Having said that, let's not go back and forth. I can get a lot of bills the same way and show that you voted against motherhood and apple pie in this bill, that bill, and the other bill. You know that to be the case. I would hope we can stop doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The only reason I brought it up is your statement at the end was that you voted for it.

Mr. HOYER. You are correct.

Mr. MCCARTHY. At any time, if I may finish, if I state that I voted for something that is incorrect, please bring it up.

Mr. HOYER. I will do that. I will tell you, you are correct in saying that I did not support the omni, but I did support the proposition.

Mr. MCCARTHY. In saying that, you just recently said you supported CHIP, but you voted against it because you voted against the omni. Also, is it not true, when CHIP was by itself on the floor, you voted against CHIP there? Because we brought CHIP to the floor three times.

But if I could move on, that was the case. So you voted against CHIP even when it wasn't in the omni, so there are other reasons to vote against CHIP.

You had a question about a bill.

Mr. HOYER. Separating children from their parents.

Mr. MCCARTHY. As we all know, America is a Nation of immigrants. Almost all of our ancestors came from somewhere else in search of a better life in this land of freedom and opportunity, and we want to maintain that.

Mr. Speaker, America is also a Nation of laws. We support immigration, but it also must be legal immigration. We must have the security, especially, along our southern border. As we speak, our men and women at the border are doing their absolute best to maintain both order and decency.

Since 2014, Border Patrol has completed more than 13,000—let me say that again, 13,000—life-saving rescues along the border, including many children. We would be naive to think that there are not certain individuals hoping to enter this country illegally and to do us harm.

Yesterday, when we talked about ICE, one of the elements that came up was the thousands of gang members that they stop. We all know the most vicious gang out there is MS-13. We know it because we know it in our communities. We see the murders. We see the drugs. We know the hundreds of MS-13 members that they have stopped from being a part of our communities. That is why we had that vote.

Simply put, the entire immigration enforcement community deserves our support because they work under very difficult circumstances. I think everybody would agree with that, which is why, if I can be very honest with my friend, I was upset to see many Democrats refuse to stand with the men and women of ICE yesterday.

Why? Six individuals who work for ICE gave the ultimate sacrifice of their life. One was murdered by the Los Zetas cartel.

The gentleman asked if I would bring up a bill. I offered to bring up a Democrat bill, but the author of the bill who put it across the desk and asked people to cosponsor said he would vote against it.

What was most shocking to me is the number of people who voted “present.” The gentleman can argue with me all day on things I vote “yes” and things I vote “no” on. The only time he will ever see my vote up there for “present” is a quorum call, because I believe the American public and my constituents expect me to make a decision when I come.

I think it was very clear yesterday. You can make a decision. I know my friend and his beliefs, but I also know his party has a new movement. It is a socialist party, and they are gaining steam. But that new party and that new movement in there, I still believe, would want you to make a decision one place or the other.

Just last year alone, ICE made almost 5,000 gang-related arrests. They seized nearly 1 million pounds of narcotics and opioids.

The gentleman knows, those 2 weeks we spent on this floor dealing with the

opioid epidemic, there will be more than 100 Americans who will die today because of opioids, and tomorrow will be the same. That is why we did CARA in the last Congress. That is why we came back with billions of dollars of funding to combat the epidemic. That is why we came back and spent 2 weeks on this floor passing more than 50 bills.

□ 1130

But think for one moment. If my friend on the other side, his colleague, was able to abolish ICE, that would be 1 million more pounds of narcotics. And it is more than just opioids. It is fentanyl. A small dose will kill you.

They rescued more than 900 sexually exploited children. They stopped thousands of predators. My friend knows that, too, when we were able to finally stop human trafficking on the internet.

Backpage.com is no longer there because this Congress acted, and they are being prosecuted. Seventy percent of all human trafficking happens online. But do you know what? We can celebrate that that has changed because of this Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want America to remain a land of opportunity, but demeaning the individuals who keep this country safe and calling to abolish ICE is certainly not the way to do it.

I thank my friend, and I think we have a difference of opinion, and I think a strong difference of opinion, and that is healthy. But sometimes when you have a difference of opinion, it is a “no” and a “yes,” not just a “present.” You might come to the debate, but you ought to participate and you ought to take a stance.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks a lot about law enforcement, correctly so. We ought to honor those who protect us and who put their life and limb at risk daily to do so. We ought to honor them whether they are ICE agents, whether they are Border Patrol agents, whether they are DIA agents, whether they are members of the Armed Forces, whether they are members of the sheriff's departments or police departments in our various communities around the country. We ought to have compassion for those who are victims whom they are protecting and compassion for those whom we lose in the performance of their law enforcement duties.

There is not a Member of Congress who has been at more memorial services for law enforcement officers that we have lost through the centuries than I have, period.

Yesterday's vote was because of the patently political nature of the resolution that was offered. The majority leader says he wanted to offer a bill of one of our Members who suggested the elimination of ICE—small number. And that Member, apparently, according to the majority leader, told him: Look, I am going to vote “no” on that if you bring it to the floor, obviously trying to raise a point about wanting to stop the policies and practices—not the ICE

agency, but the policies and practices of ripping, literally ripping children from the arms of their fathers and mothers and estranging them at places that neither knew where the other was.

The gentleman talks about the opioid epidemic being on the front page. It is there, and properly so, because it is a crisis, and we have dealt with it in a bipartisan way, which was correct to do so. We believed it was underfunded for some period of time. We have come up with some more funds. We are glad about that.

But he did not answer my question, and he distracted us from the focus. There was a bill, which we didn't like, because the bill had a lot of other stuff in it, which is why the Speaker said we ought to consider things discreetly, individually, one at a time. Don't confuse and obfuscate the issue.

So bring a bill to the floor that says that the policy that the President was pursuing, that he then changed—and the courts have now interjected themselves; we don't know for how long—to say that we ought not, that is not who we are as Americans, Mr. Speaker.

These 2- and 3- and 4-year-old children whom we see on the front pages of our paper, they are not MS-13. There is not a Member on this floor who will defend MS-13. There is not a Member on this floor who does not want to see the folks who gain some status by being an MS-13 caught, stopped, and taken out of our country if they are not citizens of this country, not a one of us. So that is a red herring dragged across this floor back and forth yesterday and today.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that we could say that America's values do not support taking children, small children, infant children. An instance was cited on the floor yesterday where a mother was nursing her child and that child was taken from her and the mother was put in handcuffs.

Is that America? Is that the compassionate country of which George Bush talked? Is it that bright and shining city on the hill of which Ronald Reagan spoke? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

Lastly, I know that flood insurance is going to expire July 31. I see the ranking member, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, on the floor. I know she has been working on this with Mr. HENSARLING. Does the leader know whether or not that bill might be coming to the floor or some extension coming to the floor next week?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To answer his last question first, yes, we will extend flood insurance through November 30 as we continue to work through the other differences we have. We do not want flood insurance to lapse, and we will have that on the floor.

But the gentleman brought up a couple of other points. If I may, I come from a family of immigrants. I come

from a family in which nobody was a Republican. I chose to be in this party based upon its philosophy.

If you come to my office, I have two Presidents' hanging portraits: Abraham Lincoln. The greatest challenge ever to this Nation was the Civil War. Abraham Lincoln was the first Republican President. And the other one is, the other reason why—both of those men—I chose to, and that was Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan did talk about that shining city on the hill. There was another President at the time, and I saw the difference, and I made my selection.

But the gentleman talks about the challenges with the rule of law, the challenges at the border. Nobody on this side wants children to be mistreated. That is why we dealt with the issue, and we brought it to the floor. There was an executive order that dealt with it.

But we moved two pieces of legislation dealing with immigration. Not one Democrat on the other side worked with us. Maybe there were problems. Maybe they disagreed with having greater security on the border, having a wall. I understand that, but maybe that is the difference.

But the question you brought forward was the bill on the floor yesterday. It had nothing negative in it. It had nothing about children. It talked about:

Do you support ICE?

Do you support the families of those six individuals who were murdered in the line of duty?

Do you support the stopping of drugs coming across the border?

Do you stand with those children who get exploited? Those ICE agents actually find them.

Do you stand with ICE when they stop those human traffickers, the modern-day slavery of today, and stop those people?

Well, we had an opportunity for that. I know this other side of the aisle and I know the new Democratic Socialist Party feels differently, probably feels differently than my friend. They want to abolish it. They never put a bill in to reform it. They said, "Abolish it."

If we were proposing a bill that said "support it," I would allow your bill to come up as well so we could have a clear choice. But when you were given that offer, the author of the bill said, "I would vote 'no.'" The people you asked to cosponsor, "We vote 'no,'" makes me wonder.

But the most shocking part to me—I know we take tough votes on this floor. I know there are tough decisions to be made. But at the end of the day, you have to make a decision because that is why the American people sent you here.

I have never been in a debate, in a primary or a general, where they ask me: If a bill came to the floor, will I vote "present"? I have never been asked that by my district. Republican or Democrat or Independent or Green

Party: "I want you to go to Washington. I want you to be on that floor. I want you to make a strong debate down in the well. And when you get the opportunity, you press that 'present' button," never, never have I heard that and never would I have thought I would see that. I have never seen so much color on that board as I saw yesterday.

And if you truly felt your convictions of what you said, your own "present" vote made it pass, then go back to the individuals you talk to, go back to that new Socialist Party and tell them what you did, because I didn't see convictions yesterday. I saw you play politics.

Our issues are too important. People have lost their lives, and you vote "present." Now, we have more work to be done. We take this job seriously.

Ronald Reagan talked about that shining city on the hill, about everybody rising up. This is the exact same debate we had when we wanted to pass tax reform. Not one person on the other side of the aisle could vote with it, but there are 1 million more Americans working today.

When I look at the last 49 years of America—because there are a lot of people in this Chamber who are younger than that—there has only been 7 months where unemployment has been below 4 percent. And do you realize that 2 of those months, you just lived through it in April and May? You have never seen the opportunity that you grasp for today.

And do you know what happens with that opportunity? More people want to come, and that is good for America. But we should come legally.

We know our system is broken, and I know my friend knows it, too, because we spent hours talking and trying to work something out. So, yes, we brought a bill to the floor, and we had a pretty good idea that probably it wouldn't pass. Why? Because nobody on the other side of the aisle wanted to step forward.

You know the process; it would go to the Senate. Maybe it is not just perfect, but I think this country is too important to vote "present," and I am going to take risks and I am going to bring bills to the floor that take risks.

So I thank the gentleman for the question. But what I really ask—the election is still a ways away. Stop playing politics. Be a part. That voting card, I don't even know why we have a "present" button here.

We want quorum, let's just all say it. But the idea of something so important that people have lost their lives over, what do you think those families felt like today? What do you think those families felt like?

Or what do you think about that young child who got saved from being exploited or got put back to the family and saved?

What do you think about the drugs that didn't come through, the number of lives that continue to live today because of that?

Or what do you think about those men and women, a part of ICE, who question does this government even support them. And every day they risk their lives for that.

It is not a day to vote "present." If you disagree, if you are part of the Socialist Party, stand up and take a stance. Let the American public know where you stand.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows damn well that is not the case, and I am tired of hearing him demagogue about that. I expect him to do it between now and the election, but the gentleman is not honest when he does it, and he knows that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I ask the gentleman what am I not saying correctly? Were there "present" votes in that Chamber?

Mr. HOYER. He says something about the Democratic Socialist Party—it is my time. It is my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNN). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I ask the gentleman—the 133 "present" votes, did they not take place yesterday?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my time.

This is the most autocratic Congress in which I have served. It has had the most closed rules. And the majority leader brings to the floor his version of what he wants to say and how he wants to characterize it. No consultation with us, no amendments allowed, and then we say we are not going to vote against ICE agents. We honor the work that they do. We honor the sacrifices they make. We honor the critical role they play in defending our country and enforcing our laws.

□ 1145

But, Mr. Leader, we are not going to take it or leave it. We are not going to vote "no" on a resolution that purports simply to honor our ICE agents. If it were simply that, it may have been a different matter.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the majority leader would stop talking about—there are some people in his party who say absolutely absurd things at the very highest level of his party, and I haven't brought them up.

Mr. Speaker, I asked a simple question. The Speaker of this House said he was going to bring issues to this floor individually, vote them up or down. I asked the leader: Will you bring a bill to the floor which will stop the separation of children from their parents? He says he did. 113 of his colleagues on his side of the aisle thought it was a bad bill and voted "no."

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, they didn't vote "present."

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, they didn't vote "present." I voted "present" because I wanted to say to the leader, Mr.

Speaker, I am not going to take it or leave it.

He wants to make me look like I am not for law enforcement when I have been for law enforcement in the 50 years I have been in public office, without fail—without fail.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, then why did he vote “present”?

Mr. HOYER. I voted “present,” Mr. Speaker, because I was not going to take it or leave it. I was not going to just take what the majority leader wanted to shove down my throat and the throat of others. Because, Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric in that bill—and let me say to the leader, Mr. Speaker, he and I worked on a lot of resolutions regarding Israel, and we want to keep the Congress united on Israel, and we keep the Congress united on Israel.

How do we do it, Mr. Speaker? We work on the language. We work on the language of the whereas clauses and the resolved clauses so that we can create a broad majority. We could have done that with the ICE bill, easily—easily—an overwhelming support for their role and for their courage and for their character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked about the bill that deals with flood insurance. I think the gentleman has told me that that is going to come to the floor, and I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I know he misspoke earlier on a couple of things, and I think he may have misspoken again. He made a comment. He said we are autocratic. He said we are the most closed. So I just want to go to facts.

This Congress has a 20-year high for bills enacted with bipartisan cosponsors, a 20-year high. Those are not my words. That is from Quorum, a company that only deals with data and measures all. So that means we are the most bipartisan Congress in more than 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman want to know something else, just on facts? He said we close everything. There have been over 1,650 amendments. 745 of those were Democratic amendments. So I looked back to Speaker PELOSI. She allowed less than 1,000 amendments in the entire 111th Congress.

So, I am sorry, those statements were not correct.

Now, we can have differences of opinion. He has a right to vote “present.” If he gets mad about it, he can get mad about it, but that is what the RECORD shows.

And he said because what were the resolved clauses. Mr. Speaker, the gen-

tleman knows that bill was on suspension. The rules of suspension have a higher threshold to pass, but it also means there are no amendments.

If you want to be fair, instead of just the bill that was coming forward, I offered to bring a Democratic bill up that would abolish ICE.

So, for the American people to know, let's see what the resolved clauses say, because this made so many Democrats vote “no” or “present.”

Resolved. That the House of Representatives expresses its continued support for all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, officers and personnel, who carry out the important mission of ICE;

Denounces calls for the complete abolishment of ICE; and

Supports the efforts of all Federal agencies, State law enforcement, and military personnel who bring law and order to our Nation's borders.

That is what the resolved said. That is what moved the other side to vote “present.” That is what we voted on.

He may be upset. I am upset he voted “present,” too. But I don't know what in this clause drove all the Democrats here, because you know on suspension he helped it pass.

But is it because that announcement denounces calls for the complete abolishment of ICE, because that is the bill he put across the desk? If that is what he is asking for, he can stand with his convictions. Don't put a bill across the desk, cosponsor it, and then when he has something on the floor that is only positive, that is only standing with the people of ICE, say he has to vote “present.” I don't know where the courage is there.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know who “we” is. Somebody who introduces a bill on either side of the aisle doesn't make it a “we” bill.

And the reason they brought the non-binding resolution to the floor, when they really wanted to bring the bill to the floor, is because it wouldn't have served their political purposes because everybody on our side of the aisle would have voted “no.” He knows it. That is why he didn't bring it to the floor, for politics; not for principle, for politics.

And to his credit, I understand the Speaker didn't want to bring it to the floor either. At least that is what is reported in the papers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question has still not been answered.

There have been more closed rules in this Congress than any Congress in recent memory, during the time I have served. Now, there have been a lot of bills passed, and we passed them on bipartisanship. We had about six, seven, eight, or nine naming a post office the other day.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, that is a lot less than under his leadership.

Mr. HOYER. Isn't that wonderful.

I voted for all of them, either by voice vote or by card. They were bills that we all agreed with.

But more closed rules on this floor, including today's bill that we passed, than any Congress in recent memory.

My question to the majority leader was: Will he bring to the floor a free-standing bill which provides that children will not be separated from their parents—which JOHN MCCAIN says is inconsistent with the decency of the American people—so that we can vote on that proposition and that proposition only. The majority leader has not answered that question.

He talks about voting “present,” which he didn't like. I am sorry he didn't like it, but I would vote “present” again to express my opposition, the only way it was possible to do, because, unlike his characterization, I did not want to say to ICE agents, “I do not respect you.” Therefore, I did not want to vote against a resolution, the resolved clause of which I agreed with.

But it didn't deal with the most critical issue. It could have—it didn't—and it is nonbinding. To argue about that is to dissemble about the question that I asked.

I am prepared to end this because I don't think we are going anywhere. I don't think I am going to get an answer from the majority leader, and I don't think he will bring it to the floor, free-standing, any more than he will bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill, which is so necessary to this country, to the floor, no more than he will bring a Dreamers protection act to this floor.

He is gesticulating, Mr. Speaker, as if: What do you mean by that?

He brought a bill to the floor that he said solved the problem that 113 of his Members voted against. It got over 300 votes against. That is not a viable option to bring to the floor. He knew it was going to fail. He knew it was another message bill.

So I asked him: Will he bring that bill to the floor individually, discretely, to protect these children, or not? I haven't gotten an answer to that.

The second thing I asked him, which he did answer, is that we are going to bring a bill to the floor, apparently, hopefully, to protect those who live in flood zones and who are going to have trouble getting flood insurance on August 1. He says he will bring that to the floor.

Now, I am prepared to close and to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield because I just think the RECORD needs to be corrected.

The gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, that we brought two immigration bills to this floor that would solve the problem. The gentleman also knows there was an executive order signed that stopped this action being taken before this even went forward.

But I also heard the gentleman say that he voted “present” because he didn’t want the ICE agents to think he didn’t support them, and that he supported those things in the resolved. Prior, he said that is why he voted against it.

I read what was in the resolved. I don’t understand how anybody in America looks at voting “present” with an idea you support it. That is the only thing that I question.

Now, the gentleman also knows that this is the most productive Congress in modern history. It has passed more bills out of committee than any Congress in the last 25 years. It has passed more bills in this Chamber than any one in the last 25 years. He sees the openness to the number of amendments; and it is not just the number of amendments to Republicans because there are hundreds upon hundreds for Democrats.

The gentleman also knows that the immigration bills that came to this floor had an opportunity. But what is interesting to me is that people want just one that they can support.

Earlier, I heard he voted against CHIP because it was in the omni, but CHIP was on the floor by itself and he voted against it then.

He can vote for the post office bills and that didn’t deal with the immigration either, but he can vote for that. But then when it came to supporting ICE, the majority of Democrats voted “present.” That is not a profile in courage. That is walking away from a situation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this has gone on longer than it should have. But it has given us time to look at a MILCON-VA vote on May 15, 2008, in which the majority leader, on a substantive vote, not a resolution that was nonbinding, but a substantive appropriations bill, voted “present.”

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I can’t believe that to be true.

Mr. HOYER. Voted “present,” Mr. Speaker, voted “present.”

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018, TO MONDAY, JULY 23, 2018

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, July 23, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 526. An act to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

S. 791. An act to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 2850. An act to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

DOCKUM DRUGSTORE SIT-IN ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of the beginning of the Dockum Drugstore sit-in.

In 1958, 20-year-old Ron Walters and his cousin, Carol Parks-Hahn, were inspired by a California campus restaurant sit-in, the Little Rock Nine, and the Montgomery bus boycott. Bravely seeking to challenge the status quo of segregation in Wichita, they planned a sit-in at a downtown drugstore with a lunch counter for White customers only.

On July 19, 10 students walked into the Dockum Drugstore and sat down. They were described as well dressed and polite, and sought only to be served a soft drink at the counter.

For 3 weeks, the students entered the drugstore every day, boldly sitting through cursing, questioning, and even threats. Finally, on August 11, the store manager declared: “Serve them. I’m losing too much money.”

Following their success, similar efforts became a hallmark of the civil rights movement. And today, on this 60th anniversary, their actions continue to inspire.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful these young men and women took action to end segregation in their community.

□ 1200

SOVEREIGNTY OF TRIBES IN OUR NATION

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution defines Tribes in our Nation as sovereign governments with a unique relationship with the United States Federal Government. Many treaties and Supreme Court cases show legal precedent that they are sovereign nations, and the United States has a trust responsibility to ensure they have Social Services like healthcare in exchange for taking their land.

The Trump administration is not recognizing the legal right Tribes have.

They are solely considering Tribes as a racial group as their justification to impose Medicaid work requirements that we know will disproportionately result in less healthcare for Native Americans. This is wrong, illegal, and a dangerous precedent.

What happened to the treaties our government signed? What happened to the Federal trust responsibility? And what other social and legal responsibility will they negate next?

I will not stand by and watch the sovereignty of our Nation’s first people attacked, and neither should you, Mr. Speaker.

AMERICA IS FINALLY BETTER OFF

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, after years of struggling to get ahead, America is finally better off. America is stronger at home and abroad, with a booming economy, safer communities, and a revived military.

Thanks to the historic tax reform, unemployment is at an all-time low; job openings are at record highs; paychecks are increasing; wages are rising; and small businesses are expanding. I hear it from people in Florida all the time: My constituents are better off.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Florida’s Fourth Congressional District, which is home to many military families; and I am proud to say that we have begun to rebuild our military and support our men and women in uniform. We have passed legislation giving our troops the largest pay increase in almost 9 years, and investing \$144 billion in upgrading and maintaining our military facilities. Our military men and women are better off.

The work that we have done and continue to do is creating a better way for the people of northeast Florida and for all Americans. Although there is much more to do, the economy is soaring, and Republican policies are helping to improve people’s lives, making it easier for families to get ahead with a renewed sense of confidence.

CHILD ABUSE AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

(Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the child abuse at the southern border.

Three months have passed since the Trump administration announced the zero-tolerance policy that led directly to the humanitarian crisis we now witness today. Three months later and, still, thousands of children remain separated from their families.

This week, Federal judges announced a complete, one-week pause on all family deportations, as well as mandatory

counseling for traumatized children. The courts seem almost as fed up with this administration as the American people and have set deadlines for the Trump administration to act.

The deadline to reunite all remaining separated families is just 6 days away. If the Trump administration fails to meet the deadline for even just one single child, then Congress must hold all those responsible for this national tragedy accountable.

HONORING MONROE MURPHY

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 82-year-old United States Navy veteran Monroe Murphy of Dryden, who recently graduated with his high school diploma, 68 years after he put his education on hold and bravely enlisted in the Navy at the age of 16.

Monroe served in Korea as an engineman. He received an honorable discharge, returned home, and married his high school sweetheart, Ann, and raised their seven children on the family farm in Michigan.

Monroe worked at Selfridge Air Field, General Motors, and at his own service station in Romeo.

With the help of his daughter, he enrolled in adult education and began a 3-year journey of attending classes to receive his high school diploma. He graduated in June of this year, at the top of his class, and gave the commencement address to his family and friends present.

Monroe's impressive journey will continue, as he plans on enrolling in college classes.

Congratulations, Monroe, and keep up the great work.

RECOGNIZING THE REOPENING OF HIGHWAY 1

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to recognize the reopening of Highway 1, located south of Big Sur in Monterey County in my district on the Central Coast of California.

Two winters ago, after a long drought and then a large amount of rain, there were a number of landslides along scenic Highway 1, just south of Carmel and north of Morrow Bay. One of those landslides occurred 14 months ago, when close to 8 million cubic yards of dirt and truck-sized rocks came sliding down off that mountain, taking Highway 1 and putting a quarter mile of it right into the Pacific Ocean.

This was the largest landslide and the longest closure along that stretch of the world's most scenic roadway. Unfortunately, it prevented many people from traveling on that route and many businesses in Big Sur from benefiting from that tourism.

But now, 3 months ahead of schedule, the California Department of Transportation, Caltrans, finished rebuilding this road, literally on top of the slide, and it will open today.

I recognize the opening of Highway 1 because it is an example of what can happen when people work hard, work smart, and, most importantly, work together.

Congratulations, and all of us in this body can learn from this.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN MCGOVERN

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend, John McGovern. He was a beloved friend, family man, and a staple in Illinois politics. He passed away unexpectedly on July 14.

For decades, John worked in numerous State, congressional, and U.S. Senate offices and campaigns in our home State of Illinois. He was more than just a brilliant spokesperson and a political strategist, but also a mentor and a friend to everyone he worked with or worked for. He was even the best man at my good friend former Senator Mark Kirk's wedding.

He always remained a loyal and genuine person, which is something you don't always find in politics. No matter the situation, even with policy and ideological differences, he stayed true to his impeccable ethics and to his civility.

John was also involved in his community. He served on the board of the Boys and Girls Club of Chicago, the Elawa Farm Foundation, and on the auxiliary board of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Words cannot describe how much we will miss his counsel, his wit, and his friendship. I offer my sincerest condolences to his wife, Wentworth; his two young sons; and to all of us and all who knew John McGovern.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MICHELLE VO

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Michelle Vo. Michelle attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Michelle was a very hard worker at her job as a financial adviser with the LAX Coastal Chamber of Commerce. During the month before her death, she had been named the top producer of her company.

Michelle was passionate and would religiously donate blood every 2 weeks. In her free time, she enjoyed volunteering with the Red Cross, rock climbing, and golfing. Everything Michelle

did, she did with 150 percent effort. Michelle is remembered as being fun, charismatic, brave, and vibrant.

I would like to extend my condolences to Michelle Vo's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF JACK EDWARD SCHURMAN

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to speak about Mr. Jack Edward Schurman, a longtime resident of Shelbyville, Illinois, in my 15th Congressional District, a disabled veteran, an advocate for former military men and women throughout the Nation, and chairman of my Veterans Advisory Committee, and, I am proud to say, my friend.

Born in Iowa in 1939, Jack joined the Navy in 1959 and rose to the rank of yeoman third class before a disability cut short his service in 1964.

Jack made his way to Illinois, and, in 1976, he married Nancy Ellen Cranford. They raised two daughters, Kelli Ann and Kim Marie.

As chairman of my Veterans Advisory Committee, Jack has led our meetings for years, bringing valuable experience and perspective. Unfortunately, Jack's health has declined to a point where his mobility is limited, and doctors have declared that he should no longer live on his own, which is what he has done since his beloved wife passed away in 2016.

Jack is now in Mississippi, thanks to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, which located a suitable residence for him near the home of one of his daughters.

Mr. Speaker, members of my Veterans Advisory Committee and I will miss Jack. We want to thank him for his tremendous service throughout the years and wish him the best of health and happiness in this next chapter of his remarkable life.

CONCERNS OF THE DAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect corrective actions by this body and the other body, and so I rise today to reinforce the importance of the translators' notes as it relates to the meeting between the President of the United States and President Putin.

If there is anything more important for the American people, it is to know whether we are safe, whether our military is safe, and whether we are secure.

Secondarily, I am so disturbed that there is some thought of providing our public servants—Ambassador McFaul's name was mentioned as being an exchange target, if you will, for President Putin to play with.

I will be introducing legislation to protect all our ambassadors from foreign nations that may desire to undermine their leadership here in the United States.

Also, I am intending to announce next week my introduction of a temporary protective status to help those Central Americans and others who this administration has precipitously taken away their TPS and jeopardized them in 2018.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must reunite the children, and we must do it now.

SEXUAL ASSAULT ON OUR CAMPUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the House, Members of Congress, and the Chair about what I consider one of our most serious things that is happening in our country, and it has to do with sexual assault on our campuses, our universities, our colleges, and what is taking place there while students, our children, our grandchildren, go to these universities.

I want to recognize a group of individuals who have started a program, a cause is really the right word, that they call the 12th Woman. They are all members, students, former students of Texas A&M University in College Station, Texas.

The 12th Woman is a phrase that is a takeoff on another phrase that that university uses, calling the 12th Man. I look at the 12th Woman as a team, 11 on a team, and there is one more. It makes it 12, all 12 supporting each other in their cause to eliminate sexual assault on campuses, not just Texas A&M, but all the universities and colleges through the United States.

□ 1215

So these remarkable ladies started using social media to see if other people, students, former students, had encountered sexual assault on campus and what happened and what didn't happen after that was reported. Then they formed this organization called the 12th Woman.

Several of those members of the 12th Woman are here today watching Congress, and later today, they are going to go to their respective Members of Congress and talk about some of the things that are on their heart.

Constituents in the State of Texas, the reason for this request of time is that there are bad things that are happening on our university campuses. It happens because of a lot of reasons. We are talking about a lot of people, a lot of kids, in my opinion, going away from home and spending time trying to get an education at one of our universities.

I believe wholeheartedly that our universities in this country are the fin-

est educational institutions anywhere in the world. That is why we have people from all over the world coming to our universities.

So I am going to start by telling some of their stories, things that happened to them, things that they have made public. They have been bold to talk about the bad things that happened to them while they were in school.

Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot for a crime victim, especially a sexual assault victim, to come forward and publicly talk about these things. For the last, I guess, 30 years before I came to Congress, I was a prosecutor in Houston, Texas, and then I spent 22 years on the criminal bench hearing only criminal cases. And I have met, unfortunately, a lot of sexual assault victims who have come my way either when I was prosecuting their cases or as a judge.

It is tough, really, it is tough to make those statements public and come forward. But I want to read a few of these statements and these stories that happened to some of our ladies that they call the 12th Woman.

Abbie's family was based around the values of Texas A&M that it instills in its students. She was raised by two Aggie alumni, and there was never a doubt about where she would ultimately attend college: it was always Texas A&M. But like so many others, what should have been an outstanding experience, just turned sour.

One night, while hosting a Christmas party at her own apartment, she was raped. That is correct, Mr. Speaker, she was sexually assaulted.

So when she woke up the next morning, she didn't remember how a portion of that night ended. Bruises, scratches covered her arms, her legs, and her clothing was ripped and torn.

So doing everything that I think a rape victim should do, she had a rape kit conducted just a few hours later. The hospital nurse ended Abbie's SANE exam—SANE stands for sexual assault nurse examiner—and she told her, "I will see you in court," describing it as the most evidence that she had ever seen.

Abbie thought that she had a good case against her assailant. She was advised by the College Station Police Department to seek justice through the school and proceed to file her report through them.

So she filed a report. The university called a hearing.

The hearing began with what Abbie and her mom thought would be a fair playing field, until it became evident that she faced a series of well prepared attorneys at this hearing and she had no legal representation of her own. Not a single person at the university, the police department, or the hospital advised her that she had the right to retain legal representation.

During the hearing, she was, in her opinion, ambushed by her assailant's attorney, who peppered her with a lot

of questions. The fact that she had created a Facebook event for the party and offered accommodation to those who were drinking to crash at her apartment was called into question. It was if the university panel thought that Abbie's rape was her fault.

Let's get one thing straight, Mr. Speaker. Let's make this perfectly clear. Sexual assault is never the fault of the victim. It is the fault of the perpetrator, and that is the way it should be, because it is the perpetrator who caused this. The victim shouldn't feel like they did something wrong, but in our culture, sometimes they are put on trial.

Following the hearing, she was referred to a student counseling service, where she met an individual who had no training in working with sexual assault victims. So what was the point of talking to the school counseling if there was no training to handle these types of cases?

After a lengthy process and dealing with an investigative panel that she thought and believed was cold and uncaring, her assailant ultimately faced no consequences. Abbie felt betrayed by the university that she highly regarded. Her assailant just went back to class. Abbie was forced to see the man who raped her walking freely around the campus, a campus where she should have felt safe.

Ultimately, she made the decision to graduate early, ending her time at Texas A&M prematurely.

She feels like the university that she highly spoke of failed her. She says:

The university I speak so highly of has failed. Who knows if it failed before me. There just wasn't anyone to speak out about it.

Abbie joins the 12th Woman to demand change, not at just Texas A&M, but colleges across the country.

Abbie says:

It is time for Texas A&M to follow the Aggie code of honor. They should follow it themselves and unite with the sexual assault survivors to be an example of fearless change among the very best American universities.

Mr. Speaker, the Texas A&M code of honor says, "An Aggie does not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate those who do."

That is Abbie's story, and I think we should thank her for making her story available for all of us.

Meghan was a fourth generation Texas A&M Aggie. Her decision to attend this prestigious school was never a question in her mind. It was an amazing experience until things went bad.

One morning, while serving as a tutor in the athletic department, a member of the Aggie football team, twice her size, exposed himself to her not 2 feet away. He made sexual advances toward her, becoming aggressive.

Terrified and shocked, she abruptly walked out of the room, trying to remain calm as he followed her.

Despite reporting the assault to her supervisor, something just went wrong.

The remainder of her assailant's tutoring sessions were not canceled. And get this: the very next morning, Meghan's assailant exposed himself to another tutor, becoming aggressive.

Mr. Speaker, Meghan feels she did not get justice against her attacker. She feels and tells me she was failed by a university that was not really committed to helping victims. She was scared in the process, scared to go back to work, terrified she might run into this individual again.

Before the hearing, the university claims she did not need a lawyer, she was not facing charges. She received no notice that her assailant, however, had hired legal representation, which he has the right to do.

Months later, Meghan's assailant was found not responsible for exposing himself to both tutors. The panel stated that it appeared he had a skin condition and just couldn't control himself. A skin condition, Mr. Speaker?

The response she received was nothing short of appalling. The school said:

Sorry, Meghan, that you were offended, but there is nothing else we can do.

Meghan has appealed that case, and did appeal that case. She still believed the university would come to provide justice for her.

At the appeals hearing, she was informed that the charge against her attacker had been downgraded from sexual exploitation to sexual harassment. What that meant was, in the university's eyes, she was removed from the remainder of the hearing and couldn't be considered as a victim.

The university supposedly has several systems in place to aid victims. Texas A&M employs a victim advocate, but no one from the Title IX office contacted Meghan. She didn't receive any information regarding what sanctions her assailant received, if any, and of course her assailant was allowed to be back on the athletic team.

Mr. Speaker, he stayed on the team until she told the media about all of this, and then he was later removed from the team and two misdemeanor charges were filed against him after she went to the media.

Meghan felt abandoned by the university. She thought the accused was protected due to his status. Texas A&M spends a lot of money on teal ribbons, according to her, for athletes to wear for sexual assault, and she says that the ribbon is not enough. Universities must put the safety and care of sexual assault victims first. I agree with her.

She says:

A&M has a chance to be fearless on every front and to be fearless in the face of such horrible things that are happening to our victims.

She wants A&M to take the lead on this that is taking place on our university campuses.

I applaud Meghan for having the courage to come forward and tell her story to the world.

Kirsten, she loved being at Texas A&M University. She considered it one

of the friendliest campuses, and enjoyed her time at one of the country's finest educational institutions.

After she returned from the winter break in the second semester of her freshman year, her happy-go-lucky bubble of college was shattered.

She was invited to hang out at her guy friend's apartment, and was led to believe that several of their mutual friends would be there.

When she arrived at the apartment, she realized that they were alone. Her so-called friend proceeded to sexually assault her.

The next day, her friends and sister pushed her to report the assault, but she didn't want to. She was made to feel like the crime was her fault. She told her resident assistant, who warned her that as an RA, she was required to report it. So a few days later, she received an email from the Division of Student Affairs inviting her to tell her story.

Time and time again, she had to relive the story in graphic detail almost directly after it happened.

One thing about sexual assault victims that unfortunately seems to happen, when they first tell the first person about what happened to them, it is not going to be the last time. Generally they tell people who are strangers, people they don't know, and they have to tell that story over and over again, and because of that, they have to relive that experience. That is what happens when sexual assault victims have to come forward. They go through that, but we should be understanding of that process.

She says:

If I hadn't already been traumatized by this, the university officials re-victimized me, certainly cementing the damage to my mental health.

It is true that any investigative panel must understand what happened before drawing conclusions, but there is a way of doing that and getting that information without being insensitive.

Kirsten says she felt as if the investigators were cold and devoid of empathy. During the disciplinary appeals panel after the deadline to submit new evidence had passed, she was informed that the assailant's fiancée, who wasn't even present the night he attacked her, was permitted to serve as a witness. This witness served only the purpose to disparage Kirsten's character.

Right before the panel began, she discovered that her assailant had, like some of the others, obtained legal counsel. Unable to have representation of her own, she ran to the Student Legal Services. They refused to help her. They wouldn't offer her legal advice. They had no victim advocate there to speak to her or on her behalf.

Kirsten, like many other victims, was alone, and she felt alone.

There was no other choice. The investigation continued.

At one point, the officials at the university asked her why didn't she scream, as if it is Kirsten's fault she was assaulted and raped.

Kirsten says the university official in the investigation became increasingly irritated, and it was abundantly clear to her that that person viewed this as a waste of the university's time.

Ultimately, the university concluded that Kirsten had likely been sexually harassed, but it was not up to the university to sanction her offender, because there was no impediment to her educational opportunity.

□ 1230

Let me repeat that. Nothing happened because, according to them, there was no impediment to her educational opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, Kirsten fully believes, in the end, the panel turned her words, her desire to complete her education, and her commitment to her family against her. And they used her resilience and her loyalty to the university as a weapon against her to absolve themselves from any responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell Nikki's story, as she recounts it. I have a total of six. For Nikki, a semester's worth of studying was about to pay off. Finals week was here. One week was all that stood between Nikki and a short break before the next semester began—that is, until she was sexually assaulted.

