United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2019 No. 7

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 14, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANTHONY G. BROWN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

OPEN UP THE GOVERNMENT AND SECURE OUR BORDERS

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to go back home, and this weekend was especially rewarding for me. My wife and I left D.C. this past Friday afternoon, flew through Dallas, and landed in Wichita sometime shortly after sunset.

As we hopped in my truck, the snow had started to fall, and it was a beautiful Kansas evening. We got home and got to see our two boys. I woke up the next morning early, went to Sterling, Kansas, for a business meeting, then went over to Salina and got to meet some more of my friends.

On the way home, I got to listen to the radio. I listened to a Kansas State Wildcats basketball game and heard the Wildcats win that game by 1 point. And then when I got home, a special treat: I got to watch both the Kansas University basketball team win and watch my Kansas City Chiefs win. And I got to watch those games with my two boys. So it was a trifecta for Kansas, a great day.

The next morning, I woke up early for church and went to early service, and basically had to hop in my truck and come back to D.C. that same afternoon.

On the way back to the airport, I got a little bit of time to reflect; and one of the things that had come to mind was something that my good friend, my mentor, the former majority leader, one of the longest serving majority leaders in the Senate, Senator Bob Dole, had told me.

One thing Senator Dole says every time I see him is to always remember where I am from. And I think I get that. I think most of us get it, that where we are from is so very important to us, and I have always done a good job with that.

But the other thing that he talked about—I approached him one time when we were having a tough issue here in Congress, one of the first issues I had to vote on. What he told me, rather than giving me an answer, giving me his opinion, was to go back to Kansas, and the people of Kansas would tell me what to do.

So what is ironic as I went back home for these meetings and to go to church is that, everywhere I went, I heard the same thing. I heard the same thing from people in church that I had no idea that they knew so much about what was going on in Washington.

In Salina, in Sterling, everywhere I went, people asked me: When is Congress going to give the President his money to build the border?—a very simple question. So that allowed me to kind of ponder the issue a little bit more.

I have stood beside the President since day one on this issue. When I was running for Congress, I made national security, border security the top priority on what I was going to stand for; and today, I have been to that border.

As a physician of 25 years and now a Congressman for 2 years, I would tell you this: There is, indeed, a humanitarian crisis on the border as well as a national security issue on the border. Whether it is concerning the 2,000 people who come across that border illegally every day—every night we house some 40,000 people. We give them a bed. We feed them. Every day, two tons of illegal drugs come across our borders.

Mr. Speaker, that sounds like a humanitarian crisis to me and sounds like a national security crisis to me. People then often ask me: ''Well, why don't we compromise?''

And I will tell you this. I feel like we have compromised already. The President, myself, most Republicans, we asked for $25 billion to secure those borders and to provide humanitarian help for people.

We thought we probably needed to build 1,000, maybe 1,500 miles of border. We compromised from those numbers back to asking for just $5.7 billion, and now we are asking for moneys to build about 234 miles of not a wall, but a barrier, a fence.

I think that that is compromise. And, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you come back to the table now and negotiate in good faith.

Mr. Speaker, people often talk that this has to be an either/or opportunity, that we either have to have border security or show compassion.

We can do both. America can do both. We can have border security, we can

provide for the humanitarian needs of people, and we can come up with a compassionate, long-term immigration process.

This system needs to be totally overhauled. I am all in. We have had several great bills that we have tried to get through.

So, Mr. Speaker, please come back to the table. Let's open up the government, and let's secure our borders.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Thank You, God, for giving us another day. Even before the first word is spoken this day, O Lord, guide our minds, thoughts, hearts, and desires.

Breathe into the Members of this House a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that all might fulfill Your holy will.

Bless the Members of this assembly with attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas, they may sort out what is best for our Nation.