Following her assault, she reported to the Texas A&M clinic, creating even more stress on her. Before she left the clinic, Nikki recalls the head physician came over to her and told her: Things happen for a reason.

It was shocking to her, and it was traumatic.

Following this traumatic experience at the clinic, she decided against engaging in the reporting process, feeling that the university was not sensitive enough. She was aware of the process, because she sat on the university disciplinary appeals panel, listening to the appeals of cases similar to hers.

She did return to a private hospital for a SANE examination—once again, sexual assault nurse examination—by someone who is qualified to examine, on a medical basis, sexual assault victims. She returned home for a short break, where she says she had time to process everything.

Mr. Speaker, deciding to come forward and report the sexual assault, as I have said, is overwhelming to these victims.

After some serious soul-searching, she began the reporting process. She told the story to the university officials, like so many others, over, and over, and over again. After her shocking experience with her visit to the Texas A&M clinic, she says it felt like the reporting was getting nowhere.

After weeks of attempting to report the behavior of the school clinic, she finally received a call back, but she was dissatisfied.

The school apologized, but no change ever occurred that she knows of. She says that: "After encountering three different women's clinic physicians

with such poor manners in a sexual assault case, it is clear to me that something is wrong at the institutional level.”

It felt like she was the bad guy, forced to justify over and over again her reasons for reporting. Feeling attacked, she tried to withdraw her case.

Mr. Speaker, no victim should be forced into a situation where they feel more discouraged by reporting a rape than they do by staying silent.

But it was too much. Her grades started dropping. She started receiving Ds and Cs on tests. She had never gotten Cs and Ds. Her professors questioned her excused absences, asking if she was in trouble, only forcing her to explain the situation more and more.

Upon finding out her assailant had hired legal counsel, she asked the university if she could obtain her own legal counsel. The university discouraged her from doing so and set a quick panel date.

Ultimately, her attacker was found guilty of sexual abuse, sexual misconduct, dating violence, and sexual harassment. He was suspended for the remaining three semesters of Nikki's time at Texas A&M. She felt lucky because many survivors never receive, in her opinion, justice.

Just in my opinion, if a person is guilty of sexual abuse, sexual misconduct, dating violence, and sexual harassment, a three-semester suspension doesn't seem to be much punishment, if any.

She says: “If I felt lucky my rapist, who was found guilty, was suspended for three semesters, one of which was already halfway over, then, clearly, something was wrong procedurally,” if that happened.

Many times, so many other victims never receive any justice, and the question remains: Why is a three-semester suspension unheard of as severe punishment?

Mr. Speaker, something here is wrong. The reporting process for sexual assault should never continue to traumatize the victim at every turn.

Nikki says: “The trials of the reporting process at A&M served to exacerbate an already traumatizing experience, leaving me feeling punished, trapped, and deceived.”

She called on the university's support program for survivors of sexual assault. It is an interesting note that, during this process, she received a cease and desist letter from a lawyer wanting her to tell the university it never happened, and to pay \$10,000—I presume legal fees—to the attorney. I think that is just outrageous that that happened.

Sydney was at Texas A&M, the school she loved, a school she always wanted to go to and did go to. It was her dream school. She was in the second semester at Texas A&M and, over a welcome weekend break, she was sexually assaulted. Her assailant took advantage of her as she was unconscious, intoxicated, and unable to fend for herself.

In accordance with title IX rights, she reported the rape. Ninety-six days after reporting, she was granted an 8-hour hearing. She was told that any individual can serve as her support during the hearing, but was never advised to seek legal counsel. Here are a few lines from her victim impact statement: “Over the spring break, I decided that I didn't want to live anymore.”

Let me read that again: “Over spring break, I decided that I didn't want to live anymore. I consciously decided that this was too much for me to take. The waiting. . . . The constant paranoia. The fact that this boy did something to me that made me want to take my own life should speak for itself. I am an optimistic person. I excel at creating my own happiness. But no matter what I tried, I could not find the silver lining in this situation.”

Mr. Speaker, Sydney did seek help. She was diagnosed with PTSD.

Her impact statement continues: “What happened to me 4 months ago has impacted me in the most tremendous way—academically, spiritually, mentally, physically, in how I handle my relationships. What happened to me has ultimately changed my life and my perspective of life forever.”

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the rare cases, in my opinion, where there is some hope. Sydney did receive justice after going through all this physical and mental anguish and pain that she is going through.

Her assailant was expelled, given a no-contact order, and restricted from A&M property indefinitely. Is it the outcome that we would expect? I would hope so.

To put it into words she said: “The weight lifted off my shoulders when I heard that A&M chose to expel him . . . a weight that nearly smothered me for over 96 days. The fear of running into him on campus, the fear of seeing him around town, the fear that haunted and controlled my every move on campus, it was finally gone.”

That, to me, is justice. It means being free from the fear of constantly being attacked. The rapist has given Sydney a life sentence of mental pain. When defendants—I will call them perpetrators, predators, whatever you want to call them—commit an act of sexual assault, whether they are punished, suspended, go to prison or not, whenever that consequence under society is over, they go on with their lives. The victims don't get to go on with their lives. This is the type of offense where they think about it almost on a daily basis.

That is why I say that it gives them a life sentence of pain and anguish and turmoil. Sydney stands with her fellow Aggies, demanding justice for the victims of sexual assault.

She says: “I wouldn't be the Aggie that Texas A&M taught me to be if I remained silent after receiving justice for myself. I wouldn't be the Aggie that Texas A&M taught me to be if I didn't have the backs of these other Aggies,

other survivors,” these other members of the 12th Woman. “Texas A&M taught me to be, if I was afraid, to stand here and be counted as another one of its one-in-five victims on college campuses” of sexual assault.

Because of the time, Mr. Speaker, I am going to just relate one more story and make some comments about what we are going to do about these cases.

Kendra was a proud member of the Texas A&M Corps of Cadets. Holding an executive officer title, she could not be prouder to attend the school and be part of this outstanding university that prides itself on respect for men and women in our military service.

She was on track to be commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Army—that was, until the repercussions of her sexual assault at the hands of a fellow cadet sent her world, like the others that I have talked about, into an uproar.

Texas A&M has an age-old tradition called the Aggie Ring Dunk. She and her fellow cadets, one by one, dropped their new class rings into pitchers of beer. Then they started drinking until they surfaced with the gold rings appearing in the foam.

What should have been a fun night ended in tragedy. One of her fellow cadets, who happened to be engaged to someone else, her friend, walked her and her friend to the dorm room. However, he followed her into her room, locked the door, and began assaulting her.

Despite being weakened from the alcohol, she told him “no,” pushed him away, did everything that a lady, a victim in this case, should do to get him away from her. At one point during the attack, he began suffocating her. She feared for her life.

Since her assault occurred in a campus dorm room, she was told that there would be a crime alert email sent out to the entire campus. That alert never went out. No one was warned that a violent sexual assault on campus had been reported. Not a single A&M woman was any wiser.

Kendra says: “I believe Texas A&M endangered the lives of every single A&M student that came into contact with my rapist from the time the university knew” what he had done.

She was then told that she would meet with the commandant of the corps, along with both of her parents, to address the safety and her lack of safety. Suddenly, her parents were barred from the room, not allowed to provide any support for her.

Rest assured, the general would have two assistants in the room with him. Three against one, the 20-year-old cadet versus three high-ranking military officials, to discuss rape, rape against her.

After much debate, the meeting never occurred. Instead, the dean of student life met with Kendra and her parents. She described that meeting as that individual “implied that my report of the assault was causing her

trouble, and I wasn't helping anyone by coming forward. . . . And then there were several ways that I was requesting not to see my assailant, because we lived in very close quarters and had common classes and common activities."

Every single one of those requests by her was denied to keep him away from her. They offered to move Kendra's parking spot; not the assailant's. They offered to change Kendra's schedule; not the assailant's. They offered to move Kendra's dorm to another dorm, but not the assailant's. A no-contact order was issued, but, you guessed it, it was up to Kendra to leave if the individual showed up in a classroom or the building.

Throughout the entire process, she said the university said that lawyers slow things down and aren't necessary. But Kendra obtained a lawyer that night. Shortly afterward, she received justice against her assailant.

As soon as her attorney met with school officials, the school quickly found a way to suspend the assailant until the hearing. Kendra's case was decided by the university's student conduct panel composed of three faculty members, and they found him responsible for 21 charges, including sexual abuse and sexual contact. And he was expelled.

□ 1245

It seems to me that because she hired her own private attorney she got the justice that she wanted and she deserved.

To this day, Kendra hopes university police will pursue a criminal case against her attacker. With the current backlog of DNA testing, it would take a year for her sexual assault kit to be analyzed. Until then she will continue to speak up, be part of the 12th Woman, and ask for change for her beloved university and all universities to make them safer for all students.

Those are six cases, individuals, young women, who went to college and bad things happened to them. Their statements speak for themselves. In some cases they felt like the university helped them; some cases they don't feel like the university helped them. But to a person—I was starting to say to a man—but to a woman, they all want improvements on college campuses about what has taken place on our campuses.

After all of these things came out in the public domain, the 12th Woman group met with university officials. They presented a 12th Woman report outlining specifically what happened and what they want changed on their university, and really what should be changed on other universities.

Mr. Speaker, I include the report in the RECORD.

12TH WOMAN REPORT

This report outlines the information shared between the 12th Woman and the administration of Texas A&M including Chancellor John Sharp and President Michael Young on Monday, June 25, 2018.

About 12th Woman—The 12th Woman is a group of survivors and advocates dedicated to transforming Texas A&M University policies for providing justice in cases of sexual assault that are reported.

INTRODUCTION TO MEETING WITH TEXAS A&M ADMINISTRATION

My name is Abbie Hillis, and I want to welcome everyone here tonight. Thank you to the victims for being brave enough to share your story and thank you to the administration and President Young for making this meeting a priority.

It is fair to say that we all know this meeting shouldn't even be a meeting we are forced to have. As survivors, we know the administration has had meetings like this before, recently in fact, where you were forced to listen to stories about how the policies and procedures at Texas A&M need to change. We are here tonight because there has been complete and utter failure by the leadership at Texas A&M. You all have declined to make sexual assault advocacy, policy, and procedure a priority. Instead, you continue to issue what are titled "messages to the community," in the hopes that a carefully-worded statement will keep current and future students satisfied. Well, we are saying no more. The constant gaslighting and victim blaming must end.

We come to you today with huge hearts for Texas A&M, but we also come to you with broken hearts, because you have chosen to prioritize the university's brand over justice for victims. For a university that portrays itself to the public as unique by priding itself on its core values, it is unconscionable to hear the never-ending stories over and over and over from survivors. These stories are all the same and demonstrate in each and every case that the university prioritizes athletes, money, and perceptions of safety over providing advocates and support for victims who have been sexually assaulted. Victims are silenced, shamed, and encouraged not to hire an attorney. Victims go to the Student Counseling Center only to be told not to report their story or that the issues are far greater than the SCC can handle. Victims are forced to walk on campus next to their assailant, or worse, to watch their assailant compete and represent the university on a global stage.

Our stories today will illustrate the inconsistencies in Texas A&M's reporting procedures for sexual assault crimes. There is no uniform reporting process and no one is held accountable. Current policies encourage those in charge, like some of you sitting in this room today, to brush stories aside and sweep victims under a rug. Texas A&M is spending money on ribbons for athletes to wear for sexual assault awareness but can't provide a qualified trauma counselor to support sexual assault victims. The university also spends money duplicating services that are already provided for free through the government. But this isn't new information to any of you.

Beyond hearing our stories today, I hope you all also know that we are investigating your Clery Act alerts with reports of sexual assault, as we believe there are discrepancies. We are aware that the university has hired Husch Blackwell LLP to do a "thorough" review of your sexual assault investigations related to Title IX. But we also know that this is the exact same firm that found Michigan State University compliant with Title IX prior to Larry Nassar being convicted of over 200 counts of sexual assault. Maybe if MSU actually hired a team of attorneys that genuinely had the university's best interest at heart, they wouldn't find themselves in a \$500 million settlement. We are curious, is this the same outcome you

all want for Texas A&M? As I mentioned before, none of this information is new, yet these issues still come up and we get the same response from the administration with no results. There is no doubt that the university is proficient in providing a statement in attempt to address an issue, but we all know that words only go so far and actions speak so much louder, actions that you all, to date, have not had the decency and respect to make a priority.

Our goal is not to spread awareness to this administration; you know very well these issues exist. Instead, our goal is to invoke action with the leadership of the university. Texas A&M has the ability to be a leader among universities across the nation. You have an opportunity to address these issues and create a system that actually works to protect and advocate for victims of sexual assault. We can either choose to work together and create change or we will have to work against each other and force change. Ultimately, it is up to you, the leadership of Texas A&M, to decide which route we will take. What we are asking for is simple: a commitment to integrity, to ensure that all Aggies are safe to attend Texas A&M University.

Mr. POE of Texas. Also, the school, Texas A&M, has responded. The president met with the 12th Woman, the ladies in this group, and had a meeting with them and has issued a comprehensive statement, as they call it, comprehensive reviews and actions and next steps by the president of the university.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD what Texas A&M's response to all of this is.

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS, ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

(July 2, 2018)

Dear Aggie Community, I would like to provide you with an update regarding review plans recently announced that seek ways to improve how the university addresses sexual assault investigations. Since the last update, below are some of the efforts underway now and in the near future:

Robin Means-Coleman is, as reported earlier, leading the internal review. She has begun the following initiatives, to which she and those involved will add additional actions throughout the review:

Assemble the internal review committee. The committee is comprised of a team of experts, to include: students including sexual assault survivors; faculty whose scholarship focuses on sexual assault; staff including student assistance services; a representative from the community Sexual Assault Resource Center (SARC); and others;

Analyze related university rules and Standard Administrative Procedures (SAPs);

Examine Student Affairs Title IX processes, from intake to post-process;

Identify ways to improve communications with students regarding available resources, advocates, and advisors; and

Understand staffing allocations and needs.

EVP and Provost Dr. Carol Fierke is, as reported, the lead liaison to the third-party review firm, Husch Blackwell (HB). HB will be on campus beginning this month to interview students, faculty, staff, community advocates and others. HB was selected because of their expertise and deep level of scrutiny as it pertains to assessments of policies and, importantly, challenges in implementing those policies. Primary interview input, process analysis, training review and benchmarking to other universities will be some of their work. We will make available

to HB the information and resources that they require. Significantly, as is essential to any meaningful results in a third-party review, we will also stay out of their way so that they may do their work independently and unfettered.

During the course of these reviews, as opportunities for improvement are identified, we will take action. We will not wait until conclusion of reviews to implement what we are able to improve as we move along.

Since my last message, an Aggie-led sexual assault survivors group agreed to meet with our leadership team last week. The Chancellor, Provost and I along with other campus leaders listened carefully as individuals bravely shared their experiences. We are deeply grateful for their input. We will not comment on any individual case or publicly share details of that private discussion, but I want to sincerely thank them for their testimonies and willingness to share with us directly. I reiterate our commitment to addressing concerns brought forth.

We are committed to keeping our Aggie community informed as these important reviews and resulting actions progress. It is important to remind you of the standing invitation for all Aggies to send suggestions to feedback@tamu.edu, which we are reading.

I want to thank you again for your input, caring and support as leaders inside and outside of the university advance this important work.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL K. YOUNG,
President.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Texas A&M is not alone in the fight to provide victims a voice. As stated in one of the victim's statements that I read into the RECORD, the National Sexual Violence Resource Center reports that each year one in five women will be assaulted while in college. One in five, 20 percent, in those 4 or 5 years. To me that is a staggering statistic.

According to End Rape on Campus, an American woman who attends college is more likely to be a victim of sexual assault than a woman who does not go to college. That means whatever you think it means—one in five.

Mr. Speaker, most of us in the House are parents. I am blessed to have three daughters and a son, and I have 12 grandkids, eight of which are girls. Parents need to be aware of these statistics. One in five will be assaulted while in college as a student.

So what we want to do and what the 12th Woman wants to do is to stop these statistics and bring them down. I understand that at Texas A&M, the statistics—and I may be wrong—the statistics show that 1 in 14 are assaulted. At the same time, institutions of higher education across the country, to me, do not have an incentive to acknowledge the problem publicly, to address it.

We can understand why universities don't really talk a lot about what is happening with crimes on campus. They just don't. It is about the image of the university and other things. But it is not being talked about, I think, enough so that people are on notice that there is a problem.

Here are some solutions to the chances of having an assault committed on campus and what we can do

about it as public, Members of Congress, and what universities can do about it. Some of those solutions are presented in the president's report at Texas A&M. Many of the solutions are presented in what these victims, the 12th Woman, tell us about.

The current oversight—because there are Federal laws that talk about reporting all crimes, including assault—seems to affect encouraging colleges to underreport sexual assaults.

I certainly applaud these young women for having the courage to come forward and tell their stories to the world. This 12th Woman group, as I said, are here today, and they are advocating for change on the national level. It has nothing to do with Texas A&M. It has everything to do with changing all of our universities. It is a call to action. The 12th Woman is dedicated to bringing change to the way universities address sexual assault, not just at A&M, but across the country.

I will stand with the 12th Woman, Mr. Speaker, for their coming forward and telling their stories. These stories that you heard are not unique to one university. They happen all over the country.

So what are we doing about it?

Hopefully, I have shown part of the problem. Now it is up to us. I am talking about Congress. Victims of crime on college campuses—or really any other place—sexual assault victims don't have high-dollar lawyers from New York City to represent them. Whether it is in a university setting or whether it is in a courtroom, they don't. Some of them do, but most of them don't. As stated in these cases, most of them are alone when they are trying to resolve this problem before officials at the school.

The United States Congress must be their voice.

How do we become their voice? We make sure there is the right legislation filed to protect our daughters and our sons when they go to our universities. We have some legislation. The Clery Act is one of these. We are going to try to improve it.

So I am talking about three pieces of legislation. These are pieces of legislation that are bipartisan. I will repeat that. It is bipartisan. So it may not get a whole lot of notoriety because we are not fussing, fighting, and feuding with each other. Both sides agree. I want to thank CAROLYN MALONEY from New York and JACKIE SPEIER from California—bipartisan—for working on these pieces of legislation.

They will help combat sexual assault on campus, provide victims with a clear path to reporting to the universities, make sure victim advocates are ready and available to all students nationwide, and make sure that victims are able to access a qualified nurse examiner, a forensic examiner.

Let me mention the first one. It is called the Megan Act. It is bipartisan. Megan Rondini lived in Austin, Texas. She went to school at the University of

Alabama. While she was a sophomore there, she was at a local hangout, a bar, and came in contact with a former student. She was taken to his place. She was sexually assaulted, jumped out of the second story window at his place, and then the whole system seemed to fall apart.

She went to the hospital, but the person at the hospital didn't really understand what the responsibility was of that medical test. The rape kit was taken, but nobody knows where it is. It is gone. The police interrogated her, I think, because they knew who the accused was. The parents were important people at the university. They didn't have anything to do with the case and even talked about filing charges on her.

Then she went to the university and talked to a counselor. The counselor said:

Well, I know the accused, and I am not qualified to talk to you about it.

But they didn't furnish her with somebody else.

So she didn't get help from the university, didn't get help at the hospital, and didn't get help from the police department. She had a lot of emotional problems and decided to transfer. So she transferred from the University of Alabama to SMU in Dallas, Texas.

Shortly after she transferred, Mr. Speaker, she committed suicide. She couldn't handle it, all of these things going on in her mind. So she paid; she got the death penalty for what happened to her. Megan Rondini could have been anybody's daughter.

So we have filed the Megan Rondini Act. What does it do? It does one thing specifically. It says universities and colleges must provide a SANE or a SAFE, sexual assault forensic examiner, to victims of sexual assault, or have one available for them nearby so that when they go to report this trauma medically they get treatment from an expert. It is bipartisan legislation. We ought to pass this legislation, get it on the House floor and pass it to make our universities better.

I will say this about the University of Alabama, because of this thing that happened at their school, they changed a lot of things. Good for them that they changed a lot of their procedures.

I would ask the Speaker how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESTES of Kansas). The gentleman has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Okay. I will talk a little faster. I am from Texas. We talk slower. I would like to get more than 17 minutes, but I understand.

JACKIE SPEIER and I have filed a bill called the HALT Act, HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act. I will give as many details as I can, Mr. Speaker.

The National Institute of Justice estimates that 63 percent of universities shirk their already legal responsibility when reporting sexual assault violent crimes. They are already supposed to report it; they don't. This bill will make sure that they do report it.

It allows the Department of Education to issue financial penalties to people who don't comply with Title IX. It increases the penalties up to \$100,000. It allows a private right of action by the victim on campus, and it requires public disclosure of a list of colleges and universities under investigation in violation of Title IX and the Clery Act. It increases funding so that universities can do this. The HALT Act is a good piece of legislation.

The third piece of legislation by CAROLYN MALONEY of New York and me—it is pretty bipartisan. CAROLYN MALONEY from New York is a progressive, liberal Democrat. TED POE is kind of a conservative guy from Texas. We are joining together to sponsor the Campus Accountability and Safety Act.

What does it do? It provides, specifically, victim advocates in sexual assault cases to victims of sexual assault on campus. It does a lot of other things, too. I hope we can get both of these on the House floor soon. It also requires that there is one reporting mechanism.

In other words, if you are complaining of sexual assault by a student, there is one avenue on campuses. Other campuses, such as the ones that have the Corps of Cadets, you go through the Corps of Cadets. If it is against a faculty member, for example, you go that route. If it is against an athlete, you go a different route. So we need to combine all of those in all of our reporting systems so that students know and are put on notice that they can go through one specific route. These legislations do a lot of other specific things, too.

Recently I was at Rice University. I had Members of Congress down there. We did a sexual assault forum on campus. What happened? Rice University is doing a lot of good things. One of the things they do is just make it real obvious that there are things that students can do.

Mr. Speaker, I include this poster in the RECORD.

YOU ARE NOT ALONE

Rice University has supportive and caring faculty, staff, and students who are here to help you.

If you have experienced any kind of sexual assault, sexual harassment, relationship violence and/or stalking, it is not your fault and you have options.

Rice University's Sexual Misconduct Policy prohibits relationship violence, stalking, and sexual misconduct. These behaviors include physical and verbal abuse, sexual assault, unwanted sexual contact, and sexual harassment.

For emergency assistance, call:

RUPD/REMS.

For confidential counseling, call (24/7):

Rice Counseling Center

Houston Area Women's Center

the Montrose Center

Students can learn about their options at Rice by contacting:

Title IX Coordinator

Student Wellbeing and Title IX Support

To learn more or to find a STRIVE Liaison:

Visit safe.rice.edu

Email TitleIXSupport@rice.edu

Mr. POE of Texas. They post these posters throughout the university and restrooms telling them basically you are not alone and here is what you can do to educate and what you can do if a crime is committed against you.

It is a good idea. They have a protocol that I think many universities ought to look at. They have designed a student-based—really?—a program that all students are required to take when they are an incoming freshman. It is not just a 1-hour course. It is several weeks long. They educate students on how to deal with other people—relationships—that a lot of them have never been trained in doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about, I think, a very serious thing that happens. Here in Congress, we spend a lot of time talking. Right before I talked, you heard a lot of talking on both sides. But we spend a lot of time talking about our national defense, and we spend a lot of money on airplanes, aircraft carriers, and our military. I'm not saying that we shouldn't. But it is defense spending to make us safe from foreign countries.

Should we not be as concerned about the safety of Americans in America and maybe refocus on their safety?

I think we can and we should. We need to make sure we get our priorities straight.

□ 1300

I have known a lot of sexual assault victims in my career at the courthouse for 30-plus years. I still keep in contact with them on a periodic basis. Sometimes they just call me to check in. I have known sexual assault victims who, even after the trial and the person went off to the Texas penitentiary, committed suicide.

Mr. Speaker, rape, sexual assault is a different type of crime than your car being stolen or your house being burglarized. It affects the individual in the deepest part of their soul. Sometimes the offender tries to steal the identity, the soul, the self-worth of the victim. Many of them feel that way for a long time.

We in the House of Representatives have the responsibility to be the voice of sexual assault victims in our country and do what we can to make sure that they have due process, that the same Constitution that protects the rights of offenders—and I totally believe in those rights—protects the rights of people who are victims of crime.

Due process and justice must balance both of those so that we get the right decision for the right reason when these things happen to, primarily, our female athletes or female students throughout our universities.

I admire these women who have come forward, being bold to make public what happened to them—bad things—and our response should be: We are on your side. We are in it together. We are going to do what we can to make our great universities even greater and pro-

tect our young men and women on college campuses.

The 12th Woman. I would say, Mr. Speaker, don't mess with the 12th Woman. These are relentless, tenacious young women who want to take what happened to them and turn it around and make it something that we can prevent, make it a positive thing.

My grandmother, who was the most influential person in my life—and I will close with this, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the time—lived to a ripe old age of 99. She was the most influential person in my life, even more than both my parents, who are both alive. They are 93 now. She told me that there is nothing more powerful than a woman who has made up her mind.

I think these women have made up their mind, and we need to join them and be together in our calls to stop sexual assault on campuses and tell our universities and help our universities make those places safer because our American children and children from other countries that go to our universities are worth fighting for. It is our job to do so, Mr. Speaker.

And that is just the way it is.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. 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 topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague Congressman TED POE holding this important Special Order Hour to honor survivors of sexual violence on our college campuses, and in particular the brave members of the 12th Woman, a group of survivors from Texas A&M University who are speaking truth to power about their experiences. Judge POE has been unwavering in his pursuit of justice for victims of sexual violence on the bench and in Congress. I applaud his strong advocacy and tireless dedication to this incredibly important cause. He is a true ally and his legacy on this issue will continue to help countless victims and survivors move forward.

When parents drop off their children for their first year of college, we expect our institutions of higher learning to keep them safe. But that's not the reality for 20 percent of young women and six percent of young men who are destined to become victims of sexual assault on campus. To make matters worse, survivors are constantly told that they are responsible for their assault—from being penalized for so-called 'code of ethics' violations, like drinking at parties or going into other students' dorm rooms, to being blamed for not fighting back.

That includes a brave survivor at Texas A&M who had the wherewithal to alert her school that her rapist was allowed back on the swim team after being suspended for only one semester and not being subject to criminal charges. The school's response speaks volumes—"I regret your displeasure with the perceived impact, and I wish you all the best as

you continue to seek healing". The school's failure to protect the survivor and other potential victims is unacceptable.

They are not alone. Universities continue to inadequately deal with perpetrators across the country—from expulsions after graduation, to honor code violations that carry less of a penalty than plagiarism, to allowing perpetrators to directly cross-examine their victims about their past sexual history during the so-called investigative process. This kind of antiquated victim-blaming and -shaming must end.

That is why I am introducing the bipartisan Hold Accountable and Lend Transparency or HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act with my colleagues Congressmen TED POE and BRIAN FITZPATRICK to ensure that our colleges and universities do everything they can to hold perpetrators accountable and to provide the support survivors need and deserve.

WHAT TAX REFORM MEANS TO PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes this afternoon during this Special Order just to go over some highlights of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act as we continue to see very robust economic growth happening across the country, including in my district back in western Pennsylvania.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is the culmination of years spent listening to the stories of families back home who had nothing left over at the end of the month, of families who were struggling to save for retirement, pay off loans, and simply make ends meet. These stories are not just unique to my district, but they are coming in from all across America to the House of Representatives.

For too long, hardworking Americans toiled under a broken Tax Code filled with loopholes and special interest carve-outs. For most of the last decade, we had sluggish growth, stagnant wages, and limited opportunity across the country, including parts of Pennsylvania. When an economy is stagnant and not healthy, fewer job opportunities exist and workers' hard-earned wages often do not keep up with expenses.

Since being elected in 2012, I told my constituents that it did not have to be that way, that we could do better, that we deserve better. That is why 6 months ago, my colleagues and I passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and the President signed it into law.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act puts hardworking Americans first by allowing them to keep more of their paychecks, bringing businesses home from overseas, and creating that healthier economy.

To help workers keep more of their wages, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act nearly doubles the standard deduction from \$6,350 per individual to \$12,000, and

from \$12,700 to \$24,000 for married couples, essentially doubling the amount of income that will not be subject to Federal income taxes.

It also expands the child tax credit to \$2,000 to help parents with the cost of raising kids, and adds a new credit to help provide care for elderly family members and adults with disabilities.

With these changes, the zero tax bracket increases significantly. Consequently, more Americans will be fully exempt from Federal income taxes, and they can keep more of their hard-earned wages.

Additionally, before the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the United States had the highest business tax rates in the industrialized world. Pennsylvania's combined Federal and State corporate tax rate stood at nearly 45 percent.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is removing a choke hold on our economy, decreasing for American corporations the tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent. Consequently, the Pennsylvania combined rate now stands at 31 percent. This puts American companies in a better place, from a competitive standpoint, than their Chinese and Mexican counterparts.

Think about that. Prior to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, China was treating its companies better, Mexico was treating its companies better, with lower tax rates, and you saw investments going into those countries. Now, with the United States having lower tax rates, it is turning around.

This improvement, as well as other provisions such as the immediate expensing of new equipment, is causing companies to bring cash back from overseas and invest in America and hire workers and raise pay.

Under the new system, small business employers, known as pass-through enterprise—your partnerships, your LLCs—will be able to deduct 20 percent of their qualified business income, and the remaining income will be taxed at new and lower rates.

This translates into a significant tax cut for Main Street businesses, freeing up resources that will allow them to innovate and invest in their communities, hire workers, and increase wages.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act also established a program that will ensure that the benefits of our booming economy reach areas that have been historically overlooked: the opportunity zone programs.

States are identifying areas that have struggled with high poverty and sluggish economic growth. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act provides tax incentives to direct private investment into and reinvigorate these communities. These communities have been starved of robust capital investment for decades. That is about to change.

In my district in western Pennsylvania, Governor Wolf from Pennsylvania has designated zones across the State. In western Pennsylvania, in my district, we have tracts that have been

designated in Beaver Falls, Midland, Johnstown, and Aliquippa. These are strong communities, Mr. Speaker, that once again can thrive thanks to the attractive incentives offered in the opportunity zone investment.

This is how it is going to work.

People may have an asset they have been holding for a long time and have a capital gain there. There is \$6 trillion locked up in capital gains across this country. If somebody wants to make an investment in a community where there has not been an investment, they can sell that asset, defer their capital gain, and invest in that fund. If they hold that in the fund for 10 years, they can defer the tax for that 10 years, get a step up in basis, and here is where it is great: they will not pay taxes on the appreciation of that investment in the opportunity zone.

Think about that capital that can flow into those communities and stay there and grow a business. That is private capital coming in, which is different from a government grant that might go in.

You have individuals who are looking to make investments. They want that investment to grow. They want that investment to do well. They want that investment to prosper in these communities. This is good news for those communities and good news for people who live there and can get jobs as a result of the investments in these opportunity zones.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is not just about simplifying our Tax Code. It is saving people money. It is about empowering people in Pennsylvania and throughout our Nation with hope and opportunity to better their lives for themselves, their families, and their communities.

These reforms within the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act are resulting in real benefits that are being experienced across the Nation. Already, 90 percent of American workers are receiving higher take-home pay under the new withholding tables. Four million workers have received bonuses, raises, or expanded benefits, and over 1 million new jobs have been created, including 160,000 manufacturing jobs.

For the first time in many years, there are more job openings than job seekers. Last month, the unemployment rate was 4 percent, nearly the lowest in decades, and the unemployment rates for African Americans and Hispanics were at historic lows. Fifty-eight percent of small business owners are confident about hiring new employees, and more Americans are optimistic about their future.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is bringing workers who were pushed to the sidelines during the previous years back into the labor force and restoring hope to everyday Americans. In June, 600,000 people entered the labor force, and 213,000 new jobs were added.

Businesses in my district are reinvesting in their employees, communities, and operations through bonuses,

higher wages and salaries, and increased charitable giving.

In western Pennsylvania, PNC Bank and BNY Mellon have raised their employees' minimum wages. Major companies, including UPS, FedEx, and Home Depot, that employ thousands of western Pennsylvanians, are providing bonuses and contributing more to their employees' retirement plans.

In fact, the Hampton Township Home Depot plans to create its own Success Sharing Program, in which hourly employees will be able to divide an estimated \$30,000 to \$40,000 among themselves semiannually, twice a year.

The Ellwood Group, a steel manufacturer, is planning a \$60 million addition to its New Castle plant and adding 25 new employees once it is fully operational.

Some who opposed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Acts have touted these meaningful benefits to U.S. workers as "crumbs." They have said that this law only helps the wealthy.

Let me ask this: Is the Pennsylvania Utilities Commission requiring 17 of its utility companies to give a monthly credit to their customers, saving \$320 million a year, crumbs?

Mr. Speaker, these aren't crumbs. These are seeds that are taking root and growing opportunities, creating jobs and the economy for all Americans to prosper.

Don't just take it from me. Take it from John in New Kensington, who is seeing more money in his paycheck and received a \$2,500 bonus.

Take it from Brian in Windber, who is receiving \$500 more a month; Michael in Aliquippa, who is bringing home an extra 4.5 percent in each paycheck; Edward in Westmoreland County, who is receiving \$128 more per paycheck. That is more than \$3,000 per year.

Take it from Flory in Westmoreland County, who said that, thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, her family will have more money to use towards their son's postgraduate education; and Heidi from Allegheny County, who wrote to tell me that "every penny we aren't taxed can go towards our other bills such as food, utilities, school loans, a mortgage, and clothing for our children. We were barely scraping by during the previous administration."

□ 1315

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is about empowering everyone, from the single mom in Ambridge, Pennsylvania, looking to buy her first home to the entrepreneur in Beaver Falls, working to achieve his or her American Dream.

When our people can fully develop their God-given skills and talents in a competitive economy without the government's excessive taxes and regulations, not only will our citizens' lives improve, but our country will grow stronger.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 23, 2018, at noon 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:

5696. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, pursuant to Public Law 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5697. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report to Congress on International Monetary and Financial Policies, pursuant to Sec. 1701 of the International Financial Institutions Act, as amended by Sec. 583 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5698. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Second Triennial Report to Congress on Biofuels and the Environment, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7545 note; Public Law 110-140, Sec. 204(a); (121 Stat. 1529); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5699. A letter from the Assistant Director, OSD SEMO, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of a 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.

5700. A letter from the Assistant Director, OSD SEMO, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of a 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.

5701. A letter from the Assistant Director, OSD SEMO, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of a vacancy and a 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.

5702. A letter from the Assistant Director, SEMO, Department of Defense (Army), transmitting a notification of a vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, discontinuation of service in acting role, and change in previously submitted reported information, 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.

5703. A letter from the Assistant Director, OSD SEMO, Department of Defense (Navy), transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5704. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2017-18 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 160808696-7010-02] (RIN: 0648-BH47) received July 13,

2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5705. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; 2017 Purse Seine FAD Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 160205084-6510-02] (RIN: 0648-XF873) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5706. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's announcement of a valid specified fishing agreement — Pacific Island Pelagic Fisheries; 2017 U.S. Territorial Longline Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits for the Territory of American Samoa (RIN: 0648-XF156) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5707. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2018 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XG110) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5708. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic; 2018 Commercial Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XG173) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5709. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Commercial Trip Limit Increase in the Atlantic Southern Zone [Docket No.: 160426363-7275-02] (RIN: 0648-XG009) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5710. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; 2017-2018 Commercial Hook-and-Line Closure for King Mackerel in the Gulf of Mexico Southern Zone [Docket No.: 160426363-7275-02] (RIN: 0648-XG034) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5711. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North Atlantic Swordfish Fishery [Docket No.: 120627194-3657-02] (RIN: 0648-XF817) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5712. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Re-Opening of the Recreational Sector for Red Snapper [Docket No.: 170803719-7719-01] (RIN: 0648-XF848) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5713. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 121004518-3398-01] (RIN: 0648-XF815) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5714. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2017 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish; July Through December Season [Docket No.: 141107936-5399-02] (RIN: 0648-XF810) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5715. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Commercial Closure for Spanish Mackerel [Docket No.: 140722613-4908-02] (RIN: 0648-XF765) received July 13, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care through modernized health savings accounts; with an amendment (Rept. 115-844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide high deductible health plans with first dollar coverage flexibility; with an amendment (Rept. 115-845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care; with an amendment (Rept. 115-846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limitation for health savings accounts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow bronze and catastrophic plans in connection with health savings account; with an amendment (Rept. 115-848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify the definition of qualified health plan for purposes of the health insurance premium tax credit and to allow individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market to purchase a lower premium copper plan; with an amendment (Rept. 115-849, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6199. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses; with an amendment (Rept. 115-850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals entitled to Medicare Part A by reason of being over age 65 to contribute to health savings account; with an amendment (Rept. 115-851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that direct primary care service arrangements do not disqualify deductible health savings account contributions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY (TX): Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the carryforward of health flexible spending arrangement account balances; with an amendment (Rept. 115-853). 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. HOYER (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HECK, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. JONES, and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 6437. A bill to combat subversive activities of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), the Judiciary, Armed Services, House Administration, Energy and Commerce, Appropriations, Financial Services, and Oversight and Gov-

ernment Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 6438. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security an Unmanned Aircraft Systems Coordinator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 6439. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security the Biometric Identification Transnational Migration Alert Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6440. A bill to provide career and technical education for STEM teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 6441. A bill to authorize the establishment of American Dream Accounts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 6442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to consumers to reimburse a portion of the cost of broadband infrastructure serving limited broadband districts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 6443. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a continuous diagnostics and mitigation program at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 6444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of certain assets for purposes of determining gain or loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 6445. A bill to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 6446. A bill to reauthorize the White House Conference on Small Business Authorization Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 6447. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the position of Chief Data Officer of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. COHEN, Mr.

GRIJALVA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 6448. A bill to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify the definition of valuable consideration, to clarify that pilot programs that honor and reward organ donation do not violate that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 6449. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to take steps to ensure that there is no foreign ownership or influence on the voting systems used in elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 6450. A bill to prohibit the flying of any flag other than the United States flag over United States diplomatic and consular posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 6451. A bill to establish the policy of the United States with respect to contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 6452. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 6453. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 445 Main Street in Laceyville, Pennsylvania, as the "Melinda 'Mindy' Gene Picotti Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 6454. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require regional centers of air transportation excellence to conduct research on the impacts of aircraft noise on humans and effective methods for mitigating such impacts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 6455. A bill to reauthorize funding for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 6456. A bill to amend section 38 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 relating to small public housing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa):

H.R. 6457. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to advance carbon utilization technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 6458. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the national organ transplantation procurement program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 6459. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a strategy to diversify the technology stakeholder marketplace regarding the acquisition by the Transportation Security Administration of security screening technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 6460. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 6461. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish in the Transportation Security Administration a National Deployment Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 6462. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H. Res. 1004. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Clinicians HIV/AIDS Testing and Awareness Day, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H. Res. 1005. A resolution directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the border security policies, procedures, and activities as such relate to the interdiction of families by the U.S. Border Patrol between ports of entry; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. SIREs, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 1006. A resolution condemning the deteriorating situation in Venezuela and the regional humanitarian crisis it has caused, affirming support for the legitimate National Assembly and the Supreme Court, and urging further regional action in support of democracy in Venezuela; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. HOYER:

H.R. 6437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
CLAUSE 18: The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. McCAUL:

H.R. 6439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. KNIGHT:

H.R. 6440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 6442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 6443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. NUNES:

H.R. 6444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 6445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BLUM:

H.R. 6446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 6447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 6450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 grants Congress the power to exercise exclusive legislation pertaining to "other needful Buildings" owned by the United States.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 6451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 3 Section 8

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 6452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 6453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7—"The Congress shall have the Power to establish Post Offices and Post Roads."

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 6454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 6455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 6456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 6457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 6458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 6459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, that Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 6460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 6461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 6462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 120: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 173: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 176: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 365: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 371: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 548: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 795: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1300: Mr. EVANS and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1341: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1439: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1615: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1697: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 1881: Mr. BUDD and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 2101: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 2106: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2315: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. FASO.

H.R. 2902: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2903: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 2925: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3272: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3602: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 3608: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3738: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 4022: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR

of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PALONE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 4099: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 4107: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4116: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 4117: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 4165: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 4312: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 4647: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 4673: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4855: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4884: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 5108: Ms. MOORE and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 5414: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5533: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. MOORE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5538: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5658: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 5760: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5780: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 5871: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 5882: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5902: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 5950: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5988: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 6014: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 6031: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 6071: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 6077: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 6086: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 6143: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 6144: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 6193: Mr. CARBAJAL and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 6195: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 6238: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 6274: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 6296: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 6313: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 6317: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 6340: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 6344: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 6345: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 6346: Mr. PERRY, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 6354: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PERRY, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 6360: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 6364: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 6392: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 6393: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 6396: Mr. COOPER, Mr. KIND, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 6400: Mr. FLORES and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 6414: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 6417: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 6435: Mr. DELANEY.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. CLOUD.
H.J. Res. 121: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 274: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H. Res. 593: Mr. LANCE.
H. Res. 745: Mr. YOHIO.
H. Res. 785: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GARRETT.
H. Res. 826: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H. Res. 864: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. GARRETT on House Resolution 458: Mr. Walker.

Petition 11 by Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania on House Resolution 873: Mr. Coffman.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018

No. 122

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by the Reverend Dr. Richard Gibbons of First Presbyterian Church, from Greenville, SC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us join our hearts and minds together as we pray.

Let us pray.

Gracious God and loving Heavenly Father, as we prayerfully seek Your presence, enable us amidst complex challenges to be refreshed and renewed by the transforming nature of Your extravagant love. Impart to us a profound sense of gratitude, thankful that in Your sovereign purposes, we are a people shaped by adversity, dedicated to equality, while fully dependent on You, for "In God we trust."

Father, grant to us a renewed sense of Your calling, sustained by the enduring values we hold to be self-evident. Equip us, by Your Spirit, to be defined by consensus through compassion, expertise enlightened by experience, leadership resistant to polarization and expediency, yet intentional in unity, honesty, transparency, and integrity, as together we seek to be "one nation under God."

We bring our prayers to You in and through the Name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF RYAN BOUNDS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate is continuing our productive summer. This week we have been focused on confirming more of the President's qualified nominees. After his confirmation yesterday, Andrew Oldham, of Texas, will now bring his impressive credentials and years of distinguished service to his new role on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Today, we are considering the nomination of Ryan Bounds to serve on the Ninth Circuit. Each of these nominees has been selected by the President and

his team for their credentials, reputations, and commitment to the rule of law. Each has been thoroughly examined by our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee.

Ryan Bounds is no exception. He has earned degrees from Stanford and Yale. He clerked for the very Ninth Circuit judge he has been nominated to succeed. For the past 14 years, he has distinguished himself as a public servant at the Department of Justice and in his current role as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for Oregon.

Along the way, he has earned the respect and recognition of legal professionals from across the country and the political spectrum. Forty-six of his colleagues in the District of Oregon describe his "admirable work ethic," "keen judgment," and "masterful writing" as "skills that colleagues and opponents alike seek to emulate."

In a letter to our Senate colleagues from Oregon, criminal defense attorneys who have litigated against Mr. Bounds testified to his "fairness," "diligence," and "legal acumen."

They write:

He has shown time and time again that he is a man of his word. . . . He is an excellent lawyer and would make an outstanding judge.

A number of law professors from across the country seem to agree. They remind us about the standards to which this body is charged with holding judicial nominees—fairness, impartiality, intellectual rigor. To sum it up, in the words of one legal peer, "Ryan has all of this, and more."

So I look forward to voting to confirm this excellent nominee, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, speaking of excellent nominees, I would like to speak for a moment about President Trump's outstanding

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5079

choice for the Supreme Court, Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

This week, even more of our colleagues have had an opportunity to meet with Judge Kavanaugh. I am sure they will agree that it is hard not to come away impressed—the academic achievement, the judicial credentials, the esteem of his peers and fellow legal professionals.

Of course, that hasn't stopped the far-left special interest groups from grasping at straws and trying to smear this nominee any way they can. They don't seem to care whether it is honest or not. They don't seem to care whether it is accurate or not.

The latest made-up controversy is an attempt this week to make hay out of comments Judge Kavanaugh made about the long ago expired independent counsel statute. But, once again, there is no "there" there, whatsoever.

Here are the facts. Judge Kavanaugh's apparent concerns about the independent counsel law appear in line with mainstream views that have been widely held on both sides of the political aisle—views that were, in fact, strongly held by many of my Democratic colleagues, at least until there was an opportunity to try to make political hay.

Congress chose to let the statute expire back in 1999, based in large part on constitutional concerns.

Let me say that again. The Congress, in 1999, on a bipartisan basis, decided to let the independent counsel statute expire.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, the assistant Democratic leader in the Senate right now, explained this well when he was fighting any attempt to renew the statute. Here is what he said in 1999 about the independent counsel: "Unchecked, unbridled, unrestrained, and unaccountable."

My friend from Illinois punctuated his enthusiasm for the demise of the independent counsel law by saying: "I would like to say to Judge Starr and all of the other counsels, your days are numbered."

I agreed with him about the independent counsel statute. A number of us, in both parties, saw it the very same way. So we happily allowed the law to expire.

This has nothing to do with special counsels. That is different from the independent counsel. The day the independent counsel statute expired, the day we actually finished with the impeachment trial of President Clinton in the Senate, Senator Chris Dodd from Connecticut and I went upstairs and had a press conference, stating that we agreed that the independent counsel statute ought to be allowed to expire, and it did. That has nothing to do with any special counsels or any tools that are currently in place for elected officials to be held accountable. This has nothing to do with any investigations that are in the headlines today.

What Judge Kavanaugh was talking about is a law that has not existed for

two decades and which the Supreme Court upheld with only a single dissenting vote. One of the dissenters in the case that upheld the independent counsel statute was Justice Scalia.

The irony or hypocrisy is that our Democratic colleagues are now criticizing Judge Kavanaugh because he may hold the same views on this subject that they did, at least until Judge Kavanaugh was nominated. It is a view that was shared and acted upon by Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, as I have explained.

So it is another day, another off-base attack.

Here is how Newsweek dismissed this tempest in a teapot: "Law experts told Newsweek that Kavanaugh's view on independent counsels has nothing to do with special counsels or Mueller's probe and, in fact, the two types of federal investigations are completely different."

Yet again, the far-left special interest groups that are desperate to deny Judge Kavanaugh fair treatment are hoping the media will buy their latest made-up charge.

Do you remember the outrage when it was learned that Judge Kavanaugh enjoys baseball? My goodness—shocking.

Well, I am proud the President has chosen a nominee who is as strong as Judge Kavanaugh. We should put aside these unfair attacks and misrepresentations and give his nomination the fair treatment it deserves.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a final matter, this week I discussed a number of converging reports that highlight the strength of this economy for middle-class families and job creators.

U.S. retail sales just increased for the fifth consecutive month. Earlier this year, consumer confidence hit its highest level since 2000. More than a million new jobs have already been created in 2018. There are more job openings than job seekers for the first time in 15 years. Over 95 percent of U.S. manufacturers are reporting confidence in their companies' outlook—an all-time high.

Just this morning, there was this announcement from the Department of Labor: In the second week of July, new claims for unemployment benefits fell to their lowest level—listen to this—since 1969.

All of these favorable trends are interrelated. Jay Powell, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, testified before our colleagues on the Banking Committee this week that "robust job gains, rising after-tax incomes, and optimism among households have lifted consumer spending this month."

To put it even more simply, American employers are doing better. So American workers are doing better. So American families are doing better. So American businesses are doing better.

This is how a vibrant, growing economy works. This is what happens when Washington, DC, swallows up less of the American people's money in taxes, when it imposes fewer heavy-handed regulations that make it hard to do business, and when it gets the bureaucracy's foot off the brake of our economy.

This is among the best—quite possibly the best—of economic moments for jobs and opportunity that Americans have seen in recent memory.

The policies of this united Republican government helped to bring it about, and they are helping to sustain it.

Earlier this week, the Wall Street Journal reported:

Tax cuts appear to be propelling robust consumer demand. Many households are experiencing less withholding from their paychecks thanks to the tax overhaul.

According to a recent survey, fewer than one in five American manufacturers now say an unfavorable climate due to things like taxes and regulations is a primary obstacle to their businesses. Back in 2013, during the Obama economy, more than two-thirds of the manufacturers said that. Two-thirds said it was a problem in 2013, and only one in five considers it a problem now.

All across the country, as job creators of all sizes have announced worker bonuses, pay raises, and business expansions, many say loud and clear that tax reform is what made it possible.

The American people voted. Republicans kept our promises. Now middle-class families are seeing the effects of the pro-growth policies they asked for in 2016, and the whole world has seen what the American people can accomplish when their government gets off their backs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in the 3 days since the President returned from his humiliating display of obsequiousness in Helsinki, he has offered numerous explanations for his behavior.

First, he said the media was too focused on the negative and that his summit with Putin was a great success. Then, admitting there was, in fact, a problem, he attempted to walk

back some of his comments, but even he couldn't commit to that and ad-libbed that other people could also have been responsible for interfering in the 2016 elections. A mere 24 hours later, the President was back to claiming it was not his fault and that the media was biased.

Then, astoundingly—the President not having learned his lesson—when he was asked yesterday whether Russia was still attacking our election system, the President replied “no.” This was, of course, followed by yet another implausible clarification when—surprise—his Press Secretary told reporters that was not what the President meant. Although, when you actually look at the tape, it is clear as a bell it is what the President meant. He was saying Russia was not still attacking our election system—once again, disbelieving all of the fine men and women who have reported this, who labor quietly, diligently in our intelligence agencies.

The constantly shifting, insincere, and thoroughly unconvincing explanations for the President's performance reveal that the President and his team do not understand the depth of President Trump's blunders with Putin. Frankly, any post hoc clarification cannot substitute for or repair the President's failure to confront Putin face-to-face. All of his walk backs, which then get undone, are done in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Where is this man who prides himself on being strong but is then afraid to say these things to Putin and has to wait until he is 6,000 miles away to say them? It is unbelievable.

One of the most stunning things about the summit was the President's openness to a request by President Putin to question former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow Michael McFaul and other Americans. In Helsinki, the President described the request as part of an “incredible offer.” The President's spokeswoman was asked about it yesterday. She confirmed the President and his team would discuss it.

That President Trump would even consider handing over a former U.S. Ambassador to Putin and his cronies for interrogation is bewildering. No President should have the power to gift wrap American citizens, let alone former Ambassadors, to our known adversaries. How can President Trump and his team spend even a moment considering Putin's request? How can they equate the democracy and rule of law and system of open and fair prosecution we have in this country with what Putin does? It is just amazing.

Every day, this President demeans the United States. So many Americans are saying they are ashamed to have him as their leader when he behaves like this.

Certainly, if the President were to agree to such a request, Congress must do everything in its power to block it. There can be no room for debate, no room for discussion. We must be

clear—and clear quickly. This morning, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator SCHATZ, and I plan to offer a simple resolution that states: “It is the sense of Congress that the United States should refuse to make available any current or former diplomat, civil servant, political appointee, law enforcement official, or member of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin.” This body must agree on the importance of protecting our Ambassadors. We should pass it today, not wait, not show any equivocation.

This incredible offer, as President Trump so casually and incorrectly called it, raises other serious questions. What else has President Trump agreed to behind closed doors? What else has he discussed with President Putin? President Trump and President Putin met for nearly 2 hours behind closed doors. No one else was present but a translator, and hardly anyone knows what was said.

Has Secretary Pompeo been briefed on that private, behind-closed-doors meeting? Nobody knows. He hasn't said so. Does our military know if President Trump made commitments about our nuclear arsenal? Nobody knows. Defense Secretary Mattis hasn't said whether he has been briefed. Do we know if President Trump made commitments about the security of Israel or Syria or North Korea or about any of the other issues the President said he discussed with Putin?

It is utterly amazing that no one knows what was said. This is a democracy. If our President makes agreements with one of our leading—if not our leading—adversaries, his Cabinet has to know about it and so do the American people. These questions and more need a full and complete accounting before Congress, in an open setting, as soon as possible.

That is why I have called on the Republican leadership to demand that Secretary of State Pompeo, Ambassador Huntsman, and, crucially, the translator who was present at the closed-door session be made to testify before the Senate. They should come immediately—now. What are our Republican friends waiting for?

The events of this week raise serious questions about the President's ability to responsibly and safely conduct this Nation's foreign policy, about his ability and willingness to defend the United States and her citizens, about his very ability to govern in so many areas.

Confronted with these grave questions, I believe the Senate must act to show our country's resolve to punish Putin for his interference and never allow such a thing to happen again and to ensure the President is doing what is necessary to stand up for American interests.

So I have proposed—and many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have proposed—a bunch of things we can do right now to take action in the wake of

President Trump's indefensible summit with President Putin. Democrats are not in the majority. We don't control the floor. We need our Republican colleagues, who control the Senate floor, to join us on these measures. The lack of action—action, not just words—by our Republican colleagues is stunning and deeply disappointing not just to Democrats but to all of the American people.

Since Monday, sadly, we haven't seen movement from our colleagues in the majority, just more slow-walking. I understand my friends, Senators Coons and Flake, are working on introducing a resolution to support the consensus of our intelligence agencies and to request congressional oversight. We are all for it. I hope it passes with the unanimous consent it deserves. My Republican friends can and must do more—actions, not just resolutions and statements of disapproval. We shouldn't need this resolution. The things asked for in this resolution should have been happening already.

The burden of patriotism and of protecting America's security is on Leader MCCONNELL's shoulders. I know he has a difficult situation. I know he has a President who can sometimes be vindictive. The bottom line is, our country's security, our country's direction, our country's honor demand it.

We need to bring Secretary of State Pompeo, Ambassador Huntsman, and the rest of President Trump's national security team from Helsinki, including the translator who was present in the one-on-one meeting with Putin, right here before the Congress, in open session, so we all will know what happened.

We need to pass legislation to protect Special Counsel Mueller. There is bipartisan legislation already that was passed out of the Judiciary Committee under Senator GRASSLEY's leadership and support. It is on the floor. What is our Republican leader waiting for?

We need to see the President's tax returns, which has been the common practice of all Presidents in recent memory, but it is needed far more now because one of the most logical explanations of the President's obsequious and almost inexplicable actions toward President Putin is that Putin has something on him. Maybe it would be revealed in the tax returns, and if there is nothing there, the President should have no problem with releasing them.

We need to implement sanctions against Russia, not weaken them. We need to demand that Putin hand over the 12 Russians who have been indicted for election interference. We also need to harden our election infrastructure so that what happened in 2016 never happens again.

These are all commonsense measures, and most of them have bipartisan support already. They will accomplish for America what the President has been unwilling or unable to do. If my Republican colleagues refuse to pursue any—if not all—of these items, they are de

facto consenting to the President's capitulation in Helsinki. They cannot stand by. The American people will not allow it.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, on healthcare, ever since Republicans have been handed the keys to both Houses of Congress and the White House after the 2016 election, they have engaged in a protracted campaign of sabotage against our healthcare system. Premiums are going up, coverage is going down, and it is all falling in the laps of our Republican colleagues in the House and Senate.

President Trump and congressional Republicans proposed legislation that would have gutted Medicaid and allowed insurers to charge more and deny coverage just because a person had gotten sick. The legislation would have excluded critical benefits and imposed lifetime or annual limits on care.

Under cover of night, the Republicans dismantled the healthcare law's coverage requirement without putting anything in its place.

The Trump administration canceled the Federal program that helped low-income customers afford insurance and expanded the availability of junk insurance plans that sucker Americans in with low premiums but that hardly cover anything. When people have these plans, they ask: Why did I even buy insurance? They were duped.

Now, worse yet, the administration has directed the Justice Department to stop defending the constitutionality of protections for Americans with preexisting medical conditions—turning its back on the most popular and humane advancement in our healthcare system over the last decade.

I would say to my Republican friends: Go to your constituents. Ask if people have someone who is sick in their families. You will get a lot of hands. Then ask them if they should be excluded from gaining health insurance to help that sick member and see how many support these ideas.

If they try to do this in the dark of night, it is not going to work. In August, we Democrats are going to be talking about this over and over again. Believe me—this will probably be the most important factor in the 2018 election as the American people will rebel from the taking away of healthcare.

Imagine going back to the days when a mother with a child who has cancer can no longer find affordable healthcare for her daughter. When hard-working Americans who fall on hard times are made to suffer by being denied healthcare coverage precisely because they need it, how wrong, how backward, how immoral. That is where President Trump wants to take us, and that is where all of our Republican colleagues seem to be following.

Later this morning—actually, right now—a group of Democrats is announcing how we plan to fight back against

this lawsuit and preserve the protections for up to 130 million nonelderly Americans who have preexisting conditions. The elderly, fortunately, are protected since we still have Medicare, despite some efforts by some on the other side to cut it back.

As millions of Americans watch their healthcare costs go up, as they read the news about the latest Republican effort to undo healthcare protections, they fear for the future and wonder who in Washington will be fighting for them. In November, they will have the chance to vote for a party that will check the President's dangerous healthcare sabotage, that will work to bring down costs and improve quality, that will never undermine the protections of Americans with preexisting conditions.

I look forward to the response to my colleagues' announcement.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my support for the 20,000 men and women of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. They work hard every day to keep drugs off our streets, to stop human trafficking, to protect our communities from gang violence, and, yes, to enforce our immigration laws. Theirs can be a thankless job, but they do it with courage, dedication, and professionalism. So I, for one, want to say thank you.

I wish to point out the overwhelming support that House Republicans showed for ICE yesterday, which stands in stark contrast to the contemptible display put on by House Democrats. On a simple resolution merely expressing support for the men and women of ICE, only 18 Democrats voted yes, 8 skipped the vote, 34 voted no, and 133 Democrats voted present, which is the same thing as no. That is a pretty sad state of affairs. Thirty-four Democrats condemned the men and women of ICE, and 141 Democrats don't even have the courage of their conviction—they don't

even have the guts to vote yes or no—because we all know that Democrats, in their heart of hearts, want to abolish ICE. The way they tell it, ICE is a rogue agency driven by hatred and spite to tear apart communities.

Congressman POCAN of Wisconsin said that ICE is "ripping at the moral fabric of our nation."

Congresswoman JAYAPAL of Washington said that "ICE is out of control."

Congressman BLUMENAUER of Oregon calls ICE "toxic."

The senior Senator from Massachusetts said that we should replace ICE "with something that reflects our values," which I suppose means that the 20,000 men and women of ICE don't measure up to the professor's definition of our values. I have to ask, isn't the rule of law one of those values? Because ICE's job is simply to enforce the law and to protect our citizens from crime.

In the last year alone, ICE arrested more than 125,000 illegal aliens with criminal records. Those illegal aliens were responsible for more than 80,000 DUIs, 76,000 dangerous drug offenses, 48,000 assaults, 11,000 weapon offenses, 5,000 sexual assaults, 2,000 kidnappings, and 1,800 homicides. Yes, that is right, almost 2,000 souls would still be on this Earth but for those illegal alien criminals. ICE's investigative arm seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics last year. These men and women are on the frontlines of the war on drugs and the opioid crisis in particular. Do the Democrats really believe we should put all these efforts on hold?

This call to abolish ICE is so irresponsible that even some Democrats—those not running for President or beholden to the radical left—are speaking out against this.

Jeh Johnson, President Obama's former Secretary of Homeland Security, said that it "is not a serious policy proposal" and "would compromise public safety." He pointed out that even those who opposed the Vietnam war wouldn't have demanded that we abolish the Department of Defense.

Eric Holder, President Obama's former Attorney General, said, "I don't think that substantively or politically that makes a great deal of sense," calling it "a gift to Republicans."

Sarah Saldana, who ran ICE under President Obama, has called it "nonsensical."

Perhaps the most insightful comment came from former Senator Joe Lieberman of Connecticut. He said, "This makes no sense unless you no longer want any rules on immigration or customs to be enforced." And that, I would contend, is the whole point.

Those who want to abolish ICE just want open borders. The very bill House Democrats have introduced to abolish ICE doesn't even say which Federal agency should assume its critical law enforcement duties. They leave it up to a commission. The reason, I submit, is that they don't really care. Their obsession with open borders is so great

that they are willing to risk public safety to achieve it. These irresponsible politicians should know better. They aren't worthy to lead the brave, hard-working men and women of ICE. These officers are just trying to do their jobs and to keep us safe. On behalf of a grateful nation, I conclude by again extending them my deepest thanks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arkansas in commending those who are involved in law enforcement, risking their lives for the safety of this Nation at all levels—Federal, State, and local. They put their badges on every single day and risk their lives for us, and that is a fact.

Within the Department of Homeland Security, there are men and women who are conscientiously trying to keep America safe. I commend them as well. I believe they are doing their job as they understand it, and they are risking their lives many times to achieve it, not only to stop the illegal flow of drugs into our country but to deter crime and to ferret out criminals where possible. They risk their lives to achieve that goal.

I have not joined in a call for the abolition of ICE, but I will not join in a call for the adoration of ICE because of one specific issue. The zero tolerance policy of the Trump administration resulted in our agents of the Department of Homeland Security forcibly separating children from their parents—forcibly separating up to 3,000 children from their parents.

I saw some of those kids separated by that agency. They were toddlers and infants. Some were being held by the care workers whom I happened to visit in Chicago. They were little babies taken from their mothers—toddlers, children 5 and 6 years old, separated by this agency under the President's zero tolerance policy. There were up to 3,000 of them, according to the administration's own estimates.

Had that happened before? Only rarely, but it became the policy of this administration until there was such an uproar in the United States and around the world that President Trump reversed his position on zero tolerance.

Reversing the position did not return the children to their parents. It took Federal courts to do that—one in particular, in San Diego, where the judge called the representatives of ICE, Health and Human Services, and all the other agencies involved in these children being removed forcibly from their parents and gave them deadlines to return the children to their parents. It was then that we discovered something about this agency. It was then that we discovered that they didn't keep a record of the parents and kids.

If you place an order online to Amazon or some other source and the next day you want to check on the status of your order, you use your tracking

number, and they will tell you where your package is. There was no tracking number when it came to these kids. If you decide that you are going to order a pizza and it seems to take a little too long and you call the pizza parlor, they can generally tell you where the delivery person is. The same thing is true in so many other areas.

Why, then, did this agency, which my colleagues are now coming to the floor claiming such great praise for, ignore the obvious? This agency, the Department of Homeland Security, ended up setting free 3,000 children into care facilities around the United States of America and didn't keep records of the parents.

We asked them several weeks ago, downstairs—all of the agencies, including ICE, referred to by the Senator from Arkansas: OK, let's get down to basics. How many kids are we talking about?

They wouldn't give us a number.

How many kids are under the age of 5? Those are the ones whom you have a deadline to reunite under the Federal court order in San Diego.

They couldn't give us a number.

Then, how many parents can you identify who actually had their kids taken away?

ICE said: We can identify 10.

Ten parents, 3,000 kids—I am not making this up. This is exactly what they said.

They said: We have 10 parents in custody. Those are the ones we can identify.

Two weeks passed, and we had another briefing this week. The numbers are now more complete. There are some 2,500 kids separated from their parents, spread around the United States.

What happened to the parents who lost their children?

The explanation from ICE was that they abandoned their kids and left.

Does that sound reasonable? Does that sound honest? You take the child away from the arms of a parent and then the parent says: I am leaving the country.

That might have happened in some cases, for reasons I don't know, but it is an outrageous suggestion. What it reflects is incompetency. How in the world can you take a child away from a parent, forcibly take them away, and not keep an adequate record for their reunification? How can you do that? Common sense and common decency suggests that you would do it.

I am not going to join in any resolution applauding that action by any Federal agency—the Department of Homeland Security, ICE, or other agencies. To me, it is a stain on the reputation of this Nation, one that we need to quickly resolve by reuniting these children with their families as quickly as possible.

You see, it isn't just a question of a holiday for these kids. Pediatricians have come forward from the American Academy of Pediatrics and have said

that what we have done is institutional abuse of children.

This separation is not just another day in the life of this 2-year-old, 5-year-old, or 8-year-old. This separation is something that is causing trauma within their own minds.

Have you read the stories about the reunifications, where some of the parents come back, finally get their children, and the children will not even come to the parents? They don't quite understand what just happened to them. They think the parent might have just decided to give them up.

There they were alone and by themselves at that tender age. Can you imagine that for your children or your grandchildren? I can't.

We did it as part of the official government policy of the Trump administration under zero tolerance.

When some of us come to the floor to question the actions, the conduct, the management of ICE, we have good reason to do it. I hope for the people within that agency who are doing their jobs conscientiously that we can at least be honest in saying that this policy is one which doesn't deserve praise and doesn't deserve our adoration on the floor of the Senate or the House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S. RES. 582

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a matter of extraordinary importance to the future of American democracy and, in fact, democracies all over the world. At the Helsinki summit on Monday, President Trump embarrassed our country, undermined American values, and openly sided with Russia's authoritarian leader, Vladimir Putin, against the U.S. intelligence community's unanimous assessment that Russia interfered in the 2016 Presidential election.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN is right when he said: It was—

[It was] one of the most disgraceful performances by an American president in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump's naivete, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. But it is clear that the summit in Helsinki was a tragic mistake.

That is not BERNIE SANDERS talking. That is former Republican Presidential candidate Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

On Tuesday, after a strong international backlash, Trump, in a bizarre statement, claimed he misspoke and, of course, blamed the media for reporting what he said, even then he could not help but suggest that the electoral interference "could be other people also" and not just Russia.

In an interview last night, Trump changed his answer yet again and acknowledged, in the meekest way possible, that, yes, Russia meddled in our election, and, as the leader of Russia, Vladimir Putin is responsible.

This is a step forward, but it is not remotely sufficient. Who knows what tweet the President will release tomorrow? He seems to come up with a new response every few hours.

Today, we face an unprecedented situation of a President who, for whatever reason, refuses to acknowledge the full scope of the threat to American democracy. Either he really doesn't understand what is happening—and that is possible—or he is under Russian influence because of compromising information that they may have on him or because he is ultimately more sympathetic to Russia's authoritarian oligarchic form of government than he is to American democracy.

Whatever the reason, Congress must act now. Democrats must act and Republicans must act if we are serious about preserving American democracy. We must demand—and I know this is a radical idea—that the President of the United States represent the interests of the American people and not Russia.

Let us be as clear as we can be. Russia has been interfering not only in U.S. elections but in the elections of other democracies—the United Kingdom, France, Germany.

I yield to the Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend, the Senator from Vermont, for this outstanding resolution. It is a resolution. I don't see who can object to it. We ask for five things in this resolution: that our government accept the assessment of our own Intelligence Committees about Russia's interference; that we move aggressively to protect our election systems; that the sanctions that this body passed 98 to 2 finally be implemented by the Trump administration; that there be no interference in Mr. Mueller's investigation; and that there must be cooperation.

Who in America would object to that? Maybe a small group of hard-right ideologues, but no one else.

Who in this body will object to it? This is an outstanding resolution.

I know my friend from Vermont would agree with me. We need action in addition to resolutions, but this is an excellent start. I urge all of my colleagues to support this fullheartedly. Our country is at risk.

The Senator from Vermont is sounding a clarion call and saying in a bipartisan way that we should strengthen our country, not weaken it, as the President has done over the last week. I hope this will get unanimous support from every Member of this body—whether they be Democrat, Independent, or Republican; whether they be liberal, moderate, or conservative. If you love America, if you care about our security, support this resolution.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Democratic leader for his strong efforts on this enormously important issue. I want to reiterate that this really is not a Democratic resolution. If there is any resolution that should be bipartisan, this is it. My Republican colleagues believe in democracy. I know that. We believe in democracy. Together, we and the American people must make it clear that we will not allow Russia or

any other country on Earth to undermine our democracy.

Let's be very clear that Russia has not just been interfering in U.S. elections but in elections of other democracies around the world—the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, to name just a few countries.

Russia's goal is to advance its own interests by weakening the transatlantic alliance of democracies that arose after World War II, while also inflaming internal divisions in our country and in other countries. We should also be clear that this interference is directed from the very highest levels of the Russian Government. Last week, Special Counsel Mueller announced a set of indictments of 12 members of Russia's military intelligence service, the GRU. There can be no doubt that given the nature of the Russian Government, Vladimir Putin was directly involved in this effort.

But our concern is not only what has already happened; more importantly, it is what could happen in the future. What happened in 2016 was an outrage, but we have to make sure it does not happen in 2018 and future elections.

Last week, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, a former Republican U.S. Senator, raised the alarm on growing cyber attacks and threats against the United States in a range of areas—a range of areas, not just elections—including Federal, State, and local government agencies, the military, business, and academia, saying that the situation is at a “critical point.” Coats said Russia is “the most aggressive foreign actor, no question, and they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.” Coats compared the warning signs to those the United States faced ahead of the September 11 terrorist attacks. This is a clear and present threat to our democratic system and those of our allies.

Ultimately, of course we want a peaceful relationship with Russia. We do not want a return to the Cold War, and we surely do not seek any type of military conflict. But at the same time, we must be very clear that we oppose what Putin is doing, both in terms of his foreign policy and his domestic policy.

On foreign policy, we will not accept Russia interfering in the elections of democratic countries, stoking political tensions by promoting hatred and suspicion of immigrants and minorities, and trying to undermine longstanding alliances between democratic allies.

In 2014, in violation of international law, Russia invaded neighboring Ukraine and annexed the Crimea region.

Russia has assassinated political opponents abroad, most recently through the use of poison in Salisbury, England. The British Government concluded in that attack that it was most likely carried out by Russia's military intelligence service.

Domestically, Putin has undermined democracy in Russia, crushing free

speech, jailing political opponents, harassing and assassinating journalists who criticize him, and increasing persecution of ethnic and religious minorities.

On Monday in Helsinki, President Trump had an opportunity to speak out on all of these things and more, to confront Putin about these destabilizing and inhumane policies. He chose not to.

Well, here is the main point: If for whatever reason the President of the United States is not going to do what is right, Congress must do it. Democrats must do it. Republicans must do it.

The Congress must make it clear—and this is the resolution I am introducing and asking for unanimous consent—the Congress must make it clear that we accept the assessment of our intelligence community with regard to Russian election interfering in our country and in other democracies. Does anybody doubt the truth of that?

The Congress must move aggressively to protect our election system from interference by Russia or any foreign power. Does anybody deny the importance of that?

The Congress must demand that the sanctions against Russia, as the Democratic leader mentioned, which passed with 98 votes, be fully implemented—98 votes on that issue.

The Congress must make it clear that we will not accept any interference with the ongoing investigation of Special Counsel Mueller, such as the offer of preemptive pardons or the firing of Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, and that the President must cooperate with this investigation. Time and again, I have heard Republicans, including leaders, make it clear that there should not be an interference in that investigation. There is nothing new here on that point.

Finally—nothing new here, either—the Congress must make it clear to President Trump that his job is to protect the values that millions of Americans struggled, fought, and died to defend: justice, democracy, and equality; that he is the President of the United States and his job is to protect the interests of the American people, not Russia.

Tweets, comments, and press conferences—and I know many of my Republican colleagues have been involved in those activities. They are fine. They are constructive. But we need more from Republican Senators now. It is time for the Senate to rein in the President's dangerous behavior.

If their leadership—Senator McConnell—will not allow votes on this extraordinarily important matter, then my Republican colleagues must join with Democrats to make it happen, or all of their fine-sounding words of concern will become meaningless.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 582

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, the

Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 582, submitted earlier today. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Trump derangement syndrome has officially come to the Senate. The hatred for the President is so intense that partisans would rather risk war than give diplomacy a chance. Does anybody remember that Ronald Reagan sat down with Gorbachev and that we lessened the nuclear tensions? We need to still have those openings.

Nobody is excusing Russia's meddling in our elections. Absolutely we should protect the integrity of our elections. But simply bringing the hatred of the President to the Senate floor in order to say "We are done with diplomacy. We are going to add more and more sanctions"—you know what. I would rather that we still have open channels of discussion with the Russians. At the height of the Cold War, Kennedy had a direct line to Khrushchev, and it may have prevented the end of the world.

Should we be so crazy about partisanship that we now say "We don't want to talk to the Russians. We are not going to have relations with the Russians"? We should stand firm and say "Stay the hell out of our elections," but we should not stick our head in the ground and say we are not going to talk to them.

I would like to see the Russians leave Ukraine. I think we could do it through diplomacy. We are not going to have it if we don't talk to them.

I would like to see the Russians help more with North Korea, with denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. We are not going to have it if we just simply heap more sanctions on and say that we are not going to talk to the Russians and that anybody who talks to the Russians is committing treason.

For goodness' sake, we have the former head of the CIA, John Brennan, gallivanting across TV—now being paid for his opinion—to call the President treasonous. This has to stop. This is crazy hatred of the President. Crazy partisanship is driving this.

For goodness' sake, we don't excuse Russia's behavior in our election, but we don't have to have war. We can still have engagement. We have engaged Russia throughout 70 years, while also acknowledging the imperfections of their system, the parts of their system we vehemently disagree with—the lack of freedom, the lack of human rights. Yet we had open channels of negotiation, open channels of communication.

I could not object more strongly to this.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky just told us that he wants dialogue with Russia, he wants diplomacy with Russia, and that he thinks it is important that we communicate with Russia. I agree. Who disagrees with that? There is not one word in this resolution that suggests that the United States of America should not aggressively engage in diplomacy with Russia to ease the tensions that exist between the two countries. What the Senator said is totally irrelevant to what is in this resolution.

What this resolution says is that we are going to tell Russia: Stop interfering in our elections.

What this resolution is about is telling Russia to stop interfering with the elections in democratic countries all over the world.

What this resolution is about is saying that we should implement the sanctions overwhelmingly voted for by Congress.

What this resolution is about is that we will not accept interference with the ongoing investigation of Special Counsel Robert Mueller.

What this resolution says is that the President must cooperate with the investigation of Mr. Mueller.

That is what this resolution is about. It has nothing to do with ending diplomacy with Russia at all. That is inaccurate.

I would hope that, if not today, in the very near future, Republicans will join Democrats and do the right thing in our effort to preserve American democracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 583

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, we are here to put forward a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its adoption. This is the Flake-Coons resolution, which Senator COONS will speak on and I will take it from there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor with my colleague Senator FLAKE from Arizona to send a strong, clear, and, importantly, a bipartisan message to the American people that we stand with the men and women of the Department of Justice and the men and women of the U.S. intelligence community.