May all speech in this assembly be deliberately free of all prejudice so that others might listen wholeheartedly. Then all dialogue will be mutually respectful, surprising even us with unity and justice.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Friday, January 11, 2019:

S. 24, to provide for the compensation of Federal and other government employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

INVESTING IN MAIN STREET ACT OF 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 116) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 116

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 ''Investing in Main Street Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. INVESTMENT IN SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

Section 302(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 682(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: ''or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period the following: ''or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'appropriate Federal banking agency' has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act of 2019.

Since 1958, the Small Business Investment Company, SBIC, program has been an integral part of SBA's mission to provide small businesses with capital and create jobs. It achieves this purpose by partnering private and public investments in early-stage startup businesses.

In fact, in 2016, the SBIC program provided $6 billion in financing to 1,200 small businesses and helped sustain over 120,000 jobs. It has afforded America's small businesses an invaluable opportunity to grow their innovative ideas.

Just look at Apple, Tesla, and FedEx. They have all achieved what we hope for every small business: extraordinary growth and success. And they each received early-stage financing from SBICs.

One of the SBIC program's greatest strengths is its hands-off approach, giving fund managers the autonomy to invest in almost any business sector they choose, from apparel to cutting-edge technology. This freedom, coupled with sound investment strategies, has led to its success.

Access to capital remains the number one priority for small firms across America. The SBIC program has helped increase the flow of capital to worthy small companies, yet we can do more to ensure they can meet growing demand.

H.R. 116 will strengthen and grow the SBIC program by letting banks and Federal savings associations invest up to 15 percent of their holdings into SBICs. This increase in capital, at no cost to the taxpayers, provides entrepreneurs with enhanced opportunities to grow their businesses and create jobs.

The goal of the SBIC program is to fill the gap between the availability of venture capital and the needs of small

businesses in startup and growth situations. Today's bill makes a sensible change to address this goal by facilitating increased investment in small firms.

I applaud Congresswoman CHU in identifying this issue and finding a solution. I, therefore, ask my fellow Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act of 2019.

Small businesses across the country are reporting increased confidence and heightened optimism. Despite these improving economic conditions for the Nation's true job creators, many of them are still facing hurdles when it comes to accessing capital to grow and expand their operations.

To assist small businesses with their financing needs, the SBA, Small Business Administration, offers the Small Business Investment Company program, also known as the SBIC program.

While currently running on a zero-cost subsidy to the American taxpayer, the SBIC program increases access to long-term capital through a private equity financing model. SBICs are privately owned but licensed and regulated by the SBA.

The Investing in Main Street Act of 2019 provides a simple and commonsense solution to a limitation that is holding back growth within the SBIC program.

Currently, financial institutions and savings associations are prohibited from investing more than 5 percent of capital or surplus in an SBIC. In order to assist small businesses as they seek capital, H.R. 116 increases the 5 percent limitation to 15 percent, subject to the approval of the financial institution's regulator.

In the 115th Congress, an identical bill was favorably reported out of the Small Business Committee, unanimously, and passed on the House floor via voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for continuing their work on this legislation. As always, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) the now-chairman of the Small Business Committee, for advancing this bipartisan bill that will further improve the SBIC program.

Small businesses, from Ohio to Texas to California, are transforming towns and communities across the country. They are building the Nation's newest products and offering the newest services, all while constantly innovating. They are nimble, swift, and often very flexible. We must work together to create an environment where they are free to grow and create jobs.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, the Investing in Main Street Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), author of this legislation.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act of 2019.

I am so pleased that the House is considering this bill at the very start of this new Congress because small businesses are the backbone of our economy. They account for two out of every three new jobs and lead the way in innovation.

The SBA's Small Business Investment Company, or SBIC, program is an effective tool that helps small businesses get off the ground and succeed. The program facilitates private investment into early-stage startup small businesses across the country, and all at no Federal cost.

Staples, Tesla, FedEx, Apple, Intel, and Costco are just a few examples of the thousands of small businesses that have successfully used the Small Business Investment Company program during their early stages of growth. In fact, in 2016, the SBIC program provided $6 billion in financing to 1,200 small businesses and helped to sustain over 120,000 jobs. It has afforded America's small businesses an invaluable opportunity to grow their innovative ideas.