We support the ongoing investigation into Russian interference in our elections, and we must act—and act unequivocally—to hold Russia accountable for its actions.

Just 3 days after the U.S. intelligence community issued a detailed and staggering finding that led to an indictment against 12 Russian military intelligence officers for interfering in our 2016 election, President Trump stood shoulder to shoulder with President Putin and failed to challenge Putin's claim that his government played no role in the effort to undermine our democracy.

In fact, when asked, at the time, whether he believed Putin's denial or

the U.S. intelligence community, President Trump said: "I have confidence in both parties."

He has subsequently walked back those comments, but I think it is important that the Senate be on the record as saying that our intelligence community is clear, our law enforcement community is clear, and today the Senate should be clear.

So today Senator FLAKE and I are putting forward a resolution that, in its language, commends the Department of Justice for its ongoing investigation into Russia's interference in our last election—the one that led to last week's 11-count indictment, offering the most thorough and detailed accounting to date of Russia's complex effort to sow doubt and create chaos in the months leading up to our last election.

The resolution also reaffirms the intelligence community's assessment of Russian interference and asserts that Russia must be held to account for its actions. This can be accomplished in part by immediately and responsibly implementing sanctions provided for in the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, or CAATSA, which this body passed 98 to 2 this summer.

Finally, following the President's summit with Putin in Helsinki, today's resolution calls for prompt hearings and the release of notes to better understand what the two leaders discussed and may have agreed to during their one-on-one meeting, which ran for over 2 hours.

I am encouraged by hearings that have already been scheduled, but I think it is important that it be clear that our Senate seeks a role in engagement and oversight.

Congress and the American people deserve to know what promises or concessions may have been made to President Putin, and thorough hearings with senior officials, including Secretary Pompeo, are critical.

This resolution is a first step—a good first step—but we need to be clear-eyed. President Putin of Russia will not stop until we stop him. We know we face continued threats to our elections in 2018 and beyond. Just last week, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, our former colleague here in the Senate, cautioned that the warning lights are blinking red again on cyber attacks against our Nation. He said:

These actions are persistent, they are pervasive, and they are meant to undermine America's Democracy. Attacks on our country's digital infrastructure [are] made principally by Russia.

He said:

Russia is the most aggressive foreign actor and the worst offender.

So we know that we continue to face hostile threats. FBI Director Chris Wray said just yesterday: "Russia is still working to sow division in the United States and continues to engage in malign actions against our country."

So we need to join arms and look forward to protecting our next election. Today's resolution is an important first step, but I think we should work together to take up and pass the DETER Act, introduced by Senators RUBIO and VAN HOLLEN, to deter Russia from interfering in our next election.

I think we should take up and consider the Lankford-Klobuchar Secure Elections Act to strengthen election cyber security.

Of course, I would like to see my Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act taken up as well. We can build on \$380 million invested in election security, grants provided by this Congress to the States back in March to help bolster their election systems against threats.

It is important to remember that Putin and Putin's Russia are attacking other democratic processes throughout Europe. As Americans, as Senators, we need to stand up and fight for our democracy and the rule of law.

I had a memorable conversation with the Ukrainian leader last year, who said to me: If you don't defend your own elections, your own democracy, how can the rest of us count on you to defend ours?

This resolution makes clear that, on a bipartisan basis, we intend to defend our democracy. Russia's attacks on our last elections where attacks on every American—Republicans and Democrats. The threat is great, it is pressing, and it demands that we act.

Today's resolution is a first step and an important one, and I call on my colleagues to join us in supporting it. If there is any Senator who disagrees with this very basic resolution, I look forward to hearing their reasons.

Let me close by thanking my colleague and friend Senator FLAKE, from Arizona, for having taken the initiative and the lead in introducing this important resolution. We may not agree on everything, but we agree on this important principle: We should stand up and be counted in defense of our democracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS, for helping to get together and working on this resolution and for working with his colleagues.

I hope that we can pass it today. There may be an objection to moving forward. If there is, we will bring it back again and again. This needs to be passed. The Senate needs to speak here.

Mr. President, in his dystopian novel "1984," George Orwell wrote:

The party told you to reject the evidence with your eyes and ears. It was their most final, essential command.

Well, what we saw on air this week in Helsinki was truly an Orwellian moment. What we saw earlier this week in Helsinki is what happens when you wage war on objective reality for nearly 2 solid years, calling real things fake

and fake things real, as if conditioning others to embrace the same confusion. Ultimately, you are rendered unable to tell the difference between the two and are at critical times seemingly rendered incapable of thinking clearly—your mind a hash of conspiracy theory and fragments of old talking points deployed in response to a question no one even asked. Ultimately, you fail to summon reality in the face of a despot in defense of your country.

It wasn't a hard question. An American President was invited by a reporter to denounce the Russian attacks on our elections and, in doing so, to defend the country that he was elected to lead. This should have been not much of a test at all for any American President. Yet it was, and our President failed that test.

The findings of our intelligence community regarding the Russian aggression are not matters of opinion, no matter how powerful and strong Putin's denial. To reject these findings and to reject the excruciatingly specific indictment against the 12 named Russian operatives in deference to the word of a KGB apparatchik is an act of will on the part of the President.

That choice now leaves us contemplating a dark mystery: Why did he do that? What would compel our President to do such a thing?

Those are questions that urgently beg for an answer, and it is our job to find that answer. But what isn't a mystery is that, by choosing to reject objective reality in Helsinki, the President let down the free world by giving aid and comfort to an enemy of democracy. In so doing, he dimmed the light of freedom ever so slightly in our own country. Such is the power that we vest in the Presidency. Such are the consequences when a President does not use that power well.

I can add no further to the extraordinary and thoroughly justified response of my fellow Americans from across the political spectrum to the events in Helsinki, ranging from heartbreak to horror. But I will say that if ever there was a moment to think of not just your party but for the country, this is it. This is not a moment for spin, deflection, justification, circling the wagons, forgetting, moving on to the next news cycle, or for more of Orwell's doublespeak. No, when the American Government offers an onslaught on unreality, it puts the whole world at risk.

That is the lesson of Helsinki. That is the dose of reality that hit hard. We have indulged myths and fabrications and pretended that it wasn't so bad, and our indulgence got us the capitulation in Helsinki.

We in the Senate who have been elected to represent our constituents cannot be enablers of falsehoods. This bipartisan resolution from the Senator from Delaware and me, which we have here today, commends the Department of Justice for its thorough investigation that has led to the indictment of

12 Russian operatives who on behalf of the Russian Government interfered in the 2016 election. It acknowledges that such efforts by the Russian Government to undermine our elections, as confirmed by our own Director of National Intelligence, continue.

Specifically, the Flake-Coons resolution rejects the denial of election interference by Russian President Vladimir Putin, something that our President failed to do when given the opportunity in a public forum in Helsinki on Monday.

This resolution calls for the full and immediate implementation of mandatory sanctions, passed by a vote of 98 to 2, to deter and punish election interference by the Russian Government.

If there are waivers that are needed—and there are some needed for the Indian Government, for example, for weapons they purchased from the Russian Government or for hardware—there is a waiver process already in law for that, and I would support that.

Finally, the resolution calls on the relevant committees of the Senate to exercise oversight, including prompt hearings and obtaining relevant notes and information to understand what commitments were made by the President in the summit and the impact it will have on our foreign policy going forward.

The Russian Ambassador last night said that "important verbal agreements were made." We need to know the details of those agreements.

Empirical, objective truth has taken a beating for the last 18 months. I said from this pulpit in January that "the dissemination of untruths has the effect of eroding trust in our vital institutions and conditioning the public to no longer trust them."

As we saw in Helsinki on Monday, entertaining the untruths of a dictator has the same effect. Passing this resolution will let our constituents, the administration, our allies, and our adversaries know that here in the Senate we do not entertain the deceit of dictators.

The truth is that Russia interfered in our elections in 2016, and these efforts continue. Accepting that truth is the first step in preparing us to confront this malign activity. Let's pass this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 583, submitted earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me first thank the Senator from Arizona and

the Senator from Delaware for expressing all of our concern about Russian interference in the 2016 election. It is absolutely clear they did, and the President has said as much on a number of occasions.

Now, I agree, in Helsinki he was less than clear about that, but he came back and said that he misspoke and reaffirmed his earlier position that, yes, the Russian Government had attempted to interfere in the election, although nobody disputes the fact that they were unsuccessful in changing a single vote or affecting the outcome. Ironically, the very same investigation which has made clear that the Russians did attempt to disrupt the election has also made clear there is no evidence of collusion that anybody has uncovered to date.

My concern with this resolution is that it is purely a symbolic act, and what we need to do is not just offer symbolic resolutions on the floor. We need to do the hard work Senators have to do through regular order. In other words, our committees that have jurisdiction over these issues ought to be permitted to call the witnesses and ask the hard questions and develop the record before we go on record as to a resolution like this.

I would point out that the indictments that were referred to, apparently, according to published reports, Rod Rosenstein, the Deputy Attorney General, asked the President before Helsinki if he should withhold the announcement of those indictments or go ahead and release them before the summit. The President said: No, go ahead.

Anybody who read the 29 pages of the indictment, issued at the request of Robert Mueller by a grand jury in the District of Columbia, knows there is chapter and verse of how Russians attempted to interfere with the election. It is a good and important read. The President knew that before he went to Helsinki. That gives me some confidence that he did, indeed, misspeak, especially in light of his subsequent affirmations of Russian interference in the election.

I happen to be privileged to sit on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. We have been conducting a bipartisan investigation of the Russian matter for the entire time the President has been in office for the last year and a half. We already issued some preliminary reports. The way to do our work is through bipartisan committee work—have the witnesses come and testify, ask them hard questions, and render our judgment.

I know Secretary Pompeo is coming before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sometime next week. He ought to be asked hard questions. I am confident he will respond to those questions. That is how we get the information we need.

Let me just say that I think we should consider sanctions—not some sort of sense-of-the-Senate resolutions that have no sting or no impact, cer-

tainly no deterrent effect on what we all want, which is to discourage Russian involvement in our 2018 elections. That is why the majority leader today asked the chairman of the Banking and Foreign Relations Committee to hold hearings and recommend additional measures that could respond to or deter Russian malign behavior. We ought to do our work through our committees of jurisdiction.

When we rush to judgment and do resolutions like this, we can inadvertently make mistakes. Let me point out one that is in this resolution. There is a reference to Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, which passed the Senate 98 to 2, to deter and punish election interference by the Russian Federation. There is a provision in the current conference committee on the Defense authorization that would issue a waiver of that act to our partner India. If we want to encourage countries like India to come partner with the United States of America—the world's largest democracy and the world's oldest democracy—then we ought encourage that movement toward us and away from the Russian Federation. I worry there is no reference in here to the waiver provision in the Defense authorization conference committee that India has asked for and that Secretary Mattis has requested Congress grant.

All I am asking for is a little bit of caution in the rush to issue a resolution. No. 1, I don't think we acknowledge the full picture, but we also don't commit our work to the committees that have jurisdiction over these matters to do it carefully, thoughtfully, and in a bipartisan way so we come up to the best solution to the problem.

I think this is the wrong way to go about it. I think our committees ought to continue to do their work—Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Banking Committee. We ought to come up with the right kind of bipartisan answer, which I think could well include sanctions against the Russian Federation to deter them from meddling in our 2018 elections and beyond. I am confident they will continue until we stop them from doing so.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I think it is regrettable this was objected to. We will bring it back. The majority leader said this is just a symbolic vote. It is. Symbolism is important.

Obviously, we have underlying sanctions we ought to fully implement. If there are waivers needed, there is already a waiver process in the NDAA authorization. I support those waivers with regard to India. This does not affect that. This says, in a symbolic way, that we in the Senate don't buy Vladimir Putin's rejection or his denial of election interference.

That was put in question this week, whether our government believes that or not. We in the Senate should stand and say: We don't believe it. We know the intelligence is right. We stand behind our intelligence community. We need to say that in the Senate.

Yes, it is symbolic and symbolism is important. Our agencies of government need to know that we stand behind them. That is what this is about.

I hope we will pass this. I note, regretfully, that there has been an objection to it, but we will bring it back. I believe this should pass, and I believe it ultimately will pass.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding Senate rule XXII, postcloture time on the Bounds nomination expire at 1:45 p.m. today; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. RES. 584

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Bounds nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to the immediate consideration of a Schumer resolution that is at the desk; further, that the Senate immediately vote on the resolution; that if agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

S. RES. 583

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I join my colleague from Arizona in briefly remarking on my regret that our resolution was not adopted today.

It does call for the full implementation of mandatory sanctions as discussed at some length. It does not call for the reckless implementation of mandatory sanctions.

There is a significant range of sanctions already provided for in this law, adopted 98 to 2 by this body, that have not yet been adopted. I recognize that this resolution, standing strong behind the Department of Justice, the intelligence community, and its ongoing investigation is, as was referenced, a symbolic act, but there are moments when symbolism and standing together are important.

I look forward to continuing to work closely with my colleague and friend from Arizona to ensure that this resolution is adopted, that the American people and the men and women of our Federal law enforcement agencies and our intelligence community understand that this body strongly supports them and their work and sees clearly the ongoing and continuing threat to

our democracy posed by President Putin and Putin's Russia.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, before I talk about the resolution Senators MENENDEZ, SCHATZ, and I have authored that will be voted on at 1:45 p.m., I would like to say a few words about the work the Senators from Delaware and Arizona did and my severe disappointment that there was objection from the Republican leadership.

The bottom line is very simple. President Trump has put our country in a foreign policy crisis. President Trump has weakened the security of this country. A resolution is the minimum we can do. We should be acting.

The idea that we cannot even pass a resolution in this body because of the objection on the other side, when this was done in a bipartisan, careful way by the Senators from Arizona and Delaware, shows something very bad. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so cowered by a President that they cannot stand up for national security. They cannot stand up to Vladimir Putin, just as the President seems not to be able to.

I have one more point. From what I am told, one of the major objections from the other side was that Congress wished the contemporaneous notes from that secret 2-hour meeting be made available. That is key.

What are they hiding? What are they afraid of? The American people have a right to know what went on in that meeting, particularly when President Putin gets up and talks about some agreements that it seems not even our high-ranking officials in the State and Defense Departments and intelligence agencies know about. This is amazing.

We have come to a really low moment in this body when a bipartisan resolution that is rather modest and limited—I had talked to the Senator from Delaware. He knows I wanted much more in this resolution, but in an effort to get something done, we limited it.

In my view—the view of most Americans—the notes should be made available. The translator should be made available. The translator wasn't specifically referred to in this resolution, but when they talked about relevant people coming, my view—and I believe the view of the Senator from Delaware—was that would include the translator. I am not sure if it was the view of the Senator from Arizona. It doesn't matter. We are not even passing this resolution.

I have to say, this was a moment for bipartisanship. This was a moment for America pulling together. This was a moment, when the President doesn't served the country well, that Americans of all parties, all ideologies come together and fill that void and undo the misdeeds that occurred in Helsinki.

Unfortunately, because of weakness, fear—my guess is, if you looked inside

the hearts and minds of every Member on the other side, all but maybe one or two would feel this is the right resolution, but they are afraid. Fear will not get us anywhere. Letting a bully push us around, meaning President Putin, as he pushed President Trump around, will not serve this country well. It is a sad moment that this resolution was rejected.

S. RES. 584

Madam President, before I yield to my good friend, the hard-working and very able ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I want to talk about our resolution which we are going to vote on. Lord knows what would happen if we couldn't have even gotten a vote on that.

The idea that an American ambassador, who served us so well, should be brought before Putin and his minions to be questioned, when there is no charge against him, no issue against him—it is not like the 12 Russians who are indicted for trying to interfere with our elections. It is not even an analogy. There is not an evenness. President Trump amazingly called this an "incredible offer." Our President is saying that one of our Ambassadors being hauled before an authoritarian regime that twists the truth, that lies at will, that even seems to kill people they want to with poison in other countries is an incredible offer?

Well, this resolution is a fine resolution. It will pass. It doesn't undo what just happened. It doesn't make up for the fact that our colleagues are afraid to take real action, even a resolution that posits action in terms of the major misdeeds at Helsinki. At the very least, we are protecting the integrity of the men and women who serve us, because if today it is the Ambassador, tomorrow it could be somebody in the military or somebody in the intelligence agencies or elsewhere.

This resolution is very clear. What it says is, when President Trump called Putin's offer an "incredible offer," he was incredibly wrong. No President can put one of our fine servants at risk who has worked hard, in this case, for the diplomatic corps. This resolution is a bare minimum of what we should be doing here. I am glad it will be on the floor, and I suspect it will pass—hopefully, unanimously.

I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I am very pleased to join with the distinguished Democratic leader in co-authoring this resolution.

S. RES. 583

Madam President, before I speak to it, I do want to speak to the Flake-Coons resolution.

Certainly, I would have supported it; although, I believe it is the minimum of what this body should be expressing after what we saw in Helsinki. This is a moment for bipartisanship and for patriotism because what I saw in Hel-

sinki speaks to the opposite of standing up to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

In the majority whip's objection to the resolution coming to a vote, I find it interesting that, among other things, he was talking about our having more sanctions against Russia, which I will speak to shortly. We are in the midst of developing a new, strong package of sanctions as it relates to Russia. So I embrace and welcome him to that effort if he seeks to actually see real sanctions against Russia.

We have sanctions. There are sanctions that passed by 98 to 2 in this institution and that passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives, which forced the President to sign it as a result of there having been overwhelming votes. These were sanctions that were largely mandatory but have not been fulfilled. So we could start off by having a robust engagement of the existing sanctions.

I am not quite sure how we start being tough on Russia. One of the elements of those sanctions was to go after Russia's sales of defense weapons. Yet here we are, and we are already looking for waivers. There is a difference between a country that, maybe, has a long history of buying Russian military equipment, but the S-400—a new anti-defense system—is a new version. That is not a legacy issue. I am not sure how we are going to tell one country it can buy the S-400 but tell another country it can't. It doesn't work. That is how sanctions begin to crumble at the end of the day. Yet I welcome the response that we should be having new sanctions.

S. RES. 584

Madam President, as it relates to this resolution, it is outrageous that the White House would not instantaneously and firmly dismiss a proposition that Russian prosecutors question a former U.S. Ambassador. Again and again, we have seen President Trump take Vladimir Putin's word. It is unconscionable that this White House would give anything other than a full-throated defense of America's Foreign Service, like Ambassador Mike McFaul, who has served our country with honor and distinction.

The reason Putin doesn't like Mike McFaul is that as our U.S. Ambassador, he stood up for democracy and human rights in Russia; he stood up to the Russian regime; and he promoted American values and ideals. He spoke truth to power inside Russia. That is why Putin wants him. Congress shouldn't have to tell America's President to stand up for America's public servants and its diplomatic corps, but apparently we have to.

President Trump has repeatedly dismissed Russia's attack in 2016 and shrugs off the threat it poses today, despite all of our intelligence agencies and the Director of National Intelligence, just days ago, saying there are red blinking lights about Russia's continual engagement and interference in

the elections that will take place 110 days from now.

This week, he has continuously and directly contradicted his own national security advisers and, instead, has embraced the line of Putin and Russian intelligence. Now, I know they have been trying to clean it up. Yet he has said it so many times and in the same way he said it in Helsinki. That is what he really believes. Now for him to say something that is different—wrong time, wrong continent, not too much. He has spouted talking points that have sounded like they have come straight from the Kremlin. He has shown a willingness to accede to Putin's requests to interrogate Americans, a willingness to accept Putin's denials about Russian interference, a willingness to attack NATO allies like Montenegro, and a willingness to be a supplicant to Putin's views.

The President keeps claiming he has been tough on Russia. No. It is Congress that has been tough on Russia by its passing CAATSA, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, with broad and deep bipartisan support. Yet the White House hasn't taken it seriously. It has ignored a series of mandates in the law. The clear tone and intent that came from the Helsinki summit was one of accommodation, not of pressure.

I don't see any other way forward, other than through further congressional action, to forcefully call out and address the administration's willful paralysis to Putin's abhorrent behavior. To date, our efforts have been transformative, but just as the administration has been prepared to find ways that allow Putin to circumvent the law and to avoid implementing mandatory provisions of CAATSA, we must be equally prepared to adjust and adapt by closing those loopholes.

That is why I will soon introduce comprehensive legislation to increase pressure to actually implement the law and increase pressure on Russia for its aggression against the United States and our allies. Among the considerations we have for this new legislation are to increase sanctions on Russia's energy sector, to increase sanctions on its cyber sector, to increase pressure on Russia's oligarchs and those who are closest to Putin, and to look at Russia's sovereign debt as a target.

We cannot wait to see whether Russia will attack us in the 2018 election. We know it is in the midst of making that a reality, and we need to ramp up the pressure. We can't afford to wait.

Based on this President's behavior, we also need to protect our institutions here at home. That is why we want to include protections for the Office of Special Counsel. The President has done more to target Bob Mueller than he has to go after Vladimir Putin, and this must stop. This effort must be bipartisan, which is why I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues who truly want to see us fight back on Russia and nearly all of whom

voted to increase sanctions on Russia last year and place more authority for sanctions alleviation in the hands of Congress. They were right to support such measures in July of 2017, and God knows it would now be right to step up and defend America's interests.

It is time to show the American people that we can be patriots, not just partisans. It is time to show the world that we can put our country over party. It is time that we defend America's democratic institutions against Russia's continued aggression. I look forward to the resolution and its vote, and I urge everyone to join us in approving it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we will vote today on the confirmation of Ryan Bounds to the Ninth Circuit. He has been nominated to fill the vacancy left by Judge O'Scannlain. Mr. Bounds once served as a law clerk to Ninth Circuit Judge O'Scannlain.

Mr. Bounds is highly qualified to serve on the Ninth Circuit. A native of Oregon, he attended Stanford University and Yale Law School. He has dedicated his career to public service and has served in government for the past 14 years. The last 8 years were as an assistant U.S. attorney in Oregon.

I have listened to my colleagues on the other side voice their opposition to Mr. Bounds. Interestingly, none of them cite anything Mr. Bounds has done in his legal career as a reason for opposing his nomination. Instead, they focus on two things. First, they say we shouldn't confirm Mr. Bounds because his home State Senators didn't return their blue slips. Second, they say some of Mr. Bounds' college writings were insensitive. So I am going to start with point No. 1 on which they base their opposition to him.

As I have explained so many times on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in the Senate Judiciary Committee—and I don't know how many times to the multitudes of journalists who are on the Hill—my blue-slip policy is the same as all but 2 of my 18 predecessors who were chairmen of the Judiciary Committee over the 100-year history of blue slips. Like Chairmen Ted Kennedy, Joe Biden, and ORRIN HATCH, I will hold hearings for circuit court nominees who have negative or unreported blue slips if the White House has consulted with the home State Senators, and I will not allow Senators to abuse the blue-slip courtesy for political or ideological reasons.

In the case of Mr. Bounds, the White House sought the Oregon Senators' input, seriously considered the one

candidate suggested by the Oregon Senators, and waited several months for the Senators from Oregon to establish their judicial selection committee, which is quite a tradition in that State. The selection committee itself even recommended Mr. Bounds. Yet the Oregon Senators still didn't return their blue slips.

They say it was because Mr. Bounds didn't disclose some of his college writings to the selection committee. There is a very good reason he didn't—the selection committee never asked for his college writings. In fact, Senator WYDEN's staff instructed Mr. Bounds not to disclose them. Moreover, the Oregon Senators refused to ever meet with Mr. Bounds during this whole process.

It has been misleadingly said this will be the first time in modern history we will have confirmed a judge without there having been at least one positive blue slip from the two State Senators. My Democratic colleagues have only themselves to blame. The way the blue slip used to be enforced was through the 60-vote filibuster, and that was done away with in November 2013, led by the then-Democratic majority and Senator Reid.

For example, Chairman HATCH held hearings for five nominees in 2003 and 2004, despite there being the lack of a positive blue slip from either home State Senator. These nominees were voted out of committee. Then Senate Democrats blocked these nominees on the floor by using the 60-vote filibuster. But my Democratic colleagues abolished that filibuster, as I said, in 2013 for the reason that they needed the votes and the freedom to pack the DC Circuit with liberal judges who would uphold Obama's regulatory schemes.

Leading this effort was none other than Senator MERKLEY of Oregon, who argued that 41 Senators shouldn't be able to block a Senate majority from confirming judges. Now they have a different point of view. Now he argues that he alone should have the right to block Mr. Bounds from even getting a hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

In November of 2013, I told my Democratic colleagues that they would regret abolishing the filibuster just to stack the DC Circuit Court of Appeals with their friends. Now, obviously, today, as they consider the Bounds nomination, they know they made a mistake.

Turning to the only other criticism my colleagues have made about Mr. Bounds, which is in regard to his college writings, I don't believe that misguided statements made in a college newspaper 25 years ago should disqualify Mr. Bounds. I hope we don't live in a world where controversial things that we write in college end our careers forever. This is especially true with our kids and grandkids now in the era of social media.

For example, a few years ago, just when the same thing came up on Justice Wright going to the Minnesota

District Court, I voted and supported her despite very controversial writings she had in law school. We shouldn't assume that views expressed years ago during college and law school represent the nominee today.

Mr. Bounds testified that he regretted much of what he wrote in those op-eds.

We received numerous letters in support of Mr. Bounds' nomination from people who have known him personally throughout his life. We received a letter from some of his classmates at Stanford. And before I quote, it is kind of like—these sound like they were his friends in the dormitories. I never was a dormitory student, but I imagine you really get acquainted with people there. This is what they had to say about Mr. Bounds:

We have become aware of a handful of controversial op-eds and articles Ryan wrote for *The Stanford Review* during that time. None of us believes that these writings reflect Ryan's character, either then or now. All of us remember our dorm-mate fondly.

We are a diverse bunch. Yet Ryan never failed to treat all of us with courtesy, respect, and civility, regardless of our respective genders, sexual orientations, skin colors, religions, ethnicity, or any other characteristics.

There is not, and never has been, a racist, sexist, homophobic, or bigoted bone in Ryan Bounds's body.

Mr. Bounds has also been a community leader, promoting diversity and equality. As a member of the Multnomah Bar Association's Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee, Mr. Bounds spearheaded programs to expose underprivileged young people to the legal profession. He mentored young scholarship recipients and helped those same people navigate law school admissions and law school. He expanded low-cost CLE offerings and organized anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training.

Mr. Bounds is imminently qualified to serve on the Ninth Circuit. His college writings do not represent who he is today. His professional accomplishments and exemplary public service speak much more loudly to his character and integrity.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Mr. Bounds' confirmation today.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Madam President, I would like to say one thing about another nomination issue. I understand that so far, no Senate Democrat has met with Judge Kavanaugh. They are apparently awaiting their marching orders from the minority leader. Well, the American people elected each one of those Democratic Senators to represent them, not the minority leader. And when Senate Democrats have largely already made up their minds to vote against Judge Kavanaugh and none of them have even met with him, their demand for a paper chase beyond relevant material sounds more and more like a demand for a taxpayer-funded fishing expedition.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR BOB RAY

Now, Madam President, I would like to address my colleagues in the U.S. Senate on the life and death of Governor Bob Ray, a wonderful Governor for the State of Iowa over a long period of time. I wish to honor him in this way.

I wish to pay tribute to my good friend and an exceptional Iowan whose life and legacy will be remembered in my home State for generations to come. As the people of Iowa mourn the loss of our 38th Governor, I would like to share about a few ways that Robert D. Ray made Iowa a better place to grow. Looking back at his lifetime of service, it seems nearly impossible that one person could wear so many hats and reach the highest rungs of distinguished service in both his private life and in the public sector.

After graduating from high school in 1946, Bob enlisted in the U.S. Army to serve his country that way. He returned from service and earned undergraduate and law degrees at Drake University in Des Moines, IA. He married the love of his life, Billie, and together they raised three daughters.

In addition to serving 14 years as our State's chief executive from 1969 to 1983, Governor Ray also served as our State party chairman at the age of 35, chairman of the National Governors Association, interim mayor of Des Moines, 11th president of Drake University, U.S. delegate to the United Nations Conference on Refugees, and CEO and board member to a number of non-profit and for-profit corporations.

Reading such an outstanding resume, one might come to the conclusion that this Iowan must have an outsized ego to match. To that, I can personally affirm that Bob Ray was a humble leader driven by a servant's heart. He brought honesty, dignity, and integrity to the campaign trail and, in turn, to State government.

His policy achievements as our 38th Governor made government work better for the people by reorganizing State government, such as the creation of the department of transportation, and modernizing the National Guard. Those are just a few of the reorganizations. But through doing this, he strengthened rock-solid Iowa values in education, conservation, good government, and fiscal stewardship. It was Governor Ray who signed Iowa's—we call it the bottle bill. You get a redemption for a can you return instead of throwing it in the dump. He signed it into law to keep our roadways clean and our State looking beautiful.

Arguably, the lasting measure of his governorship is defined by moral leadership, and particularly as evidenced after the fall of Saigon in 1975.

As a result of the ending of the Vietnam war, Governor Ray's actions transcended the riverbanks of America's heartland to reach thousands of refugees across the world. Those refugees were fleeing communism in Southeast Asia. Governor Ray persuaded Presi-

dent Ford to allow Iowa to welcome the Tai Dam to Iowa, allowing this close-knit ethnic group to stay intact and to resettle in Iowa.

In 1978, we had another wave of Southeast Asians who were desperate to escape communism in South Vietnam. They became known as the boat people who put their lives in peril for the pearl of freedom that we offer in America. Bob Ray put his political life on the line to open Iowa's homes and hearts to rescue them from suffering and death. In so doing, he saved the lives of thousands of people, including generations of new Iowans yet to be born.

Yet again, Governor Ray responded in 1979 to another humanitarian crisis going on in Southeast Asia by launching the Iowa SHARES Program. The acronym "SHARES" stands for Iowa "Sends Help to Aid Refugees and End Starvation." That very first year, the program raised more than \$600,000 in less than 1 month—small donations to send food and medicine to starving people on the Cambodian border. Volunteer nurses and doctors from Iowa also went to save these people, who suffered under the harsh Khmer Rouge regime of Pol Pot.

When one of those members of the boat people first learned of Governor Ray's passing, she was moved to tears. Now a wife and mother of five children, she prayed for Governor Ray, in fact referring to him as "Saint Bob Ray." She attributed his courage and generosity to saving thousands of people just like her.

At his funeral, Senator ERNST and I saw a whole part of the church filled with these Southeast Asians who very much wanted to express their appreciation for Governor Ray's leadership by being there at that funeral.

In 2005, Governor Ray received Iowa's highest civilian honor, the Iowan Award. It is a well-deserved honor for this legendary man of honor. He is a statesman, a humanitarian hero, and, of course, to those who loved him the most, he was a husband, dad, and grandpa.

Years after Governor Ray left the Governor's mansion, called Terrace Hill, he launched the Robert D. and Billie Ray Center at Drake University. That center's mission is dedicated to improving civility and developing ethical leaders at home and throughout the world. And for all of us, we know that in a society less civil now than it has been throughout most of the history of our country, that center is going to serve a very needed purpose. For those who know the story of Bob Ray, his ray of light connected with the center will inspire generations of leaders for years to come.

Barbara and I join our fellow Iowans in extending our condolences to Billie and the entire Ray family. We will miss this extraordinary Iowan. Our State benefited in countless ways because he shared his gift so generously to make Iowa an even better place to grow for generations to come.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that three eulogies that highlight Governor Ray's life as a Governor, political humanitarian, and a man with strong family values be printed in the RECORD.

These eulogies are from David Oman, who served as chief of staff to Governor Ray; Ken Quinn, a former U.S. Ambassador to Cambodia who worked on the refugee resettlement as a member of the Ray administration and today serves as president of the World Food Prize Foundation in Des Moines; and the third is from Scott Raecker, who serves as director of the Robert D. and Billie Ray Center at Drake University. I hope my colleagues will read these eulogies because there is no way that anything I say today can do justice to what they said in their separate eulogies.

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

ROBERT D. RAY EULOGY

DAVID OMAN

One more time, for the last time, Bob Ray has done what he did so often in life—bring people together, in this church, at the Capitol last evening, on social media, and in conversations.

Lessons from his life have been learned and re-learned this week, none better than the simple reminder that a keen mind, warm heart, and a bias for action—by one person—can cause great change, and uncork goodwill among so many.

Gov. Ray's life ended without regrets and remorse. Embracing his example, we're better able to live our lives with renewal and resolve.

Yesterday, a motorcade brought the Ray family past many touchpoints in Bob's and Billie's lives—Terrace Hill, Drake University, and Theodore Roosevelt High School.

President Roosevelt, in 1910, a year after leaving the White House, spoke in Paris about leadership, and making a difference.

He said, 'above all stands character, a man's force and courage, his good faith and sense of honor . . . self-restraint, common sense, the power of individual responsibility, and acting in conjunction with others.'

TR didn't know it, but he previewed the life of Robert D. Ray, or as we called him, RDR.

Another President Roosevelt, Franklin, died at the end of World War II. FDR and RDR had something in common—a very real human touch. During FDR's funeral, an aging African American man wept inconsolably on a Pennsylvania Ave. sidewalk.

A reporter approached timidly and asked, 'Did you know the President?' The man said, 'No . . . but he knew me.'

Good leaders, good people, know, in a broad sense—and in the moment—what other people feel and need.

Bob Ray had that quality. He knew Iowans, or as he liked to say 'our Iowans.'

People who had a two-minute phone call or 20 minute meeting, or just a handshake at the Fair, felt they mattered and were the most important person to Gov. Ray at the time . . . and they were.

Sometimes, Bob Ray wasn't aware of his impact.

Two years ago, at Wesley Acres, Gov. Ray wasn't in room 146, nor physical therapy or the lunch room. A nurse and I couldn't find him. It turned out he was in P.T.; he told us we'd been lost.

Then the nurse said to me 'Gov. Ray changed my life . . .' I asked her to tell me more.

It seems her late teen life was not good in 1969; she doubted herself. Then she listened to Gov. Ray's first Inaugural Address on the radio. She added, 'He talked about the future. He said the future was going to be better and brighter. I felt he was talking about me and my life. He gave me hope. My life turned out alright, and now, I get to help him.'

Gov. Ray spoke with thousands of Iowans through four of his campaigns in seven years, ending the two-year term era. Iowans quickly got to know his openness and decency . . . civility and sincerity . . . humanity and humor.

And who didn't love his smile?

That genuine persona stood in stark contrast to the erosion of trust in a Washington awash in Watergate. In '74, Bob Ray stood against the tide. He won 59% of the vote when nine other GOP governors were swept away. He acquired more momentum, if not a mandate.

Governor Ray knew how to campaign. He knew how to govern. And, he knew the difference.

The late Lt. Gov. Arthur Neu said, 'Ray would take his time making decisions, but when his mind was made up, he was a tough as nails.'

The other evening, I wrote down Ray policy initiatives and stopped at 30. Some were ahead of their time, some were copied by other states. They covered tax policy, streamlined government, education, conservation, human services, human rights, public safety, agriculture and transportation.

I can't list them all today. As they say about baseball stats . . . 'you can look 'em up.'

The Gov. would at times borrow or co-opt good ideas from Democrats. They didn't know whether to laugh or cry, but he always gave them credit.

Gov. Ray looked beyond the next year or cycle. He paired with Gov. Culver's father, Sen. Culver, to set up the Iowa 2000 project. In his first term, Gov. Vilsack cloned it with Iowa 2010.

In 1978, Gov. Ray came up with a new theme 'progress with stability' as part of a larger effort throughout his administration to better connect Iowa's cities and towns with rural Iowa.

In small towns he would nudge with nuance 'stability with progress.' Bob Ray communicated deftly. He was transparent with and respected the press. He helped define modern Iowa and did define the modern Iowa governorship.

With Billie Ray and three active daughters, the five defined the modern Iowa First Family.

We thank you for supporting him, and for your sacrifice.

A governor's work is never easy. Gov. Ray's four successors, all with us today, have said privately and publicly, over time and this week, how much they respected him and his leadership.

Bill Clinton was the 32 year-old Gov.-elect of Arkansas when he met Bob Ray, then 50, at the NGA 'new governors school' in November '78.

The two hit it off. It was Ray 'charisma' and Clinton 'charisma on steroids.'

Clinton credited Ray with mentoring him on how to be a good governor. When he would come to Des Moines as President in the 90s; he would often ask about Bob Ray and word would get back to us. Wednesday, President Clinton tweeted a heartfelt remembrance of his mentor and friend.

Ray met one Pope . . . but worked with seven Presidents. There is apparently no public record of what Richard Nixon thought of him. The tape recorders must have been turned off.

President Ford said, 'I relied heavily on Bob's good advice.'

President Reagan: 'The success you experienced was the product of good ideas, hard work, a whole lot of follow through—just what you'd expect to find in Iowa.'

President George H. W. Bush said this well, 'He never turned his back on the Party, but somehow transcended Party and made public service better.'

Like Bush 41 and Jimmy Carter with their post-Presidencies, Bob Ray also defined the role of 'former' governor.

His ongoing service as CEO, mayor, and Drake president was exemplary. Ray backed countless charities and good works. Once I told him 'you've supported about everything except 'Iowans for Term Limits.'

To close, in the years ahead, governors and perhaps Presidents like Ronald Reagan was, will be in Room 9 of the Capitol. Gov. Branstad fittingly designated it the 'Robert D. Ray Conference Room.'

Governors have made many important decisions in that room, including Ray's to relocate and welcome legal political refugees to Iowa.

Future governors will see a large, wonderful oil painting of Gov. Ray. That portrait is behind me. It returns to the Governor's Office today.

Next year, or 2028, or 2046 (Iowa's Bicentennial year) or any year, governors will sit in the Ray Conference Room—coping with complicated, controversial, even morality laden decisions.

Our Iowans and future Iowans can hope those governors pause, in deliberative, decisive moments, look up at the portrait, and think . . .

What would Robert D. Ray do?
How would he lead?

EULOGY FOR GOVERNOR ROBERT D. RAY

AMBASSADOR KENNETH M. QUINN

One of the first refugees Governor Ray rescued and resettled in Iowa was a young man who was trapped in one of the most treacherous and threatening environments on earth—Washington, D.C. That person he rescued was me.

He brought me and my wife Le Son and our children home to Iowa where we became part of Governor Ray's extended family. For 4 years, I worked closely with the Governor on many of his humanitarian endeavors.

A few weeks ago, I was with Governor and Mrs. Ray recalling many of these experiences—and a flood of memories came back about when we were together, including:

—In the winter of 1975, at the celebration for the Tai Dam refugees from Laos, whom he had rescued and resettled together in Iowa in order to preserve their culture, language and kinship. The Tai Dam had written to every Governor in America, but Robert Ray was the only Governor to answer their plea. He convinced President Ford to permit all of the Tai Dam to come to Iowa. They have been here ever since.

—Or, on a cold January night in 1979, while he and I watched the video of a boat filled with Vietnamese 'boat people' refugees, who had escaped from Communist oppression only to be pushed back out to sea by local officials fearful of being inundated because no country in the world, including the United States, was accepting any more refugees from Indochina. We watched in horror as their boat broke up in the waves, with the refugees drowning before our eyes.

This so impacted Governor Ray that he wrote late that very night to the President, saying that Iowa would double the number of refugees it had resettled if only the President would reopen America's doors.

His letter and lobbying in Washington worked! America's doors were reopened.

—Six months later, in June 1979 we were together in Geneva, Switzerland, at the UN conference on the Boat People, where Vice President Walter Mondale announced that America would accept 168,000 new refugees each year. This led to over 1,000,000 refugees from Indochina eventually being resettled in the United States.

The assembled diplomatic delegations gave a spontaneous standing ovation to America's humanitarian leadership, a leadership that began when Robert D. Ray became the first governing official anywhere in the world to say he would accept the Boat People refugees.

—A few months later in October 1979, I was with Governor Ray at Living History Farm in Des Moines, as Pope John Paul II appeared before 350,000 people. Among those bringing the gifts to the Pope to celebrate Mass were Vietnamese Catholic refugees in their colorful native dress.

—Two weeks later the Governor and Mrs. Ray and I were at a place called Sa Kaew in Thailand where 30,000 victims of the Cambodian genocide were lying strewn across a field. Emaciated, starving and beset with disease, they were dying at the rate of 50–100 a day, with their bodies being bulldozed into mass graves.

—This scene of incredible human suffering led Governor Ray to create Iowa SHARES. Iowa Sends Help to Aid Refugees and End Starvation. With contributions by Iowans across the state, we rushed food and medicine that arrived on Christmas Day, to feed people who had been eating insects to survive. This was followed by volunteer Iowa doctors and nurses. Together this saved thousands of lives.

—On that same trip, we were in Nong Khai in Thailand, where the Tai Dam, Lao and Hmong refugees were waiting uncertain about their fate. These refugees said they wanted to show us their “symbol of hope.” They took us across a muddy field to a thatched hut. Beckoning us to look inside, they said “there is our symbol.” Tacked on the wall was the Iowa Department of Transportation highway map. Governor Robert Ray had made the shape of our state a symbol of hope for people languishing in a refugee camp 12,000 miles from Iowa.

—There was one other event where neither the Governor nor I were present but which has great meaning for today. In 2004, the Catholic Bishop of Des Moines visited a very ill Pope John Paul II. When the Bishop reminded the Pontiff of his visit to Living History Farms, the Pope heard “Iowa”—in a halting voice the frail Pope said—“Iowa . . . Farms . . . Refugees.” The man who put the words Iowa and Refugees on the lips of a dying Pope, and who made the shape of Iowa a symbol of hope around the world, was Governor Robert D. Ray.

The common thread in all of these experiences was that Governor Ray was driven by moral impulses planted deep inside him by his parents, the educational institutions he attended, and his religion, and nurtured by his wife Billie and his children.

When confronted by scenes of human suffering, Robert Ray responded, not as a political candidate doing an electoral calculation, but as a Christian following a moral imperative from the parable of the Good Samaritan.

—Robert D. Ray saw that his obligation was to his fellow human beings who were suffering and dying, even if the color of their skin, the language they spoke, and the religion they followed were all different from his own;

—Or, even if they were thousands and thousands of miles away on the other side of our planet, or adrift in the ocean.

Through his actions, Governor Robert Ray answered the eternal question—“Am I my brother's keeper?”

Even though the impact of Robert Ray's leadership would often occur far from Iowa; The one story that most poignantly captures Robert Ray's humanitarian legacy and his place in the pantheon of Iowa's greatest heroes took place about 10 years ago, not in the Governor's office or far from Iowa, but in a supermarket in West Des Moines.

As Governor Ray described it to me, he and Mrs. Ray were shopping for groceries, pushing their cart down the aisle, when, as can happen, they almost bumped into a cart being pushed by another shopper—in this case, an Asian man.

When he saw it was Governor Ray, the man stopped; walked over to the Governor and extending his hand, said “you saved my life. I just want to say thank you.”

Today thousands of Tai Dam, Lao, Hmong, Cambodians and Vietnamese who live in Iowa just want to say thank you. In a very real sense, Governor Robert Ray saved them all.

And all of us, whom he made so proud to say we are Iowans—we just want to say thank you.

Governor Ray uplifted my life. He uplifted all of our lives. And his legacy will uplift countless, thousands and thousands of others far into the future.

GOVERNOR ROBERT D. RAY—FAMILY EULOGY J. SCOTT RAECKER

On behalf of Mrs. Ray and the entire Ray family I want to express their sincere appreciation for the outpouring of love, support and prayers at this time. They have asked for me to share that following the service there will be a reception at The Robert D. and Billie Ray Center on the Drake campus—which is walking distance from the church.

So here we are Mrs. Ray, back at First Christian Church where your lifelong love story with Governor Ray started 73 years ago. You met through this church and church camp where you were elected King and Queen. You became high school sweethearts—you the smart looking girl with the car and Governor Ray the shy school-boy athlete.

Together we've looked at the pictures of the two of you in those early years—you and Governor Ray had a youthful twinkle in your eyes and a shining smile that said—“I'm in love”—and that's one thing that did not change over all these years.

Recently you told me that in the last several months it was just nice to sit and hold hands and tell each other “I love you”—and as I observed these moments, I saw that same twinkle and shining smile in both of you—and, oh my heavens, it still radiated—I'm so in love.

You also shared that you never had a fight—and I believe you. However, with all due respect, it has come to my attention through an un-named grandchild that there were a few disagreements—mostly over ice cream at McDonalds, and they were resolved with another Diet Coke and a loving grandpa slipping a dollar under the table to a very happy granddaughter.

In your understated way you told me he was a “special person”—which he was—and together you were spectacular . . . you were always his beloved Billie Lee—and you most certainly were his beloved soul mate.

Mrs. Ray, here is the message for the rest of us today—if there is an aspect of Governor Ray's life that should inspire us, and we should seek to emulate, it should be this—his excellence as a man devoted to his family—and that passion was rooted deeply in his faith, his love for you and his desire to serve others in love.

It's no secret that Governor Ray's favorite titles in life were husband, father and grand-

father—and he took them seriously—and with good humor.

It has been said that you can tell what kind of parent you are by how your grandchildren turn out—and how your children care for you as you age. And by all measures Mrs. Ray—you and the Governor were an extreme success.

Randi, Lu Ann and Vicki, he loved you girls—unconditionally. And, a gift he gave you . . . is that you all know that fact.

Whether singing out to you as his “Miss America” or, telling you at a time you needed to hear it the most, that “you are always beautiful in my eyes”—he loved you in actions that reflected his words.

And even when some boundaries needed to be set (you know what I'm talking about), that was also done in love, sometimes frustratingly so for you as he always wanted to talk things out and think through the best resolutions and consequences.

He was your hero, he was patient and calm, and even in the darkest moments he looked for the positive. He was inclusive as reflected best in his love for you son-in-laws.

And one of the things I have heard, and seen from you as daughters, and the grandchildren as well, is this—his admonition to “Do more, speak less—and if you have to speak, think before you speak.”

Now for you grandchildren, Robert, Jeffrey, Billie Ray, John, Michael, Emma, Leah and Sadie—he absolutely adored and cherished you—he was so proud of each of you. He talked more about you than anything else. And, he loved taking pictures of you.

I've watched you grow up directly, or through his stories, and see so many traits of him in each of you. In fact, you shared with me the traits you possess that you saw in your grandpa. And here they are, listen closely . . .

Empathy, kindness, humor, humility, honesty, sense of justice, respect, compassion, considerate, loyal, self-confident, attention to detail, positive, caring, adventurous spirit, modest, selfless, charisma, perseverance, appreciation for other cultures, a good and sometimes slow decision-maker, a genuine and good hearted person, never mad, peace-seeking and relationship centered.

And of course, love of ice cream and chocolate chip cookies.

You also shared that one of the qualities you admired most about him was that he was always “more interested in your opinion than telling you his opinion.” A good lesson for all of us.

And I loved this trait you shared—he adored my grandma—and so do I.

Think of this list for a minute—these are the traits that emanate from you—that is what a lasting legacy looks like. And each of you grandchildren will continue to make your lives, and the world, a better place because of these traits.

And, for the rest of us, these are qualities we also saw in your grandpa that continue to shape our lives.

When you unpack the list and look deeply into the character qualities you share with your grandpa—there is something that resonates clearly—and for your grandpa it was developed in this church early in his life.

They are called “fruits of the Spirit”—they are found in Galatians 5 and they define your grandfather's life—they are “love, joy, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control.”

Of these fruits of Governor Ray's spirit, love was first and foremost—and the fruits of his spirit were these words . . . in action.

Mrs. Ray, Randi, Lu Ann, Vicki, grandchildren, and the entire family—Governor Ray's family legacy lives on in you and is a lesson for all of us.

His faith driven love served us all—and while most directly to you the family—he

also served those of us who were blessed to call him a friend.

Governor Ray loved quotes and we shared many over the years. One that I gave him that he liked was from Richard Bach who said:

“The bond that links your true family is not one of blood, but of respect and joy in each other’s life. Rarely do members of one family grow up under the same roof.”

I thought of this quote as I spoke with Tai Dam refugee and family friend, Som Baccam, this week when she referred to Governor Ray as her ‘savior’—and he literally was.

Savior is a strong and powerful word, and when I reflect on times Governor Ray used that word in our discussions about faith—he talked about how his Savior demonstrated unconditional love—sacrificial love—service love—so that we could love others and know our eternal home.

Governor Ray has left our earthly home and created a void in our lives . . . and that hurts, however, I would challenge us to think that the real void would be if we had never had his presence in our lives.

Governor Ray set the standard for how to treat people . . . and we can all be better people if we look to Governor Ray as a model.

For me, and I hope for each of you, I want to be a better person each day because of Governor Ray and his presence in my life. I’ve felt that way since the day I met him . . . and I will for the rest of my life.

The inspiration of Governor Ray’s life is that we shine our light in the lives of others when we demonstrate love—and we must remember to shine that light first and foremost with our family and friends.

I challenge us all to honor his legacy by aspiring to be better people—by shining our light in our homes, with our family—and with our friends.

Letting our light shine may be his most important lesson.

One more time—Governor Ray leading the way.

REMEMBERING EUGENE SUKUP

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I wish to recognize a friend, an agricultural innovator, an inventor with I think about 80 patents. His name is Eugene Sukup.

If you travel around the Midwest, you will see there are grain operations on a lot of family farms. If you go to Haiti, as a result of the catastrophe down there a few years ago, you will see how smaller buildings that we would call grain storage facilities in Iowa serve as homes for homeless people. That resulted from that catastrophe.

Eugene Sukup is a quintessential bootstrap American success story. After settling in Iowa during the Dust Bowl and serving his Nation as a sergeant in the National Guard, Eugene made his living as a farmer, earning the title of “Franklin County Outstanding Farmer” in his younger years, in 1962.

While working on his farm, like a lot of farmers, he tried to think of easier ways to do things. He observed that pockets of grain—particularly corn—housed in storage bins could overheat and, as a result, spoil. Understanding the depth and breadth of the problem for farmers across the country, he was determined to find a solution, and he did. Through trial and error, along

with gritty determination and ingenuity, Eugene came up with something he entitled the “Stirway Stirring Machine.” The innovative technology automated the process of stirring stored grain and corn and became an instant success among his fellow farmers. Eugene patented his invention and founded the Sukup Manufacturing Company in 1963.

Through my years holding annual meetings in each of Iowa’s 99 counties, Sukup Manufacturing from time to time has hosted the meetings I have in Franklin County. After a tour of the factory, I always enjoyed Eugene’s allowing his employees to have an open Q&A session with me so that I could hear what is on the minds of my constituents, because these constituents can’t afford to leave their jobs and come to the courthouse to ask me questions. I try to go to people like them to make the process of a representative government work, and the best way to do that is face-to-face with your constituents.

Getting back to Sukup Manufacturing, by words and deeds, it is very clear that Sukup Manufacturing is a great place to work and a devoted contributor to the local community and global philanthropy. Fifty-five years later, the Sukup Manufacturing Company—which was the idea of a small family farmer—holds over 80 patents and sells its products in more than 85 countries. It remains the largest family-owned, full-line grain system manufacturer, employing more than 700 employees in the community of Sheffield, IA, and if I had to guess its population, I would say it is around 1,500.

Eugene’s pioneering invention contributed to the success of tens of thousands of farming operations, allowing farmers to safely store their grain on their farms to capture the best market price. We have Sukup grain bins on my own family farm near Waterloo, IA; more specifically, the little village in New Hartford, IA. His ingenuity is a perfect example of the opportunity America’s economic system gives people with ideas and drive.

Eugene’s legacy spans Iowa’s landscape from the Mississippi River to the Missouri River and reaches beyond the borders of our State and the borders of the United States. Sukup Manufacturing stepped up to reconfigure grain bins into housing units, as I previously said, for hurricane-ravaged Haiti. The units withstand 140-mile-per-hour winds, providing a safe habitat for residents.

In 2006, Eugene was inducted into Iowa’s Inventors Hall of Fame and received the Outstanding Innovation Award by the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers. He was inducted into Iowa’s Business Hall of Fame in 2011 and was named a Legend in Manufacturing by Elevate Advanced Manufacturing in 2015.

Through Eugene and its leaders, the Sukup family business has been a constant voice for job creation and oppor-

tunity. His contribution to manufacturing, agriculture, and the entire rural community and our economy will be an asset to farmers and the agriculture community for generations to come. It is amazing to think of what can happen in rural and small towns throughout our country thanks to the successful enterprise that Eugene Sukup represents.

Throughout our decades-long friendship, I have admired his relentless work ethic and unwavering commitment to community and family. His civil, political, and community leadership sets a very high bar for the rest of us in America.

Eugene was an American inventor, innovator, and a great friend. He will be greatly missed. May God bless him and his beloved family.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise in strong opposition to the nomination of Ryan Bounds to be a judge on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Bounds, who, if confirmed, would serve on a Ninth Circuit seat in the State of Oregon, has received zero blue slips. He is opposed by both Senators from the State in which he would sit if confirmed.

Never before in the 100-year history of blue slips has a nominee been confirmed over the opposition of both home-State Senators. The Republican majority is setting a precedent here, and all of our home States are at risk of being impacted by this.

By moving this nominee without blue slips, Republicans are diminishing the voice that home-State constituents have through their Senators in the process of selecting judges in their States.

Let me make it clear to my Republican colleagues: If you vote to confirm Ryan Bounds, you are consenting to a precedent that is likely to affect your state someday. Consider your vote carefully.

It is hard to understand why my Republican colleagues would abandon the blue slip for the sake of this particular nominee. Mr. Bounds has written and published articles that should disqualify him from consideration for a Federal judgeship.

Consider how the Multnomah Bar Association in Oregon—a bar association that Mr. Bounds has belonged to for 12 years—described Mr. Bounds’ articles in a statement after the writings were revealed.

The association said Bounds’ writings “express insensitive, intolerant, and disdainful views toward racial and ethnic minorities, campus sexual assault victims, and the LGBTQ community.”

The statement went on to say that the bar association “strongly disavows the views expressed in those articles as racist, misogynistic, homophobic and disparaging of survivors of sexual assault and abuse.”

Mr. Bounds’ writings, which he published in college, included his discussions about the “more strident racial factions of the student body.”

His writings mocked LGBTQ students for being sensitive when a group of drunk athletes vandalized a statue celebrating gay pride.

He mocked Latino students for being overly sensitive when they complained about the termination of a Latino administrator.

Then he wrote this, in an article about sexual assault on campus: “There is really nothing inherently wrong with the University failing to punish an alleged rapist—regardless his guilt—in the absence of adequate certainty; there is nothing that the University can do to objectively ensure that the rapist does not strike again. Only the legal system can do that, and if it lacks the certainty to do so, it is not necessarily up to the University to stick it to the suspect, anyway, just in case. Expelling students is probably not going to contribute a great deal toward a rape victim’s recovery; there is no moral imperative to risk egregious error in doing so.”

Not only did Mr. Bounds publish these writings, but he chose not to share his writings with Oregon’s judicial selection committee even though the committee had asked him to disclose any potentially controversial materials.

Mr. Bounds said he didn’t think he needed to disclose any information to the committee that preceded his time at law school.

As Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY pointed out in a letter to Chairman GRASSLEY, Mr. Bounds did share with the Oregon committee information about his high school days. He just conveniently left out his intolerant publications from college.

As Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY said in their letter, “Mr. Bounds’ failure to disclose these writings, and the nature of these writings themselves, demonstrate a substantial lack of judgment that is unsuitable for a nominee for a lifetime appointment.”

This is not a close call. The Senate should not be moving forward with Mr. Bounds’ nomination on process or substance.

Republicans are failing to be responsible stewards of nominations. The fact that Senate Republicans are moving forward with this nomination is a troubling sign for how Republicans will handle the Supreme Court vacancy.

All too often, Senate Republicans are failing to serve as a meaningful check and balance on President Trump when it comes to nominations.

Last week, 50 Senate Republicans voted to confirm an unqualified lawyer who had represented a suspicious Russian bank as the head of the Justice Department’s Criminal Division.

This week Republicans already voted to confirm Andrew Oldham, a 39-year-old circuit court nominee who refused to say whether he thought Brown v. Board of Education was correctly decided and who has described the Supreme Court as “the most dangerous branch.”

Now, Senate Republicans are looking to confirm Mr. Bounds, who has shown terrible judgment with his published writings and with his failure to be forthcoming about them.

Senators have a constitutional obligation to scrutinize these nominees and to vote no if the nominees lack the experience, temperament, or judgment to be a fair and impartial judge. The Senate should not be a rubberstamp, but under President Trump, all too often, it has been.

I know Senate Republicans like to say it is unfair to nominees if we hold them accountable for their records. My Republican colleagues have been coming to the floor, day after day, complaining about what they see as unfair scrutiny of the Kavanaugh Supreme Court nomination.

Do they have amnesia? I would remind them that no Supreme Court nominee in history has ever been treated worse than Merrick Garland was treated by Senate Republicans in 2016. Senator MCCONNELL wouldn’t even allow Judge Garland a hearing or the courtesy of a meeting.

The treatment of Merrick Garland was unprecedented, and it was disrespectful. His record and reputation were torn apart by Republicans who never gave him a chance to respond in an open hearing. Even Judge Bork got a hearing and a vote.

I hope my Republican colleagues are not going to simply rubberstamp President Trump’s nominees. So many of these nominees are extreme. We need to review their full records and consider them carefully before voting to confirm them for life.

I have carefully considered Mr. Bounds’ nomination, and I will vote no. I urge my colleagues in both parties to join me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

CUBA

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to give tribute to the spirit of the Cuban people—the people of my forefathers, who still live under a corrupt and violent Communist regime—and to honor the memory of Oswaldo Paya. Oswaldo was a champion for freedom. He died 6 years ago this Sunday, on July 22, 2012, in a car crash that is widely believed to have been orchestrated by the Castro regime.

The plight of the brave people of Cuba has been marked by terrible suffering under both the Castro regime and the brutal dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista before it. The Castros and their revolutionary terrorist lackeys, like Che Guevara, are responsible for the suffering and murder of countless innocent Cubans. It is because of these oppressors that my family fled their beloved home in Cuba for a better life in the United States.

My father, born and raised in Cuba, fought in the revolution, initially believing that the principles of freedom were what the revolution was all about. He fought against Batista, a

cruel dictator, and he was imprisoned and tortured by Batista’s thugs.

Then my aunt, his younger sister, my tia Sonia—who was there after the revolution succeeded, who discovered along with the rest of the world that Fidel Castro was a Communist, who saw the torture and the murder—my aunt fought in the counterrevolution against Fidel Castro, and she, too, like her brother, was imprisoned and tortured, except this time by Castro’s thugs.

Both my father and my aunt were kids. They were kids who believed they were fighting for freedom, and they discovered they went from one tyrant to an even worse tyrant, a Communist dictator who would line up dissidents and shoot them.

The betrayal, the brutality, and the violence experienced by my father and by my aunt were all too typical of the millions of Cubans who have suffered under the Castro regime of the last six decades. Fidel may be dead, Raul may be retired, but the evil of the Castros persists. It still molds the Cuban regime’s fundamental opposition to truth, to freedom, and to human rights.

But the malice and menace of communism cannot break down the will of the Cuban people. Instead, it has strengthened their resolve. It has further united them to fight for freedom and build a better future for their country, to establish a free Cuba—a Cuba not streaked by the ashes of dissident literature or littered with the corpses of defenseless teenagers; a Cuba built on human decency and individual liberty, where citizens are heard, not murdered, and speech is protected, not silenced. It is the Cuba envisioned by Oswaldo Paya Sardinias, his Christian Liberation Movement, and their fellow activists who continue to stand against the Castro regime. It is the Cuba of the young bloggers who expose the regime’s crimes and corruption at the risk of arrest, deportation, torture, or worse.

With time, the oppressions of the Castro regime gave rise to remarkable leaders like Oswaldo Paya, whose life’s work was the peaceful overthrow of communism and whose legacy we honor today. Oswaldo dedicated his life to promoting democratic freedoms and human rights in Cuba. His memory continues to inspire dissidents in Cuba and in other countries under tyrannical rule, countries like Venezuela, where Nicolas Maduro routinely imprisons and murders those who dare speak out against him, or Nicaragua, where the corrupt Ortega regime desperately clings to power by persecuting journalists and violently putting down protesters.

Last year, I introduced legislation to commemorate Oswaldo’s legacy by naming the street in front of the Embassy of Cuba, located right here in Washington, as “Oswaldo Paya Way.” It would send a powerful statement that here in the United States of America, we stand with freedom fighters

like Oswaldo Paya who are working to bring hope and liberty to oppressed nations, who are working to make a better Cuba, free of the horrors of Communist rule.

I have never been to my father's homeland. I have never been to Cuba. My father has not returned to Cuba in over 60 years. I look forward to one day visiting Cuba, hopefully with my dad, with my tia Sonia, my cousin Bibi, with my whole family, my two girls, and seeing a free Cuba—where people can live according to their beliefs without fear of imprisonment, violence, or oppression, but today is not that day.

There are many, like Oswaldo, who have fought for this vision for a free Cuba, who are no longer with us, but their struggle will endure, and their spirits will shine a light through the darkest nights. We will never forget them, nor cease fighting to bring about the free Cuba they died for. Today, and on July 22, and each day thereafter, they will be remembered, "Viva Cuba libre."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, soon, the Senate will vote on the Ryan Bounds nomination, and I want to make sure each Member of the Senate is aware of two important issues as they prepare to cast their votes on the Bounds nomination to serve on the Ninth Circuit.

First, Mr. Bounds flagrantly misrepresented his background to our bipartisan Oregon judicial selection committee. This is the committee that was tasked with vetting his nomination—a process I have worked on with Republicans for literally two decades. I was pleased to work with our former colleague Senator Smith on this. I worked with the late Mark Hatfield on this. Now it is a pleasure to work with Senator MERKLEY, and the bipartisan efforts we have had produced this selection, a process. Mr. Bounds misrepresented—in my view, really lied—as he covered up disturbing, intolerant writings from his past.

Among many hateful matters he wrote about, he defended homophobic vandals who damaged a gay pride monument. He argued against efforts to protect the survivors of sexual assault on college campuses because, he wrote, he didn't think that would guarantee absolute safety.

As I indicated earlier, what outraged me, and shocked me, was his comparison of organizations that promote multiculturalism and tolerance in America to Nazi rallies. I am the child of Jewish parents who fled Nazi terror in Germany. Not all of our family got out. My great Uncle Max was among the last to be gassed at Auschwitz. For Mr. Bounds to compare groups that lift up minorities in America to Nazis is an extraordinary and dark stain on his character. For him to have concealed these writings from Oregon's bipartisan selection committee is disqualifying.

He never acknowledged these writings until they were uncovered and then posed a threat to his nomination. To this day, he has not fully recanted the abhorrent views that are reflected in that content. Five of the seven members of the bipartisan judicial selection committee, including the Chair, said recently they would not have included Mr. Bounds among their recommended candidates had they known about the writings as he was vetted.

Our bipartisan committee forwarded Mr. Bounds' name, along with others, as part of this process, and they said if Mr. Bounds had been straight with them, he would have told them about these offensive writings, but he misled them by keeping that secret.

The second issue, this is the first time in the 101-year history of what is called the blue-slip process where a nomination moved forward without a blue slip from either home State Senator. Senator MERKLEY and I withheld our blue slips specifically because of what I described, these lies about omission. We didn't consent to a hearing, a debate on the floor, but Chairman GRASSLEY and Majority Leader MCCONNELL barreled right ahead.

Leader MCCONNELL even told the New York Times that blue slips ought to be viewed as nothing more than an indication of how Senators might vote on a given nominee. That was not the tune Republicans were singing in 2009. Democrats then occupied the Oval Office, held the gavel of the Judiciary Committee, and every Member—every Member—of this body who sat on that side of the Chamber in the Republican conference sent a letter to President Obama and then-Chairman LEAHY saying that the nomination's process was "needlessly acrimonious." They wanted to return to an era of bipartisanship. Then, they said:

We hope your Administration will consult with us as it considers possible nominations to the federal courts from our states. Regretfully, if we are not consulted on, and approve of, a nomination from our states, the Republican Conference will be unable to support moving forward to that nominee.

In 2009, while in the minority, everyone who sat on that side of the Chamber rushed to defend blue slips as a statement of senatorial courtesy and collegiality. What a difference a few years makes.

What is happening now cheapens the advice and consent role of the Senate, something delegated to us by the Founding Fathers. The White House wants the Senate to act as a rubberstamp on whatever nominees are sent our way. The majority seems perfectly willing to go along with that.

My colleagues on the other side need to be aware of the new reality—this new reality where the blue slips don't matter—they are creating. This is going to be the end of the blue-slip process as it has worked in the Senate to promote good government on both sides of the aisle. This breach of a cen-

tury of bipartisan protocol is going to further drive the judiciary to the partisan extremes.

As we consider this nomination in a few minutes, this means lights-out—lights-out—for this important bipartisan tradition. The nominee we will be voting on concealed disturbing, intolerant writings from his past, misleading the bipartisan committee that reviewed his candidacy. Moving his nomination forward, in the face of that information and without the blue slips from Senator MERKLEY and myself, destroys more than a century of bipartisan tradition and certainly expands the power of the executive branch of the President.

What we learned earlier this week is it would take only one U.S. Senator on the other side—of all the people sitting over there, it would take only one to stop this abomination of a process. I hope one of my colleagues will be swayed by the horrendous writings Mr. Bounds lied to conceal.

This has been a sad moment for the Senate and a rejection of the kind of bipartisanship this body ought to bring to judicial nominations, the kind of bipartisanship I have been honored to be part of in Oregon for two decades. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Bounds nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Michigan.

FAST-GROWING STARTUP COMPANIES

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, when you think about fast-growing startup companies, you might think about Silicon Valley, Boston, or Boulder. Though all these cities certainly have very vibrant ecosystems, innovative startups and small businesses are launching and growing across the United States, including in my home State of Michigan.

In every State, there are hard-working entrepreneurs who have established job-creating startups. These dynamic companies act as business leaders, innovators, and job creators within our communities.

This is why I am working with Senators WARREN, TILLIS, and SCOTT to commemorate Startup Week Across America and celebrate the ingenuity and entrepreneurship in our States and across the country. I kicked off this annual event in 2013 while serving in the House of Representatives. In the years since, I have had the privilege of visiting startups in Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Traverse City.

I have met with business founders who code apps for Fortune 500 companies, design and produce high-end jeans and other denim products, and grow and deliver farm-fresh products.

This Monday I visited Ferris Wheel, a new coworking space in Flint, MI, a community of hard-working Michiganders who are focused on their future.

The people of Flint are committed to building a stronger, healthier, more prosperous community, and they are

committed to doing it together. You can see this in their schools and their churches and nonprofits, and you can see this in their startups and small businesses.

One of the best parts about starting a business in Flint is 100K Ideas, a non-profit staffed by university students committed to helping entrepreneurs start their companies. This group is named in honor of the 100,000 residents of Flint and inspired by the thought that if they could pull one idea from every local resident, they could change the world.

This week, I had the chance to learn about a few of these new ideas. I met Kiara Tyler, the founder of Kalm Clothing. She moved the furniture out of her apartment to make room for inventory and stocked boxes of overalls and track suits where her couch used to be, while using her car as the company's headquarters. Now Kiara has done over \$100,000 worth of business. She is selling her clothing online, and she has space for her office and inventory at Ferris Wheel. Flint is her home, and she is excited to stay and to build her business in Michigan.

I learned about Article One Eyewear, a company that has taken on office space next door to her. They sell handcrafted eyeglasses and donate a portion of their proceeds to combat vitamin A deficiency and to fight blindness in developing nations.

I also met with SkyPoint Ventures, a true homegrown Michigan story. While they are a for-profit investment fund, they have also committed to social benefit projects and making Flint a better place to live and to do business. In addition to investing in companies like Article One, SkyPoint renovated the Ferris Building to create the Ferris Wheel coworking space and commit to the growing community of startups in the city of Flint.

Successful business growth comes down to matching talent to capital, and the United States does this better than any other country in the world. I am proud to say that I had a chance to see this happening firsthand in Flint and across the State of Michigan.

Michigan, in fact, has one of the fastest growing venture capital communities in the entire Nation, a critical asset that will help us become the startup capital of the Midwest. We have world-class colleges and universities, more engineers per capita than any other part of the country, and the infrastructure to export not just nationally but global as well.

I know that if we keep pulling together as a community and harness 100,000 ideas and beyond, Flint's future is bright. I know that Michigan's small businesses and startups will help to lead the way to new innovations that will revolutionize our economy.

I am committed to ensuring that our growing startup communities will be a fixture of creativity, innovation, and job creation for decades to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, today I rise to voice my support for the brave men and women of America's Immigration and Customs Enforcement, also known as ICE. Unfortunately, a resolution that would have shown this body's unanimous support for these courageous individuals was blocked.

While the Border Patrol has the important mission of maintaining security at our borders, ICE agents have the critical mission of enforcing immigration laws inside the United States. These two work hand in hand. Our Nation cannot have border security without enforcing our laws inside communities, and we cannot have secure communities without enforcing our laws at our borders.

The critical mission of ICE goes far beyond just immigration enforcement. These folks are on the frontlines of our homeland security.

Here is just a short list of the types of activities ICE is involved in: one, investigating and combating drug smuggling, pretty important; stopping human trafficking; preventing gang-related crimes; and working with other law enforcement entities to stop criminal and terrorist networks from operating.

Iowa, along with the rest of the country, has been gripped by an opioid crisis that puts our people and our safety at risk. Additionally, we continue to have a very grave methamphetamine issue that threatens the core of many of our already struggling rural communities.

We need ICE to help stop the flow of these drugs into Iowa's communities, our schools, our workplaces, and to our children and our families. In 2017 alone, ICE enforcement and removal operations seized nearly 1 million pounds of narcotics—1 million pounds of narcotics seized by ICE. Abolishing ICE would turn the flow of illegal drugs across the border from a stream into a monsoon.

I also implore anyone challenging the need for ICE to look at the horrendous toll of human trafficking: young and innocent women and men, boys and girls used as human pawns, smuggled across the border with hopes of a better life, forced into prostitution or worse—raped, beaten, subjected to sexual diseases and stripped of all innocence and dignity.

Sadly, human trafficking is a major issue in Iowa. In 2016, for instance, Des Moines was identified as one of the country's top 100 human trafficking locations. That information came to us from our good friends at Polaris, which is an anti-trafficking organization.

Human traffickers often exploit our immigration laws to transport their victims, and our ICE agents are the ones who help to stop them and to stop their illicit activities.

Every day, 24/7, 365 days a year, ICE agents are on the frontlines. They are

working to dismantle human trafficking networks and protect our most vulnerable.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their objections and to support not only the resolution but to support those officers and personnel who carry out the vital mission of Immigration and Customs Enforcement in order to ensure the safety and security of all Americans.

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

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

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss what is on so many Americans' minds today and the last couple of days—President Trump's recent trip to Europe, his meeting with Vladimir Putin, and his comments about Russia's interference in our elections.

So many Pennsylvanians—and I am sure this is true in every other State—have called or written to our office this week in complete disbelief asking: What is next? Where do we go from here?

These are good questions. They are critically important questions.

This President's views on Russia's past actions and the way forward have seemed to change every day this week.

Rather than focus on the news cycle following the Helsinki summit, I want to take a minute to review where things stood before—before—the President went to Europe.

Relations between the United States and Russia have been deteriorating for some time. We know that. The Russian Federation is clearly and unequivocally our adversary. Vladimir Putin envisions a world more closely resembling the Cold War era, certainly, than compared to today's realities, and he works toward a resurgence of Russian power and influence every day.

Just take a few examples. Russia attacked, annexed, and continues to illegally occupy Crimea. Russian-backed forces continue to violate cease-fire agreements in Ukraine and destabilize other parts of that country, preventing the Ukrainian people from fulfilling their dream of a secure and prosperous nation.

Russia is backing and enabling the murderous Assad regime in Syria. The conflict has emboldened terrorist groups, had dramatic humanitarian impacts, and has threatened the region's stability. As many as a half million people have been killed, and half the country has been displaced.

Just imagine if half of our population, say 150 million people, were displaced from their homes, sometimes to another part of the country and sometimes to a completely different country. That is the reality in Syria since

2011, and Russia has prolonged and exacerbated the Syrian people's suffering for its own power projection.

No. 4, Russia is also developing a stronger relationship with the Iranian regime and is reportedly considering arms sales and boosting their economic relationship. This threatens not only our national security interests in the Middle East but also those security interests of our staunchest ally, Israel.

Finally, Russia continues to have a substantial nuclear arsenal. It has violated the INF Treaty, and according to the Defense Department, is developing low-yield, nonstrategic nuclear weapons that could threaten our allies and partners.

Russia uses any number of tools, from manipulation of the energy supply to arms sales, to loans and aid to promote its brand of corrupt authoritarian governance around the world. It also employs nefarious means like hacking, espionage, and sowing false information to meddle in the most fundamental parts of our great democracy—our elections and, of course, those of other countries.

I don't think it is wrong for a United States President to meet with a hostile foreign leader. That is part of the job.

What is dead wrong is to sit across from a hostile foreign leader, one on one, with no notes, no staff, and to fail completely—completely—at your core mission, your job, which is protecting the national security interests of the American people.

To many people, it might seem odd to be focused on who was or wasn't in the room or whether any notes were taken, but without them, there is absolutely no accountability for what was said. We hear that the Russian military—let me say that again—the Russian military is ready to start implementing the agreements reached between President Trump and Vladimir Putin in that room.

We have to ask the President of the United States, what agreements? What did you agree to in that room? What did the leader of our Nation agree to that the Russian military is so eager to start implementing?

Further, there seems to have been some discussion between President Trump and Vladimir Putin about the Russian Government's interest in interrogating U.S. citizens, like former Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul. Yesterday, we heard the White House say the President was giving that absurd proposal serious consideration. Of course Putin wants to question Ambassador McFaul. He is an expert on Russia who served our country honorably as Ambassador and as a public servant. He stood up to Russian aggression and promoted U.S. national security interests, especially when they contradicted Moscow's agenda.

The idea that we would entertain handing over an American citizen to an authoritarian Russian Government with no rule of law and no history of treating people fairly—and, of course,

with a history of interrogating and torturing political opponents—that is not only insulting to our values, it is dangerous and it is wrong. That is not America. No official in our government—of any branch of government—should support that. If the administration tries it, the Congress should take every effort to stop them from doing that.