Now, many decades ago, the SBIC program was restricted from taking more than 5 percent of capital investments from banks due to this provision in the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. That provision is still the law. However, since then, banking regulations established by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency allow these same banks to invest up to 15 percent of their capital and surplus into SBICs.

I introduced the Investing in Main Street Act with Representative RALPH NORMAN of South Carolina to correct this discrepancy. This bipartisan bill would allow banks and Federal savings associations to invest up to 15 percent of their holdings to these funds to match current banking regulations.

This change will strengthen and grow the SBIC program, unleashing more capital to small businesses, and all at no cost to the taxpayer. That means more entrepreneurs will be able to access the capital they need to grow their businesses and hire their workers.

This legislation makes a sensible change to address the number one need of small firms accessing capital. I, therefore, ask my fellow Members to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentlewoman for working with us on this. The SBIC program invests in small firms across the country, providing them with the working capital they need to create and innovate new products and new technologies.

This bipartisan legislation passed the House, as we mentioned before, unanimously last Congress, and it removes a restriction that has hindered the growth of the SBIC program. It will allow it to grow and support more firms all across America, from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, access to capital is the lifeblood of every small business. The SBIC program fills the gap between the availability of venture capital and the needs of small businesses in startup and growth situations.

The SBIC program has long been an important way of channeling capital to leading-edge, high-growth companies. In fact, some of the Nation's most successful corporations received early-stage financing from SBICs. Without it, they may not be the companies they are today.

The key to the program's success is leveraging Federal funds to increase the amount of private capital invested in such promising startup companies. With more than $24 billion of capital under management, the SBIC program has a proven track record of success.

Creating parity in the SBIC program by raising the investment threshold from 5 percent to 15 percent will result in significant small business investment; and like we all know, providing funds to small firms results in real growth in our local communities.

H.R. 116 has bipartisan support, and it is endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As such, I once again urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 116, the "Investing in Main Street Act of 2019."

H.R. 116 amends the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency.

Texas has, for a historical fourth time, been ranked by CNBC as the number one spot for "America's Top States for Business."

WalletHub also recognized Texas as a small business friendly state by ranking Texas as the best state to start a business overall and giving Texas first place in the business environment category which looks at average growth in number of small businesses, growth of business revenues, five-year business survival rate, and job growth, amongst other categories.

Houston alone has almost 120,000 small business.

This makes Houston ninth nationwide and second statewide for total number of small businesses.

These small businesses enjoy calling home the 13th friendliest city in the nation for small business owners.

Over 99 percent of the businesses in Houston are considered small.

4.0 GPA is one of the many Houston small business success stories.

Founded by Henry Keculah, Jr. in 2016, 4.0 GPA's mission is to provide all students, regardless of their socioeconomic background, with the opportunity to attend an institution of higher education.

Henry, Jr. was one of five 2018 Upstart Award Finalist.

Upstart awards recognize African-American entrepreneurs who run successful companies and also give back to their communities.

H.R. 116 is common sense legislation that supports small business like 4.0 GPA, and even the Chamber of Commerce has written in support of it.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 116.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 116.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STIMULATING INNOVATION THROUGH PROCUREMENT ACT OF 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 246) to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 246

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 ''Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE.

Section 9(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(13) the term 'senior procurement executive' means an official designated under section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code, as the senior procurement executive of a Federal agency participating in a SBIR or STTR program.''.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVES IN SBIR AND STTR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(10) to coordinate, where appropriate, with the senior procurement executive of the relevant Federal agency to assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program with commercializing research developed under such a program before such small business concern is awarded a contract from such Federal agency.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 9(b)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER ACQUISITION PERSONNEL.

(a) SBIR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.—Upon the enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives issued pursuant to this subsection to require procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(l)) to assist small business concerns participating in the SBIR program with researching solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement with the concern) and to provide technical assistance to such concerns to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract. The procurement center representatives shall coordinate with the appropriate senior procurement executive and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract.''.