The Russian threat is serious and persistent. It isn't solved by one meeting and a press conference. It will take sustained commitment from the national security professionals across our government, and it will take real vision and leadership from the President and his Cabinet. I do not object to meeting with an adversary, nor does anyone. That is part of the job of being President. Instead, what I am concerned about, what a lot of Americans are concerned about, is this President's conduct during and after that meeting, especially his unwillingness to say without reservation or caveat that Russia was responsible for hacking our elections in 2016 and continues to meddle in our democratic process. This isn't a political judgment; it is the judgment of our intelligence and law enforcement experts, and it led to the indictment of 12 Russian military intelligence hackers this past Friday.

Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats reaffirmed this judgment just this week, saying:

The role of the Intelligence Community is to provide the best information and fact-based assessments possible for the President and policymakers. We have been clear in our assessments of Russian meddling in the 2016 election and their ongoing, pervasive efforts to undermine our democracy, and we will continue to provide unvarnished and objective intelligence in support of our national security.

So said the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats.

Why can't the President say this and say it repeatedly, that he agrees with their assessment and is working to stop Russia from doing it again?

My constituents, like so many Americans, were right to ask: Where do we go from here? There is no playbook for this scenario.

I believe we must act in a bipartisan fashion to make clear to Russia that the U.S. Congress will not stand for continued interference in our elections and will work to counter them on other fronts.

First, we should enact new legislation to levy sanctions on Russian entities responsible for this malicious behavior and demand the administration fully implement legislation that was passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority last year. No. 2, we must pass legislation to protect the special counsel and to shine a bright light on the dark money in politics. No. 3, we must fully fund State and municipal efforts to shore up our electoral systems. No. 4, we must speak out in support of our alliances. Many of our closest international partners are right on the frontlines of Russia's desta-

bilizing actions. Finally, we should insist that the administration answer the questions so many of us have about what happened in that room in Helsinki and what they plan to do to counter Russia and protect our national security interests.

We are in uncharted waters in terms of the actions of the President. His actions the last 2 weeks have made us less safe. I will say it again—less safe. He must take decisive action to guarantee our security by confronting malign Russian aggression against the United States and our NATO allies and partners. At the same time, Congress, both parties, both Houses, must act to protect our security and make it clear to the President that this branch of government will continue to discharge its constitutional duties.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I would like to acknowledge that the Senator from Pennsylvania has made a number of good points on the subject of Russia and the way we need to go with Russia.

People have asked me about what I think about Mr. Putin and whether he is trustworthy, and I tell them no. The way that I know he is misleading the public on the issues of meddling is because his lips are moving. He is not just telling the truth. Any time he talks about it, it just flies in the face of Federal investigations, oversight hearings, and classified briefings we have been involved in. I think it is an example of where Members of Congress have really come together on an issue. KEEPING FAMILIES TOGETHER AND ENFORCE THE LAW ACT

Mr. President, now I would like to talk about another issue that I would like Members of Congress to come together on, and it is called the Keeping Families Together and Enforce the Law Act.

You have heard a lot of reports recently about children being separated from their families at the border, and the administration has taken a position, in part prompted by lawsuits, and we can debate whether the administration should fix this problem through an Executive order, but how about this.

Why doesn't Congress act to provide long-term certainty through an act of Congress to make absolutely certain that children who cross the border with their families can be kept with their families while we are trying to determine in a court whether that family has a legitimate claim to asylum?

It sounds fairly simple. In fact, it is pretty simple. I met with Senators FEINSTEIN, Senator DURBIN, and Senator CRUZ. We sat down, and we discussed a way to actually get this into law. We all agreed it needs to be very narrowly focused.

The problem with immigration around here and the immigration subject is it gets really big and really complex really quickly. What happens with

big and complex on Capitol Hill is nothing gets done.

So the bill we propose is very simple. Fix the issues in the law, clarify the process so we can actually make absolutely certain that minor children can stay with their parents while their asylum claims are being considered.

We have had agreement on virtually everything. We have agreed that families should be kept together. We have agreed that we need more judges so we can reduce the backlog. We agreed we need more attorneys to participate in the process—basically a 2-to-1 ratio between a new judge and new attorneys to support the legal process. We agreed on minimum standards for housing so we make sure we are keeping these families in a place that we think are appropriate.

Some people may come to the floor and say we are going to stand up tent cities and subject people to harsh conditions. We don't want to do that. As a matter of fact, we feel so strongly about it that we are putting forth specific requirements for housing. So we are addressing the judge constraint, we are addressing the lawyer constraint, we are addressing specific standards for keeping families together.

We can actually pass this in a heartbeat. We can do it on the Senate floor, and we can do it through what is called unanimous consent. Allow somebody to come down here, put a bill forward, and get it passed. Give those children and parents certainty.

The fact is, some of them are going to apply for asylum and will not have a legitimate case. Others will, but we have proposed a bill that will prevent any sort of lengthy detention. As a matter of fact, if this bill gets passed, the average case with a family would be prioritized. If you have an asylum request and you are with children, we want to keep you together and get it at the front of the docket so you can get certainty fairly quickly—over 40 to 60 days, but we have a constraint we have to get past. It has to do with a court ruling called the Flores case, where if we don't narrowly tailor the language to say, if a child—if a minor comes across the border with their parents, then they will be allowed to be kept with their parents in appropriate housing until such time as their asylum request has been heard before a court of law. It is not getting rid of Flores. You have some people here saying we want to completely eliminate the case. That is not the case.

We don't want children coming across the border who don't have parents with them to be retained in perpetuity or indefinite detention, as it is referred to down there. That is what Flores does. So if a child comes across the border, and they don't have a parent with them, then after 20 days, they have to be placed somewhere other than detention. That is a good policy.

If you have a situation where Flores stands the way that it is, then the law specifically requires the child to be

separated from the parents. This gives the parents the choice. If they want the children with them while they are going through the legal process, then they can have that. If they choose to have the child placed with a family member or a guardian, then they can have that too.

One of the things that I think we have to talk more about is the danger of just randomly placing children with a parent or guardian who comes across the border. We have several cases where in our system there is no way we would place the child with some of the people they are coming across the border with. They have been convicted for a variety of things: child neglect, child abuse, drug trafficking. All sorts of things that would have an American citizen's child removed from their family are the same sort of standards we want for a child coming across the border. Of course, we want to make sure the parent who says they are their parent or guardian really is.

So in this body, there are few opportunities where you can narrowly tailor a policy to a point to where only the most partisan or unreasonable person wouldn't support it. This is one of them. We can get this bill passed, sent to the President's desk, and provide certainty—a compassionate, appropriate method for dealing with what are now hundreds of thousands of people who have come across the border—to children with their parents. Treat them fairly, treat them justly, and have them processed in what I believe is the greatest judicial system that has ever existed.

It is on us to solve this problem. Anybody who comes down here and says, well, no, I have to talk about DACA, which is something I support, a path to citizenship or I want to talk about border security, which I also support—yes, let's talk about that, but let's not hold these children and these families hostage for other immigration matters. This body should have the backbone to deal with the political challenges that may come from their own party and do the right thing—the next time.

This time, let's solve the separation of children from their parents. Let's stop playing the political games that make for great fodder, but they are not compassionate, they are not a part of the solution. I hope we have enough Members to become a part of the solution. Next week, we will be talking more about this and possibly through unanimous consent.

I want somebody to come down to this floor and explain to me why it is a bad idea. I want them to explain it to the American people, but, out of respect for the Senate, we will not offer a unanimous consent request today, but you can be pretty sure we will next week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the Bounds nomination be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, the nomination will be withdrawn.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 584 as under the previous order and that I then be permitted to speak briefly about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE AGAINST THE MAKING AVAILABLE OF CURRENT AND FORMER DIPLOMATS, OFFICIALS, AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR QUESTIONING BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VLADIMIR PUTIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session to consider the following resolution, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 584) expressing the sense of the Senate against the making available of current and former diplomats, officials, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am hopeful that we will come together on this resolution, which I introduced with the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Hawaii, that it is neither the policy nor the practice of the United States to submit our citizens, let alone our Ambassadors, to the interrogation of a foreign adversary.

Let this resolution be a warning to the administration that Congress will not allow this to happen. I call on President Trump to say once and for

all—not through his spokespeople—that the lopsided, disgraceful trade he called an incredible offer is now off the table. There should be no equivocation on the matter.

One more point. I am so disappointed in the failure of the resolutions earlier today. We had a real chance for bipartisanship. The resolutions were modest and mild, and they were just resolutions, but we couldn't even come to agreement on those. Our Republican colleagues, given the crisis we have in foreign policy, have to step up to the plate and join us not just in resolutions but in bipartisan action that is so important.

I was told that one of the reasons the resolution was objected to was because we couldn't—they didn't even want us to get the notes, let alone hear from the translator of this 2-hour, mysterious meeting where nobody seems to know what happened. The American people should know what happened. The Senate should know what happened. Our leaders in the State Department and Defense Department should know what happened. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be too afraid to let us bring that up. That is so wrong for the security of America.

I am hopeful—there are bipartisan efforts going on today—that we cannot do what we did earlier and block the resolution by the Senator from Vermont and the bipartisan resolution from the Senators from Arizona and Delaware but move together in real action to undo the damage—try to undo the damage that the President has done to this country this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 162 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Cardin	Daines
Baldwin	Carper	Donnelly
Barrasso	Casey	Duckworth
Bennet	Cassidy	Durbin
Blumenthal	Collins	Enzi
Blunt	Coons	Ernst
Booker	Corker	Feinstein
Boozman	Cornyn	Fischer
Brown	Cortez Masto	Flake
Burr	Cotton	Gardner
Cantwell	Crapo	Gillibrand
Capito	Cruz	Graham

Grassley	Manchin	Sasse
Harris	Markey	Schatz
Hassan	McCaskill	Schumer
Hatch	McConnell	Scott
Heinrich	Menendez	Shaheen
Heitkamp	Merkley	Smith
Heller	Moran	Stabenow
Hirono	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hoeven	Murphy	Tester
Hyde-Smith	Murray	Thune
Inhofe	Nelson	Tillis
Isakson	Paul	Toomey
Johnson	Perdue	Udall
Jones	Peters	Van Hollen
Kaine	Portman	Warner
Kennedy	Reed	Warren
King	Risch	Whitehouse
Klobuchar	Roberts	Wicker
Lankford	Rounds	Wyden
Leahy	Rubio	Young
Lee	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Shelby

The resolution (S. Res. 584) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARDIN. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am proud of the advancements we have made in healthcare in this country—advancements that have been made, including those in the Affordable Care Act.

At lunch today we had an opportunity to see one of the faces of the progress that we have made. Elena Hung brought her daughter to our caucus lunch today, and we had a chance to see how a young girl has been able to literally survive as a result of the coverage provided under our healthcare system.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we have found that more and more Americans have not only been able to get health insurance but they have been able to get quality health insurance that covers their essential health benefits and provides them protection against discriminatory insurance company practices. We are clearly moving to where healthcare is a right, not a privilege.

I say that fully aware that President Trump's policies have reversed some of this progress and that he is trying to reverse even more of this progress. The President's policies have sabotaged the individual marketplace. As a result, we have seen significant premium increases caused by actions taken by the Trump administration in eliminating the individual responsibility, not providing the cost-sharing, and making it difficult for reinsurance to take place.

All those add to the instability within the individual marketplace, turning it into more of a high-risk pool, increasing premiums, and causing a lot of insurance companies to wonder whether they should be in that market at all.

Recently, the Trump administration went one step further—and I would hope all Americans would be very much outraged—and that is the protection against preexisting conditions that were included in insurance policies prior to the adoption of the Affordable Care Act.

With regard to preexisting conditions, most of us have some form of preexisting condition. You may have high blood pressure, high cholesterol, asthma, heart condition, or diabetes. You may have had cancer, or you may have had behavioral health issues. All of those are preexisting conditions.

According to a recent study by Health and Human Services, there are as many as 133 million Americans, nonelderly, who would qualify for preexisting conditions and would be subject to discriminatory actions by private insurance companies if the protections under the Affordable Care Act were to vanish.

In my own State of Maryland, that number is about 2.5 million Americans, nonelderly, that could be subject to discriminatory practices by insurance companies—320,000 of whom are children.

In June 2018, President Trump's administration broke a longstanding tradition and practice in this country and announced that it would not defend the court challenge to the Affordable Care Act. In the case of Texas v. United States, not only did the Trump administration say that they would not intervene to protect the constitutionality of the act passed by Congress but that they would submit a brief to the Court recommending that protections such as the preexisting conditions protections that we have under existing law should be held invalid.

Well, the Trump administration is going to the courts asking them to allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against people in this country based upon preexisting conditions. That is why we have insurance, to protect you for what you need.

This is now in the courts, and we will see what will happen with Texas v. United States in that court, but it could very well end up in the Supreme Court of the United States. It is very clear that as we evaluate our judicial appointments, we need to understand the importance of the decisions they will be called upon to make.

We had a circuit court appointment this afternoon that we were supposed to vote on, and it has been withdrawn. I am pleased about that because that individual would not have been sensitive to the rights of the people of our country.

Now we have a nominee for the Supreme Court of the United States, Judge Brett Kavanaugh. It is critically

important that we understand that the Supreme Court of the United States may very well be considering the case of *Texas v. United States* and may very well be considering whether preexisting condition restrictions that currently exist in law are valid or not.

I think what we should be doing in our evaluation of President Trump's nominee is to determine whether that person will be an independent voice on the Supreme Court of the United States, representing the people of this country, protecting their constitutional rights against the abuses of power, whether that power comes from the White House or Capitol Hill or corporate America.

There are so many areas that we should be concerned about. Today, I am going to talk about healthcare.

Yes, it is very possible that this particular nominee, if confirmed, could be a deciding vote on preexisting condition restrictions. Judge Kavanaugh dealt with the Affordable Care Act in 2011 on the DC Circuit, where there was a challenge to the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act. The Court did not hold it invalid, but Judge Kavanaugh was in the dissent on that opinion, raising concerns to us as to whether he will side with consumers or special interests as it relates to protecting consumers and policyholders in this country against the abusive practices of health insurance companies.

We also, of course, have the concern over women's healthcare issues and whether women's right of choice will be protected—*Roe v. Wade*. Judge Kavanaugh has raised questions as to whether he will follow precedent. *Roe v. Wade* is well established, but I have little comfort as to whether Judge Kavanaugh, in fact, will follow that precedent. These are issues that, as we start the vetting process with our interviews and our committee hearings, we really need to drill down on and understand where Judge Kavanaugh is on these issues.

Then I will bring up the high cost of prescription drugs. One of the basic protections I would hope our Court would do is to protect consumers against powerful special interests. We have to make sure, as we vet Judge Kavanaugh, whether he will side with the people of this country or with the powerful special interests.

Now, we have a greater role than just vetting the next Supreme Court nominee. There are things that we can do to protect our healthcare system. I am talking to many of my colleagues, and many have said, on both sides of the aisle, that we want to protect against the preexisting condition restrictions in insurance policies. So why don't we take action? Let's make sure that we protect the Affordable Care Act as it relates to denying insurance companies the ability to deny coverage based upon preexisting conditions.

We could also intervene in the lawsuit that is pending to tell the Court that we meant what we said: Insurance

companies cannot impose preexisting restrictions on coverage.

Yes, we should deal with the high cost of prescription drugs. There are things that we can do. We have had suggestions on both sides of the aisle. The President talked about this during his campaign, but he has done little to deal with the cost of prescription drugs.

One of the basic things that can be done—economics 101—is to use the collective purchasing power of the government and the larger market share to bring down costs. Why are we paying two to three times what consumers in industrialized nations in the world are paying for the same drugs? Let's organize our markets so that our consumers can get a better price. We can pass legislation to make that a reality.

Then, yes, we should take the necessary time in the process of considering President Trump's nominations to the courts, particularly for the Supreme Court of the United States. To make sure that we recognize that the balance of the Court is at stake, let's make sure that we use as our barometer whether Judge Kavanaugh will represent your constitutional rights over the powerful, over the abuses of any President, Congress, or corporate America. We don't want to be a rubberstamp for President Trump, particularly in these times, when we have the sensitive Mueller investigation going on, when we have the President taking so much power.

We saw what he is doing with the borders and what he is doing in so many ways, violating the basic values of this country. We want to make sure there is an independent court that will not be beholden to the President of the United States.

We need to protect the advancements we have made in healthcare, including protections against preexisting conditions, women's right to choice, and continue with the work on the high costs of healthcare.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to report back to my colleagues here in the Senate and to the American people about the results of legislation which we passed here in the Senate and the House and which was signed into law by the President. We don't do that often enough, and we tend to pass legislation and don't do the oversight to figure out whether it is working.

In this case, this was legislation we passed back in April on a bipartisan

basis called the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. This legislation allows the victims of sex trafficking to get the justice they deserve by being able to sue websites that knowingly trafficked them online and have some accountability for these horrible crimes that are committed online. It also allows prosecutors at the State and local level to prosecute these cases.

We drafted the legislation because after looking at this for several years, we realized that there was a rise in trafficking of underage girls, women, and sometimes underage boys and that this was increasing primarily because of the dark side of the internet. We are hearing a lot about what is going on on the internet these days in terms of meddling in our elections and so on. With all the positives, there is also a darker side. We realized this was happening increasingly, and it was a ruthlessly, efficient way to sell people online.

We looked at it and found there was a Federal law put in place—with good intentions, I believe—a couple of decades ago to try to ensure freedom of the internet, which, of course, all of us support, but it provided an effective immunity to these websites even if they were knowingly selling people online. So we wrote legislation to get at that, spent about a year trying to get that through the process, and eventually got it to a vote and got it passed.

The law that provided the immunity was part of the Communications Decency Act. Again, it was meant to encourage freedom of the internet but was taken too far, particularly in how it was interpreted by the courts. The internet was something we had to address because without that, we would see this increase in drug trafficking and sex trafficking.

So what happened? After passing the law, there was a pretty dramatic change.

On Monday, I was in Cincinnati, OH, my hometown, at a place called the CHANGE Court. The CHANGE Court is a place where women who are trafficked and incarcerated for prostitution are able to go through a 2-year program to help them get clean and, if they are willing to go through this program, to walk away with a clean record, understanding that sex trafficking is not a crime and that they are in effect victims of trafficking.

It is very inspiring to go there. I talked to about a dozen women who are currently in the program and some women who had graduated from the program. The stories are unbelievable—women getting their lives back together; getting back to work and getting back to their families; in almost every case, getting back to their children—in almost every case, these are moms; having the self-respect and dignity that comes with work; getting back with their families; and getting their lives back on track. It is a much better alternative than the system of throwing people into jail who are, in effect, victims of trafficking and not

dealing with their issues, whether it is the trauma or the drug addiction. In almost every case, there was a drug addiction issue. Almost all of them were opiate addicts or recovering addicts. One was addicted to alcohol. This is common.

In talking to these women, almost every one of them said the same thing, which was that, yes, they had been trafficked online, and they were very interested in this legislation. They had been through it, and they wanted to save future women and girls from having to go down this dark path.

We passed the legislation and assessed the legislation meant to help on this issue, and I was able to tell these women at the CHANGE Court what the results were. They are pretty dramatic.

On Monday of this week, I also met with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, or NCMEC. This is the leading anti-trafficking group in the country. They work day and night trying to stop online sex traffickers. They keep track of the statistics and data. They particularly focus on rescuing kids from being exploited.

According to NCMEC, the results from SESTA being signed into law has been swift and significant. NCMEC said:

Since the enactment of SESTA and the government's seizure of Backpage, there has been a major disruption in the online marketplace. The robust marketplace for sex trafficking, including the sale of children for rape and sexual abuse, that took a decade to build, fragmented over the course of just a few days.

They also said:

Many sites or portions of sites where NCMEC knew children previously have been sold for sex have voluntarily shut down.

Their bottom line:

This means it is much harder to purchase a child . . . online.

This means it is much harder to purchase a child online. That is great news, and that is exactly what we intended this legislation to do—to save these kids, women, and sometimes boys from being subjected to this horrific crime.

Another analysis was shared with me recently, and you can find this online. This analysis found that since our legislation passed, online ads selling women and children have been reduced by between 60 and 80 percent, depending on the State. That is a dramatic change, having the effect of saving literally thousands of children.

I am hopeful we will continue to be vigilant about this issue because when you push something down in one place, it often pops up somewhere else. But we have done an effective job of dealing with a very real problem. Backpage.com, which we talked about, was the industry leader. They have now been shut down. The CEO of the company has pled guilty to numerous money laundering and trafficking-related charges.

Because prosecutors can now do their work and go after these online traf-

fickers and because victims of this crime can finally have their day in court, websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking are being shut down and being held liable for their actions.

This never would have been possible without the work of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The staff and investigators spent 2 years working on this issue, investigating it. We had to come all the way to the floor of this Chamber in order to enforce our subpoenas to get the information that we were able to unveil, which no one else had been able to find, and that showed clearly that they knew what they remember doing. They knew they were selling underage kids online. I chair that subcommittee. It is bipartisan. I am very proud of those investigators. They do good work, and they deserve to be applauded, given the results we are now seeing.

It is not just Backpage; a lot of other, classified websites have also shut down their personal ads or sex-related operations.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. We have made good progress on the issue of sex trafficking, but it is so related to the issue of opioid abuse. Specifically, as I said, these often go hand in hand. Often, traffickers find people who are addicted. They are vulnerable, they crave the drug, and the trafficker can provide it. But in my home State of Ohio, I have met with survivors, and many times we have found that they find vulnerable people who are not addicted but then make them addicted so they become dependent on the trafficker.

This is an issue that relates to so many things, doesn't it? It relates to our workplace because people who are addicted to opioids are not coming into the workforce. One reason we have such high levels of unemployment—people are outside the workforce altogether, not showing up on the unemployment numbers because they aren't even looking for work. The labor force participation rate, as economists call it, is so low right now largely, in my view, because of this opioid issue. Our courts are jammed, our jails are jammed, and our hospitals and emergency rooms are jammed. We have to do more to get at this issue for so many reasons.

The driving force in my home State of Ohio and around the country now is this synthetic form of heroin or opioids called fentanyl. It is 50 times more powerful than heroin. There are other drugs—carfentanil is an example—that are even more powerful. These synthetic forms of opioids are causing most of the deaths now in my State of Ohio and around the country.

The Centers for Disease Control, CDC, recently issued a report that showed this increase in overdose deaths involving fentanyl. The report analyzed overdose deaths in 10 States hit

hardest by the epidemic, including Ohio. They found that fentanyl overdose deaths in those States nearly doubled from the last 6 months of 2016 to the first 6 months of 2017. Of course, 2017 is the last year for which they have good records. It is unbelievable.

This synthetic form of heroin is the new scourge of the opioid epidemic, and it is being spread into every other drug too. When I do roundtables back home, as I do regularly, I hear about it being spread into crystal meth, cocaine, and heroin, of course.

Twice in roundtable discussions I have had with community leaders, I have heard—once from a police chief and once from a sheriff—very similar stories about a young man who wakes up from an overdose after being saved through Narcan, which is a miracle drug that reverses the effects of an overdose. When the young man comes to, he says: I was just smoking pot. How did I overdose?

In both cases, based on the forensics and the information they were able to get from the labs, they found out that of course it wasn't just marijuana; it was marijuana laced with fentanyl. No street drug is safe. They can all kill you.

As I have met with these first responders, community leaders, and those in recovery across Ohio—I just did recently with a group called PreventionFIRST—I have heard what is often brought up by those on the frontlines; that is, that we would be making so much more progress right now on this war against opioids—we have been successful here in this Congress in passing more money for prevention, treatment, and recovery, and those funds are starting to be used back home, and I see it; I see the results, and there are some really exciting things going on—but for the fentanyl. In other words, just as we were finally making progress on prescription drugs and, then, on heroin, now this fentanyl comes in and is creating even more problems. It is so inexpensive, and it is so pervasive.

Recently, in Ohio, there were two busts where they were able to apprehend people who were selling fentanyl and find this cache of fentanyl they had. In both cases, it was a massive amount combined. Just these two busts alone, there was enough fentanyl to kill half the people in my State of Ohio. That is how bad it is.

Just last week, there was an autopsy that revealed that the death of an Ohio police chief from Kirkersville, in the Columbus area, who was caused by fentanyl. The report said: "acute intoxication by fentanyl." It was an accidental overdose.

I have told the story before of the police officer who brushed a couple of flakes off his shirt after a bust. He didn't know it was fentanyl. The flakes were the drug. It got into his skin through his fingers, and he dropped to the ground unconscious and had an overdose. It took several doses of Narcan to save his life.

Our first responders are in much more danger with fentanyl than they have ever been, even with heroin, prescription drugs, and other opioids. Addiction has taken too many lives in Ohio. Again, fentanyl is the deadliest drug in this epidemic.

There was a recent estimation by a group called the Ohio Alliance for Innovation in Population Health, which suggested that opioids are responsible for more than 500,000 years of life expectancy lost in Ohio between 2010 and 2016. Think about that: 500,000 years of lost life due to opioids in Ohio, just in the 6 years between 2010 and 2016.

Often, these are lives of young people who had great promise ahead of them and had become involved in this opioid epidemic, and the addiction takes over, and it is more important than anything. It is more important than their family, more important than their friends, more important than their jobs, more important than their faith, and more important than taking care of themselves. They end up, sadly, losing their lives and all that opportunity and all the purpose God had for them in their lives.

We need to turn the tide in this opioid epidemic. We can't do it, in my view, unless we get at this issue of fentanyl because that is the new scourge. We need to look at how it is coming, why it is coming, and why it is so cheap.

Here is what is very interesting, and it might be surprising to some people. It is not coming across the border from Mexico, or if it is, it is very little of it. That is where the heroin is coming from, 90 percent of it. It is more pure than ever, more dangerous than ever. The deadly fentanyl is mostly coming through the mail system. It is being mailed into the United States of America, mostly from overseas, mostly from China.

There are some evil scientists somewhere in China making this fentanyl and then shipping it into your community. It is the No. 1 killer right now. By the way, opioid overdose and death is the No. 1 cause of death in my home State of Ohio. Nationally, it is now the No. 1 cause of death of people under 50 years old. It surpassed car accidents. It is an epidemic. How could that be? What can we do about it?

There is something we can do about it. We have to be sure that the post office helps law enforcement to find these packages as they are coming in and get these packages out of circulation so they don't come into our communities and poison our families, our children, and our neighbors. We have legislation to do that. It is called the STOP Act.

One-third of the Members of this Senate have now cosponsored that legislation. We have now had it reported out of the Finance Committee of the Senate. We need to get it to the floor and get it to a vote. It is very simple. It is legislation that AMY KLOBUCHAR, a Democrat of Minnesota, on that side of

the aisle, and I have come up with that says the post office should have to do what any other carrier would have to do—FedEx, UPS, DHL. Under law, they have to tell law enforcement in advance what packages are coming in, where it is coming from, what is in it, and where it is going. You have to provide that electronically so you can use big data to sift through the millions of packages that come in and to be able to find ones that are suspect and then immediately use sophisticated equipment to scan and screen those and pull out of circulation the ones that have fentanyl in them.

I have been to these distribution centers for these private carrier companies. I have seen how they do it. I have seen the dangerous work the Customs and Border Protection men and women are doing, using a room that has significant ventilation. They have to have masks on and gloves. They have to be very careful about it. Thank God, they are there, because they are saving lives. If you send it through the mail system, that very rarely happens.

We did a yearlong study of this in our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I talked about earlier. We found a number of things that were very troubling. One is just how easy it is to buy fentanyl online. The second is the fact that when these drugs come in through the post office, it is guaranteed delivery. The traffickers will say if you send it by FedEx or another private carrier—UPS, DHL, and others—it is not guaranteed. If you send it through the government agency, no problem. That is not the way it should be.

By the way, letter carriers—the mail carriers in my community and your community—want this fixed, too, because they care what comes into their communities. They care about the people whom they serve, and they want to be sure they are not delivering poison. They also are at risk, just like anybody else is who is anywhere in that train.

I talked about the law enforcement officers. Think about the other first responders who are using Narcan to revive people. They sometimes get exposed to it. We have too many stories of little kids dying from being accidentally exposed to fentanyl in a home where somebody is using it. It is dangerous stuff. We have to fix this.

The information as to where it is from, where it is going, and what is in it, when it is put into a digital format and can be analyzed quickly through incredible intelligence that our Customs and Border Protection people have, to be able to determine whether that package is suspect or not, will make a huge difference in taking this offline and keeping this poison from coming into our communities and ensuring that we can, in fact, begin to stop some of the poison but, at a minimum, it will raise the price by reducing the supply.

The post office, frankly, because of the pressure they have gotten from

Congress on this over the last few years have begun to start to look at some of this. They have begun to provide some of the electronic data. Based on testimony they provided for our subcommittee just recently, they are now receiving data on about 36 percent of international packages they transport into the country. Unfortunately, of that 36 percent, just over one-third, about 80 percent of those packages, are presented to law enforcement, and 20 percent get lost and end up going into the system, into our communities, even though we know they are suspect.

It is very inefficient right now. It is not working well. Plus, some of the data is not decipherable. We have a long way to go. Even if all 36 percent were being delivered to law enforcement, that would mean that 318 million international packages each year were coming in without any screening—318 million packages.

The STOP Act is very simple. It holds the post office to the same standard as private carriers—100 percent screenings. It requires that by 2020 they get all this data on all the international packages entering the United States.

It is a commonsense solution. It has already passed the House of Representatives recently with a broad bipartisan vote. Our committee has reported it out. We need to get it to the floor and get it voted on. If we do so, by the way, it will be signed because the administration has already issued a statement of administration policy on it, which supports the legislation. It was actually a recommendation of the President's commission on opioids. It is part of the solution.

Is it the whole solution? No, but it is a critical part to try to stop some of this new poison, fentanyl, from coming into our communities—the No. 1 killer—so that we can, through treatment and recovery and better prevention efforts and better other law enforcement efforts, truly begin to turn the tide on this opioid epidemic. It is critical that we do so for so many reasons we have talked about this afternoon.

My hope is that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come together, at least on this issue, on the STOP Act, and say yes, we can do something to help those in our community who are suffering, those who are dying from overdoses, those families who are looking to us and saying: What can you do to help? I run into them all the time.

Today, I am heading back to Ohio, and I know this weekend I will be talking to people in Cleveland and Cincinnati, where I will be, and in Columbus, and they will be telling me about it.

This week, I was walking down the hall back to my office on Tuesday, and a young man came up to me and said: I want to talk to you about something.

I figured he was with the media and wanted to ask me a question. I asked him what he wanted.

He said: I want to tell you thank you.

He started to well up, and I knew what he was talking about. He was talking about a family member of his who had overdosed and died. He was talking about the fact that he appreciates that Congress is finally beginning to respond to this issue, as we have.

In the last year and after, we have passed legislation that is historic to deal with this issue, but there is still so much more to do. Let's make the next step getting the STOP Act enacted into law and, therefore, be able to save lives and help people to live their God-given purpose in life.

I yield back my time.

ANTI-TERRORISM CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee marked up and passed by voice vote S. 2946, the Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act of 2018.

I was proud to introduce this bipartisan bill and to lead it through the Judiciary Committee. I am proud to have Senators NELSON, RUBIO, WHITEHOUSE, CRUZ, BLUMENTHAL, TILLIS, COONS, CORNYN, HATCH, and KENNEDY as cosponsors.

It is not always easy to find common ground here in the Senate, but there is one issue where there is no doubt we can all agree: Those who aid or carry out terrorist attacks that kill or injure Americans should be held fully accountable.

Those who have been impacted should have a meaningful avenue to seek justice.

For over 25 years, the Anti-Terrorism Act has empowered American victims of international terrorism to bring civil lawsuits in Federal courts to vindicate their rights and obtain compensation for their injuries.

Just as important, these lawsuits disrupt and discourage the financing and material support of terrorist organizations. By cutting terrorists' financial lifelines, the ATA helps to reduce global terrorism, protecting Americans both here and abroad.

In short, the ATA puts terrorists on notice to keep their hands off Americans.

I was proud to be the lead sponsor of the ATA back in 1992, which removed the jurisdictional hurdles that, for too long, had frustrated or outright prevented American victims' ability to seek redress.

Since then, terrorists and those who financially support them have tried to blow holes in the law and stretch its exceptions beyond what Congress ever intended.

The Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act of 2018—and its additional improvements adopted in the Judiciary Committee last week—strengthens the ATA and reiterates Congress's original intent that terrorist groups and their supporters be brought to justice in U.S.

Courts, regardless of where the attacks occurred.

It is a carefully considered and deliberately crafted response to efforts to undermine the ATA. It represents Congress's considered judgment in responding to acts of international terrorism that kill or injure Americans overseas.

The bill clarifies the ATA's so-called "act of war" exception. Congress never intended that designated terrorist organizations could dodge liability for attacks that kill or injure Americans by simply claiming this exception.

Some, however, have twisted the exception to get away scot-free. The "act of war" exception should not be a liability shield for designated terrorist organizations or their supporters.

This bill makes clear that the exception doesn't apply to those designated by the U.S. Government as foreign terrorist organizations or specially designated global terrorists.

This is common sense. As one Federal judge put it, "To find that a terrorist organization can be a military force under the ATA would defeat the purpose of the Act, 'which was enacted to deter terrorist activity and hold liable those who engage in it.'"

Outside of that, the bill keeps in place the current analysis that courts conduct when determining who is and is not a military force.

Second, the bill permits victims of narco-terrorism to satisfy court-awarded ATA judgments with the assets of foreign drug kingpins. Assets blocked by the Federal Government under the Kingpin Designation Act are not currently available to victims to satisfy their judgments.

This bill fixes that.

Finally, the bill responds to recent Federal court decisions that severely undermined the ability of American victims to bring terrorists to justice. The ATA was specifically designed to provide extraterritorial jurisdiction over terrorists who attack Americans overseas. Last year, I led an amicus brief, with 22 bipartisan Senators, to the Supreme Court in *Sokolow v. Palestine Liberation Organization*, reiterating the purpose and scope of the 1992 law.

I was stunned when the Justice Department failed to stand up in that case for American victims of terrorism.

Despite broad bipartisan support in Congress for the ATA and the victims it protects, the Justice Department, in fact, actively opposed those victims and their right to seek redress against terrorists.

Inconceivably, instead of standing up for American victims of terrorism, the administration urged the Court to not even consider the *Sokolow* decision.

Congress can act where the administration chose not to. Accordingly, this bill makes crystal clear that defendants who take advantage of certain benefits from the U.S. Government following 120 days after the bill's enactment—such as foreign assistance—will

be deemed to have consented to personal jurisdiction in ATA cases.

Based on further improvements in a substitute amendment adopted by unanimous consent in the Judiciary Committee, the bill also restores jurisdiction in cases pending at the time of the bill's enactment. No defendant, after all, should be able to enjoy privileges under U.S. law, while simultaneously dodging responsibility for supporting terrorists that injure or kill Americans.

The Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act is supported by thousands of veterans and Gold Star families

It is supported by groups like AIPAC, the Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, Christians United for Israel, the Endowment for Middle East Truth, the Jewish Institute for National Security of America, the National Council of Young Israel, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, the Rabbinical Council of America, and the Zionist Organization of America.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined me on this bill and whose staffs are working tirelessly to help us move it forward.

I also want to thank Senators NELSON and BLUMENTHAL for their support.

Finally, I want to thank House Judiciary Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member NADLER for introducing and moving the companion bill in the House of Representatives.

Now that the bill has been reported to the floor, I ask for all of my Senate colleagues' support and look forward to Congress sending this bill to the President's desk very soon.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ANDY HENRY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Andy Henry of Prairie County for his impact on the Terry community while working at the Roy Rogers Saloon.

Andy has spent the last 17 years of his life in Terry. After Andy graduated high school in Terry, his mom Amelia and her husband, John, bought the Roy Rogers Saloon. Following that, he began working at the Saloon. He has been working there since his family took it over, just under 6 years.

Andy's work at the Saloon brings the community together. Whether it be a friend or an old elementary school teacher of his, folks from all over the community come together at the Saloon. He enjoys spending time with their regulars and making sure the experience at the Saloon is as pleasant as it can be.

I congratulate Andy on his role in growing and contributing to the Roy Rogers Saloon. I look forward to seeing that success continue to grow and enjoying the hometown bar soon. •

TRIBUTE TO AUSTIN EGGLE

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Austin Eggl, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Austin is a graduate of Bishop Ryan High School, in Minot, ND. Currently, he is attending Presentation College in Aberdeen, SD, where he is majoring in business. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Austin for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

REMEMBERING MARLENE MCCARTHY

• Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Rhode Island has lost a tireless champion in the fight against breast cancer, Marlene McCarthy. Marlene's dedication to this cause was well known throughout Rhode Island and across Capitol Hill.

Marlene cofounded the Rhode Island Breast Cancer Coalition in 1992 and represented Rhode Island on the National Breast Cancer Coalition's board of directors and executive committee. Under her leadership, the Rhode Island Breast Cancer Coalition established a helpline for breast cancer patients and a Breast Cancer Resource Center and provided countless support services to Rhode Islanders facing this terrible disease.

Her advocacy was not limited to Rhode Island. Marlene regularly visited me in Washington, DC, advocating for stronger Federal funding for breast cancer research and broader access to the best possible breast cancer care. At Marlene's urging, I introduced the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act, legislation to set a goal of eradicating breast cancer by 2020.