(b) STTR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(p)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) procedures to ensure that procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(l))—

''(i) assist small business concerns participating in the STTR program with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement with the concern);

''(ii) provide technical assistance to such concerns to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract; and

''(iii) coordinate with the appropriate senior procurement executive and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the Federal agency letting the contract in providing the assistance described in clause (i).''.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENT TO DUTIES OF PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 15(l)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(l)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (L); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraphs:

''(J) assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract to market the research developed by such concern under such SBIR or STTR program;

''(K) provide technical assistance to small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract, including coordination with the appropriate senior procurement executive and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to subsection (k) for the agency letting the contract; and''.

SEC. 6. AMENDMENT TO THE DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (19), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(21) shall assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement, as defined under section 9, with the concern) to market the research developed by such concern under such SBIR or STTR program; and

''(22) shall provide technical assistance to small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract, including coordination with procurement center representatives and the appropriate senior procurement executive for the agency letting the contract.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation Through Procurement Act of 2019.

For more than 30 years, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs, or SBIR and STTR programs as we call them, have provided a critical source of funding to small businesses that engage in research and development.

□ 1615

The result is higher rates of business formation and job creation, something we can all be proud of.

For the U.S. economy, the SBIR and STTR programs are important to employment in scientific and technical fields. Initially, companies must hire individuals to carry out the research

and development. If research is commercialized, however, sustainable jobs can be created as products are moved to market.

This ingenuity is what makes America a global economic powerhouse. Since its establishment, these programs have helped launch tens of thousands of successful research projects in a wide variety of industries. Yet, small, high-growth firms often face a disconnect when attempting to transfer their SBIR technologies to precision programs.

Today's measure, H.R. 246, bridges this gap and aids small business concerns in commercializing their technology when obtaining government contracts. Statutorily amending the role of acquisition personnel to assist companies in the SBIR and STTR programs levels the playing field for innovative businesses competing in the Federal marketplace.

Closing this gap doesn't just help our government secure the best technologies and ideas; it grows our local communities where many small SBIR- and STTR-funded firms operate.

I applaud the bipartisanship of Ms. FINKENAUER, a freshman Member of Congress, and Mr. CURTIS in their efforts to increase participation of small, innovative companies within the Federal marketplace by guaranteeing them the same assistance other small firms receive from contracting officers.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER) for their efforts on this important legislation.

This bill continues the committee's longstanding emphasis on the commercialization of technologies developed in the Small Business Innovation Research, or SBIR program.

The bill does this by incorporating acquisition personnel into the SBIR and the Small Business Technology Transfer, STTR, programs where appropriate. Under the bill, procurement center representatives, or PCRs, would be required to coordinate and collaborate with Federal agency small business advocates and are responsible for providing small businesses with technical assistance as they navigate the bidding process. Doing so would give small firms a better understanding of the government contracting process and increases their chances of success.

The SBIR and STTR programs are often the first place innovative, small firms look in order to contract with the Federal Government. Unfortunately, it is often difficult for a firm, particularly a new firm, to understand the ins and outs of working with the Federal Government. It can be quite complex.

Providing a new avenue for counseling by utilizing the national network of PCRs will help pioneering, small firms better prepare their proposals for the SBIR and STTR programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER), the author of this legislation.

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019.

My bill helps small businesses compete for government contracts and research grants and gives them the opportunity to grow and innovate.

I grew up in a small town in northeast Iowa, and I am proud to represent communities like mine in Congress. The Iowans I know want to be able to stay and build a life in the communities that raised them. I am proud to introduce legislation that will give the next generation of Iowans opportunities to innovate in our State.

Too often, small businesses, especially rural ones, get locked out of the competition for government contracts and grants. This bill ensures that agency procurement officers will be more directly involved in this process, helping small businesses pursue research that lets them compete for these opportunities.