The driving force behind Marlene's hard work and boundless persistence was her dream of a future free from the scourge of breast cancer for her granddaughters. It is in Marlene's memory that I pledge to continue to fight for policies that will make her dream a reality.

I offer my condolences to Marlene's family and to the breast cancer community. Marlene's legacy will live on through the family and loved ones she has left behind, the continuing work of the Rhode Island Breast Cancer Coalition, and the countless people she inspired through her advocacy and compassion. She will be missed.●

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 which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

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.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 11:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1037. An act to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

At 3:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6147. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1037. An act to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 19, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 490. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam.

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office".

S. 2692. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

S. 2734. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5989. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the July, 2018 monthly cumulative report on rescissions; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on Appropriations; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and the Judiciary.

EC-5990. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and the Release of Certain Withheld Amounts; to the Committees on Appropriations; the Budget; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and the Judiciary.

EC-5991. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Lee K. Kevy II, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5992. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael H. Shields, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5993. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the United States Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5994. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Flood Insurance Program: Removal of Monroe County Pilot Inspection Program Regulation" ((RIN1660-AA93) (Docket No. FEMA-2018-0027)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5995. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility (South Carolina: Columbia, City of, Lexington and Richland Counties, et al.)" (Docket No. FEMA-2018-0002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5996. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Biofuels and the Environment Second Triennial Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5997. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Use of Byproduct Material—Medical Event Definitions, Training, and Experience, and Clarifying Amendments" ((RIN3150-AI63) (NRC-2008-0175)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5998. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inversions and Related Transactions" ((RIN1545-BO20 and RIN1545-BO22) (TD 9834)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5999. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2018-0125 - 2018-0131); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6000. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Borrower Defense Delay-Technical Correction" (RIN1840-AD28) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6001. A communication from the Vice Chairman and Executive Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of three recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 69th Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6002. A communication from the Vice Chairman and Executive Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of three recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 69th Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6003. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-397, "Fiscal Year 2019 Local Budget Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6004. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6005. A communication from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Executive Branch Financial Disclosure, Qualifies Trusts, and Certificates of Divestiture" (RIN3209-AA00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6006. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended" (RIN1400-AD17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6007. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer and the Chief Operating Officer of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an audit of the Garden for the period from January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6008. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Rules Governing Trademark Interferences" (RIN0651-AD23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6009. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule for Rating Disabilities: Skin" (RIN2900-AP27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-268. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey memorializing its opposition to and disapproval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's proposed plan to increase the amount of rent paid by persons who receive federal rental assistance; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 90

Whereas, The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") has proposed a plan that would increase the amount of rent paid by persons who receive federal rental assistance through HUD; and

Whereas, According to estimates by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, approximately 150,000 low-income households in New Jersey rely on federal rental assistance through HUD and about 99 percent of these households would see their rents increased under HUD's rent increase plan; and

Whereas, According to the same estimates, New Jersey households receiving federal rental assistance pay an average of \$4,620 annually in rent, which would increase by \$830 a year, or 18 percent, under HUD's rent increase plan; and

Whereas, New Jersey is experiencing an affordable housing crisis involving high and ever rising prices and a dwindling supply of affordable units, which is particularly severe in the State's urban areas, and which only would be exacerbated by HUD's rent increase plan; and

Whereas, It is altogether fitting, proper, and in the public interest, for this House to express opposition to HUD's rent increase plan, which would be detrimental to the many thousands of low-income New Jerseyans who rely on federal rental assistance and would see their rents sharply increase under the plan; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House expresses its opposition to and disapproval of the United States Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development's proposed plan to increase the amount of rent paid by persons who receive federal rental assistance.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President and Vice President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and each member of Congress elected thereto from this State.

POM-269. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to continue the Meals on Wheels program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 30

Whereas, Meals on Wheels provide vital daily nutritional support to homebound low income seniors. Over 3 million seniors nationwide and 300,000 in Michigan were served by Meals on Wheels last year; and

Whereas, The federal budget proposal by President Trump would cut funding for the Meals on Wheels program. It would eliminate the Community Development Block Grant program which provides a portion of funding for local and state programs. While the elimination of the Community Development Block Grant could hurt many state Meals on Wheels programs, the most dramatic impact to the Meals on Wheels program may occur as a result of proposed cuts to the federal Department of Health and Human Services budget. Within that department, nutrition programs of the Older Americans Act provide support to Meals on Wheels chapters nationwide by covering approximately 30 percent of its costs; and

Whereas, The benefit of this food delivery program extends beyond providing low income seniors with essential daily nutrition. Studies have shown that homebound seniors who receive Meals on Wheels feel less loneliness and isolation. The daily deliveries by a Meals on Wheels volunteer also enable seniors to receive a well-being check and assistance in the event of an emergency; and

Whereas, Meals on Wheels is a cost-effective program that contributes to enabling seniors to stay in their homes, resulting in fewer nursing home admissions. Continuing this program benefits the lives of millions of senior and provides peace of mind to their families; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the Congress of the United States to continue the Meals on Wheels program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation Adopted by the Senate, June 12, 2018.

POM-270. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to fund the Federal Aviation Administration's Drone Test Site Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 29

Whereas, The economic future of any society depends on its ability to develop new technologies and pioneer emerging economic sectors; and

Whereas, The civil and commercial use of unmanned aircraft systems, commonly referred to as drones, is one such emerging sector that is likely to shape future economies; and

Whereas, Although the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) published Part 107 of

the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 C.F.R. s.107 et seq. (2016)) in August 2016, which established the first rules and regulations for commercial drone use in the United States, the technology's commercial viability is still limited by the inability to fully integrate drones into the national airspace system; and

Whereas, Integration into the national airspace system, which would allow drones to reliably and safely share airspace with conventional manned aircraft, requires the FAA to develop a variety of industry-specific airworthiness credentials, air traffic control communication procedures, and operational regulations, especially for drones that fly beyond the line-of-sight of the operator; and

Whereas, Industry reports estimate that there will be roughly \$82 billion in economic impact, including over 100,000 advanced manufacturing jobs and \$482 million in tax revenue, created nationally within 11 years of the integration of drones into the national airspace system; and

Whereas, To support this emerging sector, Congress passed the "FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012" (49 U.S.C. s.40101) which established several research and development programs to support civil and commercial drone technological advancement and lay the groundwork for airspace integration; and

Whereas, Most importantly, the act established a Drone Test Site Program in which six geographically diverse test sites were created to provide the research findings and operational experiences needed to ensure the safe and efficient integration of drones into national airspace; and

Whereas, Through the "Mid-Atlantic Aviation Partnership," New Jersey, Virginia, and Maryland were selected to host a joint test site, with the Cape May Airport in Rio Grande, New Jersey serving as a primary research facility; and

Whereas, At this test site, leading researchers from Rutgers University, Virginia Tech University, and the University of Maryland focus on developing airworthiness certification standards, beyond visual line-of-sight flight operations, and long-distance drone communication technology, all of which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of drones; and

Whereas, In addition to helping the United States become a global leader of civil and commercial drone technology, the Drone Test Site Program transforms New Jersey into a regional hub for this emerging economic sector; and

Whereas, Limited federal support for the program, however, now jeopardizes this bright economic future; and

Whereas, Because test sites do not receive direct federal funding, most are forced to rent their facilities for industry drone flights in order to finance research operations; and

Whereas, As a result, budgetary constraints make it difficult for test sites to conduct the extensive research that is needed to safely and efficiently integrate drones into the national airspace system; and

Whereas, Funding limitations, in turn, undercut the ability of test sites to accomplish their original objective of supporting airspace integration and delay the development of civil and commercial drone technology in the United States; and

Whereas, Congressional funding for the FAA Drone Test Site Program could rectify this problem and ensure that the United States becomes a pioneer of civil and commercial drone technology. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House respectfully urges Congress and the President of the United States to

fund the Federal Aviation Administration's Drone Test Site Program so that test sites are able to more effectively support drone integration into the national airspace system and ensure that the United States becomes a world leader in civil and commercial drone technology.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-271. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to maintain the Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve to ensure gasoline supply and distribution stability in the northeast region of the United States in the event of an emergency; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 76

Whereas, In 2012, Superstorm Sandy made landfall in the northeastern United States and caused heavy damage to two oil refineries and left more than 40 petroleum terminals in New York Harbor closed due to water damage and power loss; and

Whereas, As a result of this storm damage and its impact on the gasoline supply and distribution chain, some gasoline stations were left without fuel for as long as 30 days; and

Whereas, In response to Superstorm Sandy's disruption of the northeast's gasoline supply and distribution chain, the United States Department of Energy created the first federal regional refined petroleum product reserve containing gasoline called the Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve (NGSR); and

Whereas, The NGSR holds one million barrels of gasoline in strategic locations in the New York Harbor area, the Boston, Massachusetts area, and in South Portland, Maine; and

Whereas, The NGSR creates a gasoline supply buffer large enough to allow the region to compensate for the initial impact of an event that disrupts the gasoline supply and distribution infrastructure until that infrastructure can return to full operation; and

Whereas, The federal budget proposed by the President of the United States recommends selling off the entire NGSR in the coming federal fiscal year; and

Whereas, The sale of the NGSR would leave the northeast region of the United States at risk of another gasoline shortage in the event of an emergency that causes a disruption to gasoline supply and distribution infrastructure, affecting the mobility of people, businesses, and emergency responders in the wake of a disaster; and

Whereas, It is altogether fitting and proper, and in the public interest, for this House to urge the President of the United States and Congress to maintain the NGSR for the safety and welfare of the residents and businesses located in the northeastern region of this country in the event of an emergency that disrupts the supply and distribution of gasoline; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House respectfully urges the President of the United States and Congress to maintain the Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve to ensure gasoline supply and distribution stability in the northeast region of the United States in the event of an emergency.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted

by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of the United States Congress elected from this State.

POM-272. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the United States Congress to adopt the National Park Service's recommendation to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include the additional sites along the Lewis and Clark Expedition's Eastern Legacy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 326

Whereas, The Lewis and Clark Expedition (Expedition) and the Corps of Discovery are nationally significant for their exploration of the Louisiana Territory and search for an all water route to the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas, Under orders by President Thomas Jefferson, the expedition was responsible for mapping the territory explored, as well as documenting new species of plants and animals and engaging with the Native American tribes they encountered; and

Whereas, Although part of the route was unmapped territory, the Lewis and Clark Expedition was able to use maps provided to them by Native Americans, European explorers and fur traders; and

Whereas, Ultimately, the expedition was able to link routes and maps together to find passage from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean, a feat that had never before been accomplished; and

Whereas, In order to recognize the historic significance of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the National Park Service previously designated a trail that runs from Wood River, Illinois, to the West Coast in Oregon and Washington; and

Whereas, Public Law 110-229, passed by the Congress of the United States in 2008, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to study additional sites associated with the preparation and return phases of the expedition, located in Pennsylvania, Virginia, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, Missouri and Illinois; and

Whereas, Those sites were to be considered for inclusion in the "Eastern Legacy" of the expedition; and

Whereas, The National Park Service evaluated 25 distinct route segments used by the Corps of Discovery for the expedition to determine if they met the criteria for national significance established by the National Trails System Act; and

Whereas, In August 2016, the National Park Service published its Draft Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Extension Study, finding that three sections met the criteria established for inclusion in the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail; and

Whereas, Those segments include the Ohio River, from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to Louisville, Kentucky; from Louisville, Kentucky, to the confluence with the Mississippi River; and from the Mississippi River's confluence with the Ohio River at Cairo, Illinois, to Wood River, Illinois; and

Whereas, A portion of the proposed extension of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail includes sites along the Ohio River in this Commonwealth; and

Whereas, The inclusion of this segment along the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail is not only historically significant and appropriate, but may have a positive economic impact on those sites; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urge the Congress of

the United States to adopt the National Park Service's recommendation to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include the additional sites along the Lewis and Clark Expedition's Eastern Legacy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each chamber of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM-273. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey condemning the federal government's policy of separating immigrant children from their families at the United States' border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 175

Whereas, On April 6, 2018, the U.S. Department of Justice enacted a "zero tolerance" policy under which all unauthorized crossings at the Southwestern border of the United States will be treated as criminal offenses, instead of civil offenses; and

Whereas, These policies separate families crossing the border without authorization, since the parents are placed in criminal detention centers while the children are taken into the care of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; and

Whereas, These separations may last months, or even years, since the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services have few procedures in place to ensure the reunification of separated families; and

Whereas, It has been reported that the motivation for these policies is not to maintain the safety of the children, but merely to deter persons from committing immigration violations; and

Whereas, The American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Physicians, and the American Psychiatric Association, together representing more than 250,000 doctors in the United States, are requesting an immediate reversal of the "zero tolerance" policy citing irreversible health complications to the children; and

Whereas, Experts find this policy is detrimental to the health of young children causing short-term developmental delays and long-term health concerns such as heart disease, cancer, and morbid obesity; and

Whereas, Parent-child separation also increases symptoms of anxiety and depression in adolescents, and young children whose parents were detained exhibit multiple behavioral changes, including anxiety, withdrawal, numbing, anger, crying, changes in eating, sleeping, toileting, and changes in development and learning; and

Whereas, This "zero tolerance" policy is medically unsound and should be considered nothing less than government-sanctioned child abuse; and

Whereas, Separating children from their parents violates one of our society's fundamental principles which is that, to the extent possible, children should not be punished for the sins of their parents; and

Whereas, These policies also run counter to the interests of the State of New Jersey, which depends upon immigrants for its cultural and economic growth; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House condemns the federal government's policy of separating immigrant children from their families and contends that the federal government's actions are sanctioned child abuse.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States; the Majority and Minority Leaders of

the United States Senate; the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives; and every member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-274. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, condemning the denial of access to government officials to immigration detention facilities and shelters for children for humanitarian inspections and purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

POM-275. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to take immediate steps to reunite children separated from their parents due to immigration detentions, and to prohibit any future parent and child separations by United States immigration authorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-276. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, urging the Department of Health and Human Resources to provide and maintain adequate medical care, nutrition, housing, and educational standards in, and to permit access by elected federal representatives to, federal immigration detention centers and shelters for children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

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 (Rept. No. 115-305).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

*Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2022.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

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.

A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed sub-

ject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. JONES):

S. 3241. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the termination by a spouse of a lessee of certain leases when the lessee dies while in military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 3242. A bill to establish an American Savings Account Fund and create a retirement savings plan available to all employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 3243. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iranian persons who engage in politically-motivated harassment, abuse, extortion, or extended detention or trial of individuals in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 3244. A bill to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3245. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 3246. A bill to provide enhanced protections for taxpayers from fraud and other illegal activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3247. A bill to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3248. A bill to restrict the provision by international financial institutions of loans and financial and technical assistance to the Government of Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3249. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the amount in controversy requirement and remove the complete diversity requirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for rent paid on the personal residence of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 3251. A bill to require executive agencies to consider rental in any analysis for equipment acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3252. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to reservation of funds for failure to enact or enforce open container laws and repeat intoxicated driver laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to add additional vaccines to the list of taxable vaccines; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3254. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish criminal penalties for unlawful payments for referrals to recovery homes and clinical treatment facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. Kaine, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KING, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. Res. 581. A resolution authorizing the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Senate in *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 582. A resolution protecting American democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 583. A resolution commending the Department of Justice for its investigation into the interference by the Russian Federation in the 2016 United States presidential election, and maintaining that the Russian Federation must be held accountable for its actions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEIN-

STEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 584. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate against the making available of current and former diplomats, officials, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. Kaine):

S. Res. 585. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the commissioning of the USS John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 586. A resolution honoring the 170th anniversary of the first women's rights convention held in the United States in Seneca Falls, New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 26

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) 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. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) 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. 1113

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes.

S. 1730

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were

added as cosponsors of S. 1730, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1880

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1880, a bill to reform our government, reduce the grip of special interest, and return our democracy to the American people by increasing transparency and oversight of our elections and government, reforming public financing for Presidential and Congressional elections, and requiring States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2009, a bill to require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2554

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2554, a bill to ensure that health insurance issuers and group health plans do not prohibit pharmacy providers from providing certain information to enrollees.

S. 2568

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2568, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 2593

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2593, a bill to protect the administration of Federal elections against cybersecurity threats.

S. 2602

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2602, a bill to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines, and for other purposes.

S. 2780

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2780, a bill to require a determination on designation of the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

S. 2843

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis.

S. 2945

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2945, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving the voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas.

S. 3063

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 3063, a bill to delay the reimposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2020.

S. 3128

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3128, a bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3172, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 3233

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3233, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons responsible for violence and human rights abuses in Nicaragua, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 525

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 525, a resolution designating September 2018 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3245. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3245

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 “Lake Fannin Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTRY.—The term “County” means the Fannin County, Texas.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Lake Fannin Conveyance” and dated November 21, 2013.

(3) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The term “National Forest System land” means the approximately 2,025 acres of National Forest System land generally depicted on the map.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this section, if the County submits to the Secretary a written request for conveyance of the National Forest System land not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the National Forest System land.

(b) MAP.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate office of the Forest Service.

(2) CORRECTION OF ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct minor errors in the map.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) subject to valid existing rights;

(2) made without consideration;

(3) made by quitclaim deed; and

(4) subject to any other terms and conditions the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) USE.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the County shall agree to manage the land conveyed under that subsection for a public purpose.

(e) COSTS.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the County shall pay for all costs associated with the conveyance, including the costs of—

(1) the survey required under subsection (f); and

(2) any environmental analysis and resource surveys required under Federal law.

(f) SURVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The actual acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) CADASTRAL SURVEYS.—The Secretary may perform and approve any cadastral surveys required to be conducted as part of a survey under paragraph (1).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 581—AUTHORIZING THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE SENATE IN TEXAS V. UNITED STATES, NO. 4:18-CV-00167-O (N.D. TEX.)

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KING, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 581

Whereas Texas, Wisconsin, Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Paul LePage (Governor of Maine), Mississippi (by and through Governor Phil Bryant), Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and West Virginia have filed suit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, arguing that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119), is unconstitutional and should be enjoined, by asserting that the Act's requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage (commonly known as the “individual responsibility provision”) in section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, is unconstitutional following the amendment of that provision by the Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (Public Law 115-97) (commonly known as the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act”);

Whereas these State and individual plaintiffs also seek to strike down the entire Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act as not severable from the individual responsibility provision;

Whereas on June 7, 2018, the Department of Justice refused to defend the constitutionality of the amended individual responsibility provision, despite the well-established duty of the Department to defend Federal statutes where reasonable arguments can be made in their defense; and

Whereas the Department of Justice not only refused to defend the amended individual responsibility provision, but it affirmatively argued that this provision is unconstitutional and that the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act guaranteeing issuance of insurance coverage regardless of health status or pre-existing conditions (commonly known as the “guaranteed issue provision”), sections 2702, 2704, and 2705(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-1, 300gg-3, 300gg-4(a)), and prohibiting discriminatory premium rates (commonly known as the “community rating provision”), sections 2701 and 2705(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C.

300gg(a)(1), 300gg-4(b)) must now be struck down as not severable from the individual responsibility provision: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the Senate in *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), including seeking to—

(1) intervene as a party in the matter; and
(2) defend all provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the amendments made by that Act to other provisions of law, and any amendments to such provisions, including the provisions ensuring affordable health coverage for those with pre-existing conditions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 582—PROTECTING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 582

Whereas Senator John McCain stated, “[It] was one of the most disgraceful performances by an American president in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump’s naiveté, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. But it is clear that the summit in Helsinki was a tragic mistake.”;

Whereas, on July 17, 2018, in response to the international backlash, President Trump, while claiming he misspoke and blaming the media for reporting what he said, still sowed doubt about the electoral interference by the Russian Federation by claiming it “could be other people also” and not just the Russian Federation;

Whereas the United States faces an unprecedented situation in which the President of the United States refuses to acknowledge an attack on the democracy of the United States;

Whereas the Russian Federation has been interfering not only in the elections of the United States, but also in the elections of other democracies, such as the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, to name a few;

Whereas the goal of the Russian Federation is to advance its own interests by weakening the transatlantic alliance of democracies that arose after the Second World War, while also inflaming internal divisions in each of those countries;

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, Special Counsel Robert Mueller announced indictments of 12 members of the military intelligence service of the Russian Federation known as the Glavnoe Razvedyvatel’noe Upravlenie (referred to in this preamble as the “GRU”);

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats raised the alarm on growing cyberattack threats against the United States in a range of areas, including Federal, State, and local government agencies, the military, business, and academia, stating that the situation is at a “critical point”, adding, “In regards to state actions, Russia has been the most aggressive foreign actor. No question. And they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.”, and comparing the warning signs to the signs the United States faced ahead of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the cyberattacks by the Russian Federation represent a threat to the democratic system of the United States and the democratic systems of the allies of the United States;

Whereas, domestically, President Putin has undermined democracy in the Russian Federation, crushing free speech, jailing political opponents, harassing and assassinating journalists who criticize him, and in-

creasingly persecuting ethnic and religious minorities and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer citizens;

Whereas, in terms of foreign policy, the Russian Federation has meddled in the elections of democratic countries, stoking political tensions by promoting hatred and suspicion of immigrants and minorities, and trying to undermine longstanding alliances between democratic allies;

Whereas, in 2014, in violation of international law, the Russian Federation invaded neighboring Ukraine, and annexed the Crimea region;

Whereas the Russian Federation has assassinated political opponents abroad, most recently through the use of poison in Salisbury, England, on a former spy and his daughter, an atrocious chemical attack that endangered the lives of hundreds of civilians and which, according to news reports, the Government of the United Kingdom concluded was likely carried out by the GRU; and

Whereas President Trump had an opportunity to raise the issues described in the preceding clauses with President Putin at the July 16, 2018, summit in Helsinki, Finland, but chose not to: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) accepts the assessment of the United States intelligence community with regard to interference by the Russian Federation in elections in the United States and in other democracies;

(2) must move aggressively to protect the election systems of the United States from interference by the Russian Federation or any other foreign power, and work closely with the democratic partners of the United States to do the same for elections in those countries;

(3) demands that the sanctions against the Russian Federation that were enacted in the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44; 131 Stat. 886) be fully implemented by the President;

(4) will not accept any interference with the ongoing investigation of Special Counsel Robert Mueller, such as the offer of preemptive pardons or the firing of Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein; and

(5) declares that the President must cooperate with the investigation of Special Counsel Mueller.

SENATE RESOLUTION 583—COMMENDING THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR ITS INVESTIGATION INTO THE INTERFERENCE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN THE 2016 UNITED STATES PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, AND MAINTAINING THAT THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS ACTIONS

Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 583

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, an investigation of the Department of Justice resulted in the indictment of 12 officials of the Government of the Russian Federation for interfering with the 2016 United States presidential election;

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, when speaking about the digital infrastructure of the United States being under attack from foreign actors, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats stated, “In regards to state actions, Russia has been the most aggressive

foreign actor. No question. And they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.”; and

Whereas, on July 16, 2018, in a joint press conference in Helsinki, Finland, the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, denied that the Russian Federation interfered in the 2016 United States presidential election: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Department of Justice for its thorough investigation into the interference in the 2016 United States presidential election, which resulted in the indictment of 12 intelligence officers of the Government of the Russian Federation;

(2) agrees with the assessment of the United States intelligence community that the Russian Federation interfered with the 2016 United States presidential election, and rejects the Russian Federation’s denial of such involvement;

(3) reaffirms its position that the Russian Federation must be held accountable for interfering in the 2016 United States presidential election;

(4) calls upon relevant committees of the Senate to exercise congressional oversight, including prompt hearings and the release of relevant notes and information, to better understand the impact of the recent summit in Helsinki, Finland, on the foreign policy and national security of the United States; and

(5) calls for the immediate and full implementation of mandatory sanctions provided for in the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44; 131 Stat. 886), which passed the Senate 98-2, to deter and punish election interference by the Russian Federation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 584—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE AGAINST THE MAKING AVAILABLE OF CURRENT AND FORMER DIPLOMATS, OFFICIALS, AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR QUESTIONING BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VLADIMIR PUTIN

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 584

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should refuse to make available any current or former diplomat, civil servant, political appointee, law enforcement official, or member of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin.

SENATE RESOLUTION 585—COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMISSIONING OF THE USS JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. Kaine) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 585

Whereas the USS John F. Kennedy (CV-67) was named in honor of the 35th president of the United States;

Whereas, on May 27, 1967, President John F. Kennedy's 9-year-old daughter, Caroline Kennedy, christened the USS John F. Kennedy at the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company in Newport News, Virginia;

Whereas, on September 7, 1968, during the height of the Cold War, the USS John F. Kennedy entered service at its home port of Naval Station Norfolk in Norfolk, Virginia, as the only ship of her class and the last conventionally powered carrier built for the United States Navy;

Whereas the USS John F. Kennedy was a stalwart of the Atlantic Fleet of the United States Navy, sailing to Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, and across the Arctic and Pacific Oceans;

Whereas, on March 28, 1977, the USS John F. Kennedy became the first United States aircraft carrier to make a port call at Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia;

Whereas, on December 4, 1983, the USS John F. Kennedy launched 10 aircraft to bomb Syrian anti-aircraft and artillery positions near Hammama, Lebanon, in response to attacks against aircraft of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas, on July 3 and 4, 1986, the USS John F. Kennedy hosted more than 8,000 people during the International Naval Review honoring the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty and hosted President Ronald Reagan on Independence Day;

Whereas, on January 4, 1989, the USS John F. Kennedy launched two F-14 aircraft from Fighter Squadron 32 to intercept and destroy 2 hostile MiG-23s from the Libyan Air Force;

Whereas, on December 29, 1990, the USS John F. Kennedy entered port in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, as the first United States aircraft carrier to visit Saudi Arabia;

Whereas, on January 17, 1991, the USS John F. Kennedy launched its first strikes in Operation Desert Storm as part of a multi-country coalition to drive the military of Iraq out of neighboring Kuwait;

Whereas, from the beginning of hostilities on January 16, 1991, to their cessation on February 28, 1991, the USS John F. Kennedy launched 2,895 aircraft sorties, which struck 114 targets, delivered 3,500,000 pounds of ordnance, and provided 11,263 aircraft combat hours;

Whereas, on September 22, 1995, the USS John F. Kennedy was transferred to Naval Station Mayport in Jacksonville, Florida, as the new home port of the vessel;

Whereas, on November 1, 1999, the USS John F. Kennedy became the first United States aircraft carrier to make a port call in Al Aqabah, Jordan, and hosted the King of Jordan;

Whereas, on September 11, 2001, the USS John F. Kennedy was called upon to secure the mid-Atlantic seaboard to "help calm a fearful and shocked nation";

Whereas, from March 11 to July 17, 2002, the USS John F. Kennedy deployed and launched strikes in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, and those strikes dropped 64,000 pounds of ordnance on Taliban and Al Qaeda targets;

Whereas, from July 10 to November 20, 2004, the USS John F. Kennedy deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and launched 8,296 aircraft sorties, which dropped 54,000 pounds of ordnance;

Whereas, on December 13, 2004, the USS John F. Kennedy returned from its 21st and final deployment;

Whereas the USS John F. Kennedy was decommissioned at her final homeport of Naval Station Mayport in Jacksonville, Florida, on March 23, 2007, stricken from the Naval Vessel Register on October 16, 2009, and lays in wait at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, pending

final disposition or the call to serve again in the United States Navy; and

Whereas, from August 23 to 26, 2018, the former crews and supporters of the USS John F. Kennedy will meet in Norfolk, Virginia, to honor the 50th anniversary of the commissioning of the vessel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary of the commissioning of the USS John F. Kennedy (CV-67); and

(2) honors the USS John F. Kennedy, its crew, and all of the courageous sailors and Marines of the United States who have served on board in the past.

SENATE RESOLUTION 586—HONORING THE 170TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION HELD IN THE UNITED STATES IN SENECA FALLS, NEW YORK

Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 586

Whereas 2018 marks the 170th anniversary of the first women's rights convention held in the United States in Seneca Falls, New York, organized by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott;

Whereas the momentum created by organized women in the 1800s led to the first women's rights convention and the passing of the Declaration of Sentiments in Seneca Falls, New York;

Whereas, at Seneca Falls, New York, 68 women and 32 men signed the Declaration of Sentiments, a plea for the end of discrimination against women;

Whereas the Declaration of Sentiments offered at Seneca Falls, New York, was modeled after the Declaration of Independence and declared that "all men and women are created equal", linking women's rights directly to the founding ideals of the United States;

Whereas women's suffrage activists tirelessly worked together to form organizations that raised public awareness, resulting in the adoption of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in 1920, guaranteeing all women of the United States the right to vote;

Whereas, in 2018, women have made giant leaps in the cause for gender equality, yet still struggle daily for equal treatment;

Whereas women of the United States earn only 80 cents for every dollar earned by men of the United States;

Whereas women constitute 50.8 percent of the population of the United States but only 20 percent of the 115th Congress; and

Whereas empowering women offers tremendous opportunity for economic and social progress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of the 170th anniversary of the first women's rights convention held in the United States;

(2) promotes meaningful participation of women in every sector of society; and

(3) supports policy measures that promote gender equality and the empowerment of women.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They

have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Kathleen Laura Kraninger, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Mary Bridget Neumayr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, and John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on following nominations: Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Carmen Guericcio McLean, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: 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, 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.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114-198, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Creating Options for Veterans' Expedited Recovery (COVER Commission): Thomas E. Harvey of New York.

The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115-123, on behalf of the majority leader of the Senate, appoints the following individual as a member of the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships: William S. Simon of Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Monday, July 23, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 1000. I ask consent that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 6147

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the Wilkie nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6147.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 23, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, July 23; 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. I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

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 Senator SULLIVAN.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO JEANNE FOLLETT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Thursday afternoon, and it is one of my favorite times of the week. I know for many of my fellow Senators, including the Presiding Officer and the pages, this is one of their favorite times of the week, too, because it is the time that we get to talk about the Alaskan of the Week. I had a couple of people today ask me: Senator, when are you giving your speech on the Alaskan of the Week?

I said: Later.

They said: OK. We will keep an eye on it—because people find a lot of interest in what is happening in the great State of Alaska. The Alaskan of the Week, as many of my colleagues know, is somebody whom we like to highlight who has done great stuff for the State, community, town, maybe country. Sometimes it is someone famous. Oftentimes, it is somebody who has been working really hard for much of their life and doesn't get a lot of recognition. They are the heroes of the community. That is why we like to talk about the Alaskan of the Week.

It is also a great opportunity to talk to people in the Gallery or people watching on TV, on C-SPAN, to get them to come on up to Alaska. Come on up. It will be the trip of a lifetime. Of course, it is a gorgeous, huge State with mountains, glaciers, and wildlife, but when you get off the plane in Alaska, you get the sense of freedom—liberty. You can almost breathe it in ways that you can't in other places.

I tell everybody who is watching: Come on up. You will love it. It will be the trip of a lifetime. You will feel that freedom in the air like you do in almost no other place in the world.

Let me introduce you to our Alaskan of the Week, Jeanne Follett, who has

displayed incredible commitment to keep our State clean and special. Let's talk about Jeanne. She was born in Detroit. She moved to Anchorage when she was just 6 years old and has called Alaska home ever since.

Like so many Alaskans, she has led a very interesting and varied life. She began her professional career as a court reporter for the Anchorage Daily News, our big newspaper, covering all kinds of trials when the State was still new and our court system had just been formed. Remember, we are a very young State.

Eventually, she moved to Girdwood, which is a beautiful ski resort town outside of Anchorage, where she was a breakfast cook and managed condos. She got a bit restless. She packed up her 1965 Mustang and drove across the country but missed Alaska so much she came back home again.

Then she worked on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, TAPS, as we call it, that flows the billions of barrels of oil from the North Slope down to Valdez for an energy-hungry country like ours.

She met her husband Ken as she was working on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. They bought a lodge in a wonderful, small community called Moose Pass—a warm, welcoming, and gorgeous Alaska community in the heart of the Kenai Peninsula, about 100 miles south of Anchorage. If you are going to fish the famous Russian River, Moose Pass is a great home base.

Ken and Jeanne worked at the resort until they both retired. Jeanne always liked to keep her yard and her surroundings clean and organized, free of trash, but when her husband Ken, unfortunately, got sick—and, tragically, she lost him over 13 years ago—Jeanne began to spend her days helping clean up the State; picking up trash on the road by her House, farther and farther from her home in Moose Pass.

Think of this, as the snow melts in Alaska, and in all sorts of weather, to this day, Jeanne laces up her hiking boots, grabs her visors, her gloves, her safety vest, drives up the highway to the spot where she left off the previous day, and she starts cleaning up the highway every single day. She gets out her bags. She starts walking and cleaning up trash on the side of the highway. This highway abuts the majestic, beautiful Chugach National Forest. She guesses that every summer, she spends 3 to 6 hours a day volunteering picking up trash. Think about that.

Alaska is a beautiful, pristine place. As a matter of fact, that is one of the things, when people come to visit, they are going to see, but like all States, in particular highway areas in States, you have some garbage. Jeanne takes action every single day. She doesn't get paid. So 3 to 6 hours a day, 5 days a week, she is out there cleaning up the highway. Remarkable.

Sometimes friends and neighbors come and help out or Boy Scouts join her. One summer, she picked up 800 bags of trash to keep Alaska clean and

pristine. People stop on the side of the road to talk to her or ask where the nearest gas station is. Sometimes people donate gas money to her because, remember, she is starting where she left off the next day, driving up the highway 40 miles to continue. It is not just time and effort, it is actual money. She thinks her presence on the side of the highway helps motivate others.

There was a story recently on KTUU, Channel 2, our big news station in Alaska. She said in that story that she thinks she has helped inspire people to keep the whole State clean, whether it is picking up trash themselves or not throwing litter outside your car.

Why does she do it, several hours a day, with no pay, day after day, week after week? She does it because she loves Alaska. She wants to keep it clean. We have hundreds of thousands—really millions—of tourists who come to our State. She doesn't want them to see trash when it is going to be the trip of a lifetime. She said: It embarrasses me to think that tourists from the lower 48 might show up in Alaska and see trash, so I am going to clean it up.

She does it because it is her way to give back to a State that has given her so much. She also gets to see things that others don't see often: beautiful wildflowers on the road, creeks, secret vistas. I am sure she has seen a few bears and a lot of bald eagles and moose. She even saw a man once walking a chicken. Yes, you see everything in Alaska.

Jeanne has found lost items on the side of the road: fishing licenses, cell phones, cameras. She tries her best to get these back to their owners. Once she found a set of hubcaps that had contact information on it for the owner. When she called and told him she had his hubcaps, he couldn't believe it. He was tickled pink to get his hubcaps back.

I think every State has somebody like Jeanne. There is no doubt, we all owe a debt of gratitude to people like Jeanne, working selflessly, volunteering thousands of hours to keep our States like Alaska clean, to keep America clean.

So, Jeanne, thanks for what you are doing for the great State of Alaska,

and thank you and congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JULY 23, 2018, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 23.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:20 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 23, 2018, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ERIC D. MILLER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE RICHARD C. TALLMAN, RETIRED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TIMOTHY G. SZYMANSKI

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF CORDOVA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

HON. AMI BERA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Cordova Recreation and Park District.

Established by popular vote of the residents in 1958, the Cordova Recreation and Park District (CRPD) now serves approximately 120,000 residents in Sacramento County. In 1962, the CRPD opened Cordova Community Center within Cordova Community Park, one of its first three parks.

Both the park and the center were renamed after Paul Hagan, the first Administrator of the CRPD. It was Mr. Hagan's idea to open a community center located close to schools in the area so that the center could be mutually supportive of the schools with their programs and facilities. Under Mr. Hagan's leadership, the CRPD expanded from three parks to six, doubling in size. The co-location of schools and parks became a model for California and the rest of the country.

The CRPD currently operates over 40 parks and facilities and they most recently opened Heron Landing Community Park in 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Cordova Recreation and Park District on 60 years of outstanding contributions to our community, and wish them luck as they continue to grow and provide safe spaces for future generations of Sacramento County residents.

HONORING BISHOP RICHARD J. GARCIA

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of the Most Reverend Richard John Garcia, bishop of the Diocese of Monterey. Bishop Garcia lived a long life, filled with God and God's children. His service to the central coast of California and love for all people will be missed.

Bishop Garcia was the son of immigrants from Mexico who wanted to give their children a better life. That American Dream was fulfilled when Bishop Garcia became a priest in 1973 and pursued further doctoral studies in Dogmatic Theology in Rome from 1980 to 1984. After serving multiple dioceses in California, Bishop Garcia was named fourth bishop of Diocese of Monterey by Pope Benedict XVI.

When Bishop Garcia would see you, he would grab you and he would not look through you, but at you. It was then that you would feel his love and divine spirit for every man.

He welcomed everyone who entered his church but also those who entered this country. He did not just care about people, but also the future of our planet, as an early supporter of a power plan which promoted and provided renewable energy to our community.

As recounted by the Diocese of Monterey and known by anyone to have had the pleasure of knowing Bishop Garcia, he had a special concern for the poor, the incarcerated, migrant workers and immigrant communities. He always had time for his priests, deacons, religious, seminarians, and the people of God throughout the Diocese of Monterey, especially children with special needs. He was proud of his Mexican-American heritage and the diversity of cultures that are represented in the Church.

Saint Junipero Serra, another eminent priest from the Central Coast, encouraged followers of God to "always go forward and never turn back." As we look back on the life of Richard Garcia, we know that his spirit, love, and guidance provides us with the divinity to always go forward. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the life of Bishop Richard John Garcia.

CONGRATULATING DEVIN ROBERSON OF THE JEFFERSON CITY JAYS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Devin Roberson of the Jefferson City Jays for his first-place finish in the Discus Field Event at the 2018 Missouri Class 5 State Track and Field Championship.

Devin and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Devin Roberson for a job well done.

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY IN SESSION UNTIL THE JOB IS DONE

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that Congress plans to adjourn for August recess without addressing critical issues important to the American people. I appreciate that district work periods allow Members to visit with folks back in their community, but it is now becoming a habit for Congress to abandon a long "to do" list in the rush to get out of town. This August is no exception.

Unfortunately, Congress has not done its job. It has not completed the work of the peo-

ple; including budgeting and critical national security legislation. Our constituents expect us to stay and finish the job. As I requested of the Speaker in June, let's clear our schedules and—in the strongest possible terms—and stay in Washington for the month of August to finish the business of the people.

As I have said in previous years as we approach the August recess, I'm prepared to stay in Washington as long as it takes. These issues are too important to delay.

HONORING RETIRED DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF STU CAVUTO, JASON WHEELER AND MELANIE MASCATO

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor retired Deputy Fire Chief Stu Cavuto, Jason Wheeler, and Melanie Mascato, for their actions to help save the life of a young father on Father's Day.

While running an errand this Father's Day, Deputy Fire Chief Cavuto and Mr. Wheeler were alerted to an emergency situation when their vehicle was flagged down by Ms. Mascato. After pulling over to the side of the road, the two learned that a young father was without a pulse after overdosing on heroin inside a nearby car. Acting immediately, the trio called for an ambulance and began to prepare the man for CPR by extracting him from his car and bringing him to the adjacent lawn. However, before they were able to begin administering CPR the man's pulse and breathing suddenly returned. Shortly thereafter, paramedics arrived on the scene and transported the man to a local hospital.

Hearing of the actions taken by these three individuals reaffirms my belief in the inherent kindness of strangers and further motivates me to work with my colleagues in Congress to pass legislation that combats the opioid epidemic.

Today, I am proud to honor Stu Cavuto, Jason Wheeler, and Melanie Mascato for taking actions to save the life of a young father. In the future, I hope that we can look toward these good Samaritans as inspiration and rally around all efforts to help those struggling with opioid addictions.

LEONARD PERLMUTTER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Leonard Michael Perlmutter, a great Coloradan and a wonderful husband, father, grandfather, great-grandfather, uncle and cousin.

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Leonard Perlmutter, born October 16, 1925 to Phil and Belle Perlmutter in Denver, Colorado died July 8, 2018 in Denver. Leonard (or "Len" or "Laz" as he was known to many) was married for 66 years to his college sweetheart Alice and they had three children Ed (Nancy), Joe, and Cassie (Joe Levi), six grandchildren (Alexis, Abby, Zoe, Ian, Aaron and Braden) and one great-granddaughter (Lily). He was predeceased by his mother and father, his sister Ann Reinstein, brother Jack, and sister Roz Altenberg.

Laz was a lifelong Coloradan and lived in Denver and Jefferson County. He attended Colfax Elementary, Lake Junior High, West High School and the University of Colorado at Boulder. He played all manner of sports from baseball to tennis to skiing to squash and handball. As a kid, he fished pretty much every stream Colorado has to offer.

Laz was a true citizen of the West in business and civic matters. In 1951, with family members and a close friend, he helped start and build Perlmutter and Sons, a prestressed and precast concrete company. Perlmutter and Sons became Prestressed Concrete of Colorado before eventually becoming Stanley Structures, which spanned the Rocky Mountain West, Texas, Arizona and Canada, and employed more than 2,000 people. Laz served as CEO of Stanley Structures for many years. It was a union business from top to bottom and was instrumental in building thousands of structures including airports, resorts, roads and bridges, federal and state installations and laboratories, military bases, apartments, warehouses, office buildings, shopping centers, and hospitals.

Laz was a dedicated ambassador for National Jewish Health for more than 40 years. He became a member of the Board of Directors in 1978 and served in a variety of key leadership roles, including as Chairman of the Board of Directors from 1983 to 1986. He was on the Executive Committee of the Board since 1980 and a Lifetime Director and even served as interim President and CEO from 1991 through 1993.

Laz's other civic engagements included: lifetime member of the Colorado Forum; Chairman of the Denver Symphony; Chairman of the international trade and standards organization called Prestressed/Precast Concrete Institute; Chairman of the Santa Fe Opera; Board Member of the Foothills Art Center; Trustee of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory; Board Member of Colorado National Bank Shares; President and Chairman of Colorado Open Lands; President of Reed Street Elementary and Wheat Ridge Junior High PTA's; precinct committee man and district captain for the Democratic Party in Jefferson County; head of Economic Development in the Roy Romer Administration; Chairman of the University of Colorado Foundation; and Board Member of the Foundation for Colorado Community Colleges. He also taught graduate courses in political science at the University of Colorado at Denver as an adjunct professor.

He loved and respected everyone, no matter their station in life or their background. He had time for everyone, especially his family and friends. Laz was a Democrat from the top of his head to the tips of his toes. Even so he had friends all over the political spectrum. He was egalitarian and community-minded. He had a great sense of humor with a big wide smile and a twinkle in his eye for just about everyone.

On behalf of my family and the people of Colorado, I extend my deepest appreciation to Leonard Perlmutter for his dedication to and good works for his community and for his love of Colorado, the mountains and his family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 2018, I was absent from the House and missed Roll Call votes 329 and 330.

Had I been present for Roll Call 329, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 4946, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1075 North Tustin Street in Orange, California, as the "Specialist Trevor A. Win'E Post Office", I would have voted "Yes."

Had I been present for Roll Call 330, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 4960, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 East Walnut Street in Columbia, Missouri, as the "Spc. Sterling William Wyatt Post Office Building", I would have voted "Yes."

CONGRATULATING ANDREW SCHNEIDER

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Andrew Schneider who attained the Eagle Scout Award. Becoming an Eagle Scout, the highest rank in the Boy Scouts, has only been accomplished by approximately four percent of all Boy Scouts. The process requires earning at least 21 merit badges which takes years to fulfill.

Receiving his Eagle Scout rank demonstrates that he is a strong, dedicated, and proven leader. With this accomplishment, it is my hope he will continue to serve as a role model for younger boy scouts. Thank you to Mr. Schneider for making a positive impact in northeast Iowa.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 2018, I mistakenly voted against amendment No. 51 to H.R. 6147, the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, offered by Representative RUBEN GALLEGO of Arizona. I intended to vote in favor of the amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERRY MCNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote number 358, I mistakenly recorded my vote as nay when I should have voted aye.

TRIBUTE TO GERALDO "JERRY" PUGA

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Geraldo "Jerry" Puga, who passed away in California on Saturday, July 7, 2018. Jerry was a small business owner in the City of Corona, an active member of our community, and he will be deeply missed.

As a young child, Jerry's family lived in Alberhill where his father worked in clay products manufacturing. The Pug as moved to Corona when Jerry was 10. When he was finished with school, he followed his father into clay manufacturing. Later, Jerry began his career in floor coverings at Larry Graebner's Furniture in Corona. In 1960, Jerry and his partner, the late Frank Addleman, opened the doors to Jerry & Frank's Carpets in Corona. For over 50 years, Jerry spent his professional life in the carpet/floor covering business.

While conducting business at a local bank, Jerry met Andrea Martinez, whom he married in 1970. They became business partners, with Andrea instituting home decorating. The business changed its name to Jerry Carpets & Interiors and opened in the Corona Mall. Jerry was an active member of the Corona Rotary and participated in numerous local charitable causes. After serving customers in six decades, Jerry retired in 2008. The Corona Chamber of Commerce honored Jerry in January 2018 with its Lifetime Achievement Award.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to Andrea Puga, the entire Puga family, his friends, and everyone fortunate enough to know Jerry. Although Jerry may be gone, the many contributions he made to our community will have a lasting impact.

RECOGNIZING THE BICENTENNIAL OF PLAIN CITY, OHIO

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Congressional District to recognize the bicentennial of Plain City, Ohio. Since Dr. Isaac Bigelow first made his way to Central Ohio from Pennsylvania, Plain City has exemplified many of our nation's core values.

In the early 1800s, the few residents of Pleasant Valley began to witness change and growth for their town. From a single log building on Post Road known as Travelers Inn and

two stores run by Dr. Bigelow himself, a truck line railroad eventually spurred sustainable and quick growth for Pleasant Valley, which officially became Plain City in 1871.

Moreover, from its foundation, Plain City has played an important role in American history, originally planted within the Virginia Military District to support veterans of the Revolutionary War. Today, there are over 500 veterans living and working in Plain City, all of whom have made tremendous sacrifices to preserve our freedoms.

For the past 200 years, the overwhelming characteristic of the people of Plain City is the compassion they hold for one another and their determination to do what is right and just. In the 19th century, residents worked diligently in support of the Underground Railroad. Today, the people of Plain City strive to create a "family-oriented community that works cooperatively to promote outstanding quality of life, securing a sustainable environment for future generations while preserving [their] unique heritage and character."

Today, Plain City remains a beautiful place to work, live, and raise a family. I am grateful for the leadership of the Village Council Members, Jody Carney, Kerri Ferguson, Sherry Heineman, Darren Lee, Shannon Pine, and John Rucker, Mayor Darrin Lane and all of the neighbors and friends who have maintained Plain City's beauty and history.

I am honored to represent this county, where community, integrity, and freedom are celebrated not just in recognition of the 200th anniversary of its founding, but each and every day.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 644, CON- DEMNATION OF SLAVE AUC- TIONS IN LIBYA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 644, to condemn the slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya. The legislation, which calls for multilateral action and support, takes an important first step towards ending deplorable human rights grievances in the country.

In an era where most of us consider slavery to be a shame of the past, the photos, videos, and reports that have emerged out of Libya in the past year have rocked us to the very core of our humanity.

What is happening in Libya is an unspeakable atrocity.

Recent U.N. reports out of Libya detail sexual violence against the most vulnerable migrant populations—women and children—as well as the unlivable conditions in the detention centers where refugees are being held.

People—human beings—are being bought, sold, and traded like chattel, on auction blocks, for their labor.

This is nothing short of a humanitarian crisis.

As a leader on the international stage, and as fellow human beings, our nation has a responsibility to speak out against such flagrant disregard for human life and freedom.

I would like to thank my colleague, KAREN BASS for offering H.R. 644 to condemn the

slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya, and for calling the world to action.

I strongly encourage my colleagues in Congress to act, with a sense of urgency, to end these egregious human rights violations.

IN MEMORY, REMEMBRANCE, AND CELEBRATION OF BEVERLY AL- STON

HON. ADRIANO ESPAILLAT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dear friend and civil rights champion, Ms. Beverly Alston.

Ms. Alston will long be remembered for her legacy as a civil rights warrior, social justice champion, and for being a loving mother. She was an icon in Harlem; renown for her tireless fight against racial discrimination. Ms. Alston worked with Reverend Al Sharpton in the early days of the National Action Network.

She saw it grow from a local grassroots organization to a nationally and internationally recognized civil rights organization.

Reverend Sharpton took time this past weekend to recognize Ms. Alston on his PoliticsNation program speaking to her character and her contributions to the fight for equality that began in the Harlem Community.

It was her lifelong mission to better our Harlem and Northern Manhattan community for this generation and those that follow. Ms. Alston was a dedicated public servant having served in many different positions that reflected her interests and aptitudes.

She was Superintendent of the New York State Office of General Services; past President of the Jackie Robinson Park Conservatory and worked in Intergovernmental Relations for the New York State Insurance Department.

In both the New York City Council and New York State Executive Chamber, Ms. Alston was always able to make a positive impact on the lives of New Yorkers in the City and throughout the State.

Her legacy to Harlem will forever be remembered. May she Rest in Peace and may God comfort her friends, family, and all who knew and loved her dearly. She will be missed.

GERALD "JERRY" K. WELLER

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Oregon has been on the cutting edge of advancing LGBTQ rights, or "gay rights" as they were known over 40 years ago. On Sunday, July 8, we lost one of the early pioneers in Oregon and nationally—Gerald K. Weller.

Jerry encouraged others to follow his example as an articulate leader, open about his sexual orientation and the critical nature of the civil rights movement he helped found. As a gay man, he provided many with their first experience of knowing an out and proud gay person.

Jerry was the executive director of Portland Town Council, a pioneering LGBTQ advocacy

organization in Oregon, and went on to leadership on the national level in Washington, D.C. for what would become the Human Rights Campaign Fund. He led a major health clinic in Chicago in the midst of the AIDS epidemic. With his return to Oregon, he worked for several state agencies as a committed advocate for gay rights.

Early in my career, I valued Jerry's leadership, advice, support, and advocacy. He truly made his mark as one of the unsung heroes of the LGBTQ civil rights movement as he improved the lives of countless Oregonians and advanced understanding for many more.

I salute his impact on Oregon and the nation and mourn his loss.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM RICHARD CRAMER

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to William Richard Cramer, who passed away in California on Wednesday, June 20, 2018. Richard was an innovator in the feed and egg industries, and an active member of our community. He will be deeply missed.

Richard was born in Anaheim on July 25, 1931 to parents Olin and Ruth. He graduated from Anaheim Union High School in 1949 and received his B.A. from Claremont McKenna College in 1953. During college he served two years in the California Air National Guard and met Carole Furman, whom he married in 1952. They were married 45 years until Carole died in 1997. Richard married Mary Eisen and they have been together for 20 years. After graduating college, Richard joined the family egg production business. Over time this business grew to include Star Milling Co. in Perris, California, that was owned through a partnership between Richard and the Eisen family of Norco Ranch.

Richard was acknowledged as a leader in the animal feed and egg production industries and was awarded "Farmer of the Year—Poultry" by the California Department of Food and Agriculture in 1959. There were many other agricultural and business enterprises that Richard had ownership in, including Goose Creek Golf Club in Jurupa Valley, Orchard Egg Farms in Anaheim and Manchester Feeds in Arizona. Richard also served as a Trustee of Claremont McKenna College from 1987 to 2006. He was a leader in many civic and community organizations, past and present, as Member of the Board of Governors of the Bowers Museum, a founding donor to the Segerstrom Center for the Arts in Costa Mesa, and a 35-year member of the Lincoln Club of Orange County.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to my good friend Mary Cramer, the extended Cramer family, his friends, and everyone fortunate enough to know Richard. Although Richard may be gone, the many significant contributions he made to his family and our community will have a lasting impact.

EULOGY FOR MARY ELLEN SHEA

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and honor of working with Mary Ellen Shea over the years. She was an extraordinary woman, loved by all at the Connecticut State Capitol. I include in the RECORD this obituary, written by her daughter, Mary Frances Shea.

My mom loved my dad. And he loved her. But before that she was born in 1932 in Hartford, to a single young mother. It was a bit unconventional for the times . . . but with the help of her grandfather she found, in her school and friends, something she was good at. She used her ample personality, unique style and insightful vision to draw people to her and with these gifts and she gave her life some structure.

She loved the friends she would gather throughout her high school and college years. She was drawn to people with fun, outgoing and stable lives.

She was nothing if not practical, easy to entertain and driven to make something happen. It was in this atmosphere that she met my dad, Bob. She was even-handed and spirited. He was a planner and a "don't sweat the small stuff" guy. He really made her laugh . . . always. Even this week in the hospital. He was always going for the laugh with her and he got it . . . often. Her laugh and "Oh Bob" was a constant in their home and our lives.

First they were a good team.

And then team leaders.

There are 5 of us. The starting 5.

Tom is smart like her. She was captured by Tommy. As a little boy he charmed her, he made her think. She was always listening for that thing he was going to say that was smarter and funnier and really sly. He is clever enough to savagely mimic her and get away with it while she laughed and laughed. She lit up when Tommy came into the room. None of the rest of us had that. He was the first and that was something.

When I was 6 she took me out to the back yard where we had a huge lilac bush. She cut a big bunch of them and I can smell the sumptuous smell right now. You can too. She wrapped them in wet paper towels and put a string around them. She gave them to me to bring to my teacher for the last day. Many of you know my mom spent years as a teacher.

She told me to say "thank you for teaching me".

I love that memory because it comes with an aroma. It is the aroma of love and gratitude. What a lesson.

Tim is her middle child. He is so much like her in that he takes care to make sure that everything is running smoothly, that everyone is okay, that the trains are running on time. He is a planner and, he, too is practical. He is the perfect combination of my dad and my mom. The middle. She counted on him. She felt great pride in his success as a family man. She loved his wife, Laura. She was awestruck and amazed by his charity and his kindness. She told me that, so I am telling all of you.

My sister was the great joy in my mom's life. She had the home team family. As we all struggled with the distance, Mary Liz shared her kids and family life joyously. They spent time in each other's lives, holidays and average days. My sis and my mother had a short hand, like there was always an inside joke. They were close in a way that

supersedes deep conversation, it was more about silliness, respect and ever a sense of fun that would find them at the garage sale or the UConn Women's game or just sitting down at dinner. My mom sincerely loves all of her children and grandchildren but it is unmistakable that Liz, David and their kids had more of my mom's fingerprint on them. It's true.

My mother had 5 and her last is John. John got away with everything and never had to do anything but look at her, to make her smile. She gave John a pass, loved absolutely everything he did and said, especially when he married Lisa. The rest of us would make note of the fact that John had different parents. He got the mom who was relaxed and chill, the one who let things slide just a little more. And John knew how to capitalize on his good fortune. The rest of us had parents, he had bud's. She loved her baby. Yes I said it. That's what he was to her.

If we all did anything perfectly, in my mom's eyes, it was to bring our children to Black Point Beach for the summer. It was there that their 8 grandchildren were drawn, like magnets to 31 Seabreeze where they would eat horribly sweet cereal—and watch Bananas in Pajamas videos—and be read to by Grandma. If you ask them, this was a unique and special bliss that they will forever share with only each other. That's how you make memories and families. She knew the special recipe. She has 8 grandchildren, all here, together with her new great granddaughter who is currently stealing the show. She loved her grandkids . . . each one uniquely and now from afar.

A few other things to note about my mom

As I mentioned, my mom was a teacher but in the mid-70's she got an opportunity to take a small job at the State Capital in the House Clerk's Office with a couple of her high school chums. She loved the characters and the drama of the daily policy making. She was good at it. She eventually worked for the then, Speaker of the House. He's here today Tom Ritter. She loved you, Tom. And she loved Shelley, too! If you knew her then, you knew how much she loved it there. Those Capital days . . . they were a very, very special time in her life.

In her 50's she found out about her birth father, discovered he had had 6 kids, who when she met, embraced her. That was fun for her.

My mom chose her friends carefully. As you all know, you who are lucky enough to have known her as a best friend (Ann, Sally, Maureen and MaryBeth) and others out there,

She was a great listener and in that way, she gave good, practical advice. Here's the formula. Listen, for a very long time. Consider carefully, and then, quietly, say something practical. There it is.

I can almost do it all myself, now. Try it for yourself.

If you were her friend, or her acquaintance her neighbor, congratulations. She was so lovely. You won.

My mom had a fulfilling and wonderful life.

Such a long and winding road of a life.

It's best to share twists and turns with somebody . . . and share she did. She often said that she was so lucky to have found and married my dad. She always said it. Remember how much I stressed fun and stability? Well, that is Bob Shea. I can attest that this is a great combination of strengths when conjuring a father, but as a husband it was the winning formula, for sure.

I'm going to sum up their marriage and it's going to sound simple but it is not, at all. Bob and Mary Ellen were nice to each other. They talked about everything. They were, without reservation, about family . . . and friends . . .

My mom loved my dad and he loved her.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SANGAMON COUNTY FARM BUREAU

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to honor a remarkable organization, the Sangamon County Farm Bureau. The Sangamon County Farm Bureau in Central Illinois is an integral organization that promotes agricultural prosperity. After many years of success and service, the Sangamon County Farm Bureau is celebrating their 100th anniversary.

Sangamon County Farm Bureau was chartered on December 20, 1918 to unite farmers in the area and advocate for central Illinois agriculture collectively. Today, the group has almost 10,000 members supporting the agrarian community and economy throughout the county.

Not only does Sangamon County Farm Bureau provide a voice for farmers and promote the development of agriculture, but they also educate and empower future leaders in agriculture. Sangamon County Farm Bureau's Young Leaders program develops leadership skills for youth with agriculture interests. Additionally, Sangamon County Farm Bureau coordinates the USDA's Agriculture in the Classroom Program to teach students the important role agriculture plays in the state of Illinois.

Illinois has become a major economic force within the agricultural sector because of farm bureaus like Sangamon County that come together and enhance opportunities for local farmers, their families, and the community as a whole. I extend my sincere congratulations to Sangamon County Farm Bureau for their outstanding accomplishments and contributions to Illinois. I hope the organization continues to grow and prosper for the next one hundred years.

RECOGNIZING DALE ELDRIDGE KAYE

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dale Eldridge Kaye of Livermore, California on her retirement. Dale has lived in the Tri-Valley for 17 years and has worked tirelessly to develop our community.

Prior to moving to California, Dale was involved in the Florida state government. She utilized her keen marketing skills to develop media strategies, execute presidential advance work, and to help bring the Super Bowl to Jacksonville in 2005. As Head of the Jacksonville Public Relations Department, Dale's exceptional marketing work for the Jacksonville Jazz Festival was nationally recognized by PBS. She continued to cultivate her love of the arts after moving to California as Vice President of the film company Gold'N Hen Productions in Los Angeles before moving to the Tri-Valley.

Upon moving to the Tri-Valley, Dale became the President and CEO of the Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce and Livermore Valley Film Commission. While at the Chamber, she helped promote Livermore businesses and began her work to attract top talent to the Tri-Valley area. One of her greatest accomplishments with the Chamber was the creation of the annual Innovation Forum. Each year this event attracts hundreds of business influencers and showcases innovative local companies.

After 12 years with the Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce, Dale founded the Innovation Tri-Valley Leadership Group. Utilizing the industry relationships she cultivated with the Chamber and her passion for business development and marketing, Dale transformed the brand and perception of the Tri-Valley. She has brought together 60 partner organizations, 25 board members, and 90 committee members to work towards the common goal of expanding the national influence of Tri-Valley innovators.

With Innovation Tri-Valley Dale launched both the annual “#GameChangers” Awards for business leaders and the “DreamMakers and RiskTakers” Awards for youth. Both of these events engage civic leaders and award local innovators for their groundbreaking work. Additionally, she was instrumental in launching the landmark “Tri-Valley Rising” report, which highlights the region’s economic strengths and promise. Her advocacy and marketing efforts have assisted the Tri-Valley in becoming recognized, as Innovation Tri-Valley calls it, as “The Heart of California Innovation.”

Dale has made an indelible mark on the Tri-Valley business community, and I am grateful to have worked with her to better California’s 15th Congressional District. I want to congratulate Dale on a long and successful career. I also want to wish her and her husband Ted, who has been her faithful partner during her tremendous work for the Tri-Valley, all the best in Dale’s retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE INSTALLATION OF THE 7/20 MEMORIAL

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the installation of the 7/20 Memorial in the City of Aurora. This memorial is dedicated to those who lost their lives, the wounded, and the countless families impacted by the theater shooting tragedy.

On July 20, 2012, thirteen members of our community were killed and seventy more were injured when a lone gunman senselessly opened fire in a crowded movie theater. The crime devastated our community, the families who lost loved ones, as well as those who suffered lifelong injuries. Aurora was a city in grief.

Out of this tragedy some good has come. To start, our first responders and caregivers admirably aided those physically and mentally injured. Our community also came together and has continued to support those impacted on that terrible day. Now on July 27, 2018, the City of Aurora is dedicating a memorial designed by the world-renowned artist Douwe

Blumberg. Mr. Blumberg’s piece entitled “Ascentiate” is located in a memorial garden added to the City of Aurora’s Municipal Waterwise Garden. The sculpture displays eighty three cranes outstretched in flight to represent the victims of the shooting. Thirteen clear cranes in the middle of the garden represent those who lost their lives. This memorial is designed to provide comfort to those in need.

I also want to acknowledge the efforts and commitment of 7/20 Memorial Foundation which made this day possible: Board Officers: Theresa Hoover, Heather Dearman, Rena Medek Tiina Coon, Heather Bailey and Board Members: Bill Hoover, Terry Sullivan, Megan Sullivan-Jenks, and Jansen Young.

Let us all remember this tragedy by recognizing the 7/20 Memorial Foundation for commemorating the victims and their families.

SUPPORTING SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE ON OUR COLLEGE CAMPUSES

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague Congressman TED POE holding this important Special Order Hour to honor survivors of sexual violence on our college campuses, and in particular the brave members of the 12th Woman, a group of survivors from Texas A&M University who are speaking truth to power about their experiences. Judge POE has been unwavering in his pursuit of justice for victims of sexual violence on the bench and in Congress. I applaud his strong advocacy and tireless dedication to this incredibly important cause. He is a true ally and his legacy on this issue will continue to help countless victims and survivors move forward.

When parents drop off their children for their first year of college, we expect our institutions of higher learning to keep them safe. But that’s not the reality for 20 percent of young women and six percent of young men who are destined to become victims of sexual assault on campus. To make matters worse, survivors are constantly told that they are responsible for their assault—from being penalized for so-called ‘code of ethics’ violations, like drinking at parties or going into other students’ dorm rooms, to being blamed for not fighting back.

That includes a brave survivor at Texas A&M who had the wherewithal to alert her school that her rapist was allowed back on the swim team after being suspended for only one semester and not being subject to criminal charges. The school’s response speaks volumes—“I regret your displeasure with the perceived impact, and I wish you all the best as you continue to seek healing.” The school’s failure to protect the survivor and other potential victims is unacceptable.

They are not alone. Universities continue to inadequately deal with perpetrators across the country—from expulsions after graduation, to honor code violations that carry less of a penalty than plagiarism, to allowing perpetrators to directly cross-examine their victims about their past sexual history during the so-called investigative process. This kind of antiquated victim-blaming and -shaming must end.

That is why I am introducing the bipartisan Hold Accountable and Lend Transparency or HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act with my colleague Congressmen TED POE and BRIAN FITZPATRICK, to ensure that our colleges and universities do everything they can to hold perpetrators accountable and to provide the support survivors need and deserve.

IN HONOR OF ROGER STAUBACH’S LIFE AND HALL OF FAME CAREER

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Dallas Cowboys’ Hall of Fame Quarterback Roger Staubach, with a poetic tribute by Albert Carey Caswell. Roger is a great Patriot, a fine Husband, Father, Civic Leader, and is great example for all our children to follow. He has given back tirelessly to his Nation and community. And brought two Super Bowl Championships to America’s Team the Dallas Cowboys. I ask that this poem penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell be included in the RECORD.

ROGER THAT, STAUBACH. CAPTAIN AMERICA,
COME BACK.

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

In the Game of Life will we go deep with all
our light?
And in our lives what promises to our souls
will we keep so bright?
Will we take the high road to greatness or
low road and to lose sight?
And when it’s third and long is it victory or
defeat to which belongs?
Is ours a life of honor, courage, and char-
acter so strong?
And upon those football fields of green
Where men of might and speed have con-
vened
With size and girth and strength to victory
to glean
When, came The Dallas Cowboys America’s
Team on the scene
While, over the years has emerged here,
one of the greatest franchises in The NFL’s
history
As one Midshipman would help lead the way
to franchise greatness indeed
Roger That, Staubach . . . Captain America
. . . Comeback to victory
And on these fields of green,
from where all leadership streams
Is the quarterback
As men of destruction come rushing in to
crush you,
as life gets mean
Whose leadership directs the point of attack
there as seen
Who are armed with courage and skill
Who must lead their offense into combat
with their sheer will
As titans amid kayos come crashing all in at
speed,
wreaking havoc to make you bleed
For no other position demands more skill
and intuition
Or more guts and determination to stand tall
and make split decisions
With only micro seconds to make the right
decisions
The difference between winning and losing,
while skillfully into the D they make their
incisions
Leading the team down the field with your
heart and soul and decisions
To cross that goal line for six,

is but your reward for all your pain and vision in the mix
 They can beat you with their arms and their brains
 But, then there are a few with an even greater threat who maintain,
 the ability to run who cannot be contained
 Who leave the defenses behind in their dust cursing their names
 Turning nothing into something for victory to claim
 And in The NFL throughout the years
 Have come many men of greatness here
 But, only a few in The Hall of Fame will appear
 And there is one such name we speak of here
 Is Roger That, Staubach. Captain America. Comeback, clear.
 Roger the Dodger Staubach came from out of that Buckeye State
 From Ohio where such men as John Glenn and Bob Hope grew up great
 And shipped off to the Naval Academy where men and woman of honor they create
 To serve their country tis of thee for whom Heaven cannot wait
 Patriots of that Old Red, White, and Blue who are our Nation's Who's Who to state
 And soon off to war to Viet Nam for his country ready to bleed
 Yea, he had their six on battle fields and oceans of honor so indeed,
 And on fields of green in the NFL in scoring he had their six continually
 Who as a Patriot, A Father, A Husband, a Great Son in The Hall of Fame exceeds
 And when he retired he had the highest 9 year passing percentage in history
 Who's lived a life of duty, honor, courage, and giving back we'd see
 Who on America's Team Roger America's Son went deep in history
 Built his life on the bedrock of FAITH, FAMILY, AND FOOTBALL agreed
 And it was at The Naval Academy where he grew up to be all he could be
 Where his dye was cast,
 forming into the legend that today we see
 Winning a Heisman Trophy in 63,
 and soon off to war to serve his sweet country tis of thee

Coming home at 27,
 to start all over to become as The Star of Texas one day to be
 With his Dallas Cowboys,
 on the gridiron ready to mount a new war in his quest for victory
 Because, Roger That, Staubach. Captain America. Comeback was born to lead,
 With four NFC Championships and two Super Bowl victories
 He helped cement the slogan America's Team today we see
 As he's done everything from passing titles, to Pro Bowls, to MVP's
 Showing us all,
 at crunch time in the big games Hail Mary was full of grace for him indeed
 While, snatching victory from defeat game after game continually
 As Roger The Dodger was like Elliot Ness UNTOUCHABLE,
 as through rushing linemen he would weave
 It's third and long and the game on the line, my money's on Roger That each and every time
 Because, the way he pull's games out in the clutch is a crime
 In The Game of Life do we go deep?
 And in our lives and souls what promises will we keep?
 Do we take the high road to greatness or travel low one to weep?
 And when it's third and long do we go strong, go deep?
 Spiraling towards the greatness we seek
 Is our's a life of honor, courage, and character which speaks?
 Roger That, Staubach . . . Captain America
 Comeback's life is of one to seek,
 Roger That.

COMMEMORATING THE DUNLAP
 HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS TRACK TEAM

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2018

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to take the opportunity to recognize the work of

the Dunlap High School Girls Track Team and their phenomenal Coach, Pat Garst, for their second straight Class 2A state title.

The young women who make up Dunlap High School's track team serve as an inspiration of what hard work, dedication, and perseverance can bring. Dunlap won the State Championship with a resounding 102 points and qualified in 16 out of the 18 events held, making it to the finals in 14 of those events. They came into the season wanting to prove themselves as true champions, not just a one-and-done team. This spectacular performance throughout the season not only earned them the state title, but also the Peoria Journal Star's 2018 Best of Preps team of the year award.

Of course, none of this would have been possible without Coach Pat Garst. Coach Garst has dedicated countless hours to improving the lives of student athletes. It is no surprise that his devotion to the betterment of these young athletes has earned himself his second straight Illinois Girls Track and Field Coach of the year award. Coach Garst is now in consideration for the National Track and Field Coach of the year award. We are proud to have Coach Grant as one of the final contenders for this distinct honor.

The achievements of Coach Garst and the Dunlap Girls Track Team reminds us all of that through time, hard work, and dedication we can achieve all our goals, whatever they might be. I would like to once again congratulate Coach Garst and the Dunlap Girls' team, and thank them for being an inspiration to many across the community.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5079–S5113

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3241–3254, and S. Res. 581–586. **Pages S5107–08**

Measures Reported:

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. (S. Rept. No. 115–305) **Page S5107**

Measures Passed:

Expressing the Sense of the Senate Against Making United States Officials Available for Questioning: By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. 162), Senate agreed to S. Res. 584, expressing the sense of the Senate against the making available of current and former diplomats, officials, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin. **Pages S5098–99**

Appointments:

Creating Options for Veterans' Expedited Recovery (COVER Commission): The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114–198, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Creating Options for Veterans' Expedited Recovery (COVER Commission): Thomas E. Harvey of New York. **Page S5112**

Commission on Social Impact Partnerships: The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115–123, on behalf of the Majority Leader of the Senate, appointed the following individual as a member of the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships: William S. Simon of Arkansas. **Page S5112**

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following disposition of the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Senate begin consideration of H.R. 6147, Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. **Page S5112**

Bounds Nomination: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Pages S5082–98**

By unanimous-consent the order that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the post-cloture time on the nomination expire at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, July 19, 2018 was vitiated. **Pages S5087, S5098**

Wilkie Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that following Leader remarks on Monday, July 23, 2018, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S5112**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 23, 2018, Senate begin consideration of the nomination. **Page S5112**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:
Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.
1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral. **Page S5113**

Messages from the House: **Page S5104**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S5104**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S5104**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5104–05**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S5105–07**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5107**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5108–09**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:**Pages S5109–11****Additional Statements:****Pages S5103–04****Authorities for Committees to Meet:****Pages S5111–12**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—162)

Page S5099

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:20 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 23, 2018. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5112.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Kathleen Laura Kraninger, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DEPARTMENTS OF THE INTERIOR AND ENERGY MODERNIZATION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine Administration reorganization and modernization proposals related to the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from Susan Combs, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of the Interior; and Bernard L. McNamee II, Executive Director of the Office of Policy, Department of Energy.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mary Bridget Neumayr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, who was introduced by Representative Upton, and

John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, who was introduced by Senator Cassidy, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Carmen Guericigoitia McLean, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported 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, 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.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 6437–6462; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 1004–1006 were introduced. **Pages H6587–88**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H6589–90**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:
H.R. 6305, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve access to health care through modernized health savings accounts, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–844);

H.R. 6301, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide high deductible health plans with first dollar coverage flexibility, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–845);

H.R. 6312, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–846);

H.R. 6306, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the contribution limitation for health savings accounts, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–847);

H.R. 6314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow bronze and catastrophic plans in connection with health savings accounts, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–848);

H.R. 6311, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify the definition of qualified health plan for purposes of the health insurance premium tax credit and to allow individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market to purchase a lower premium copper plan, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–849, Part 1);

H.R. 6199, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–850);

H.R. 6309, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals entitled to Medicare Part A by reason of being over age 65 to contribute to health savings accounts, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–851);

H.R. 6317, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that direct primary care service arrangements do not disqualify deductible health savings account contributions, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–852); and

H.R. 6313, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the carryforward of health flexible

spending arrangement account balances, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–853). **Page H6587**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H6561, H6572**

Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 119, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, by a yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 180 nays with two answering "present", Roll No. 363.

Pages H6563–69

H. Res. 1001, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) was agreed to yesterday, July 18th.

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019: The House passed H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, by a yea-and-nay vote of 217 yeas to 199 nays, Roll No. 365. Consideration began Tuesday, July 17th. **Pages H6569–72**

Rejected the Quigley motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 182 yeas to 232 noes, Roll No. 364. **Pages H6569–71**

H. Res. 996, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) was agreed to Tuesday, July 17th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, July 23rd for Morning Hour debate. **Pages H6577, H6586**

Senate Referrals: S. 526 was held at the desk. S. 791 was held at the desk. S. 2850 was held at the desk. **Page H6577**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H6577.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6569, H6570–71, H6571–72. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:17 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a markup on the FY 2019 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill. The FY 2019 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

21ST CENTURY CURES IMPLEMENTATION: EXAMINING MENTAL HEALTH INITIATIVES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “21st Century Cures Implementation: Examining Mental Health Initiatives”. Testimony was heard from Elinore McCance-Katz, Assistant Secretary, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

CHINA’S THREAT TO AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECTOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION LEADERSHIP

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “China’s Threat to

American Government and Private Sector Research and Innovation Leadership”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JULY 23, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 6199, the “Restoring Access to Medication and Modernizing Health Savings Accounts Act of 2018”; H.R. 6311, the “Increasing Access to Lower Premium Plans and Expanding Health Savings Accounts Act of 2018”; and H.R. 184, the “Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2017”, 5 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, July 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Robert L. Wilkie, Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 6147, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, July 23

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barragán, Nanette Diaz, Calif., E1036
Bera, Ami, Calif., E1035
Blum, Rod, Iowa, E1036
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E1037
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1036, E1037
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1039

Espallat, Adriano, N.Y., E1037
Katko, John, N.Y., E1035
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E1038, E1040
Larson, John B., Conn., E1038
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1037
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1035
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E1036
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E1035

Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1035
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E1039
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E1039
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E1036
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1038
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1036
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1035



Congressional Record

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.

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