H.R. 246 requires procurement center representatives and other contracting officials to assist small businesses in the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs. Making this a statutory mandate levels the playing field for our small businesses, ensuring they won't be at a disadvantage during the bidding process.

It means that when a small business owner in Marion or Manly, Iowa has a great idea that will create jobs in our communities, our government is actually making it easier, not harder, for them to grow and innovate. When Congress supports small businesses, it strengthens communities like mine in northeast Iowa.

I thank my colleague and cosponsor, Congressman CURTIS, and I thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for her support and leadership of innovative small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), who is our chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member CHABOT. I rise in support of H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019. I am pleased to lead as an original coauthor and thank Ms. FINKENAUER for her collaboration and effort on this important legislation.

Much of the country's success can be attributed to pioneering individuals and small companies, folks who have discovered a problem and developed an efficient, cost-effective solution. Innovation, research, and advancement in technology are our major drivers in today's postmodern world, and it is critical that we continue promoting the development of new and advanced technologies.

I am proud that in my home State of Utah we foster a thriving tech hub and innovation marketplace where the tech industry grew last year faster than any other State in the Nation. But there is still more work to be done in Utah and across the country.

This bill reinforces my commitment to small business success by stimulating technology innovation through the Small Business Innovation Research, or SBIR program.

Through adding critical acquisition personnel into SBIR and Small Business Technology Transfer programs, this legislation will ensure these small businesses have a voice in the procurement process and can compete on a level playing field and have a chance at success. It adds zero cost to the taxpayer.

This bill is a commonsense, forward-leaning bill that protects Federal investment into innovation and technology research by small businesses and helps these innovators succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah again for his leadership on this, and thank the gentlewoman from Iowa as well, and, as always, thank the chairwoman, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

This straightforward legislation directs PCRs and senior procurement executives in agencies to assist small businesses in the SBIR and STTR programs.

Such assistance could be in the form of researching applicable solicitations, providing technical assistance when bidding for contracts, or coordinating with appropriate agency procurement officials.

The House passed identical legislation unanimously as part of a larger package last Congress, and we recommend passage of this bill again this year.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) for introducing today's bill to spur increased contracting activity in the SBIR and STTR programs.

The SBIR program has helped thousands of small, innovative firms with good ideas to compete for Federal research and development awards. Their

success has a proven record in a diverse range of fields, including: defense, health, energy, and technology.

H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019, enables more SBIR and STTR businesses to reach their potential. It directs procurement center representatives and senior procurement executives in agencies to assist small business concerns in the SBIR and STTR programs, and coordinates with appropriate agency procurement officials.

This bill will open the Federal marketplace to more small, high-growth companies through increased technical assistance and advocacy, ensuring our country remains a leader in innovation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 246.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION ACT

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 206) to amend the small business laws to create certain requirements with respect to the SBIR and STTR program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 206

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 ''Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act''.

SEC. 2. INCLUSION OF TESTING AND EVALUATION IN THE DEFINITION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9(e)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)(5)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively (and conforming the margins accordingly);

(2) by striking ''means any activity which is'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) any activity which is—''; and

(3) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by adding ''and'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) any testing or evaluation in connection with such an activity;''.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES IN SBIR AND STTR.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or private equity firm investment'' each place such term appears and inserting ''private equity firm, or SBIC investment'';

(2) by striking ''or private equity firms'' and inserting ''private equity firms, or SBICs'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (13)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(14) the term 'SBIC' means a small business investment company as defined in section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.''; and

(4) in the heading for subsection (dd), by striking ''OR PRIVATE EQUITY FIRMS'' and inserting ''PRIVATE EQUITY FIRMS, OR SBICS''.

SEC. 4. CALCULATION OF LEVERAGE OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES THAT INVEST IN SBIR OR STTR PARTICIPANTS.

Section 303(b)(2) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 683(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) INVESTMENTS IN SBIR AND STTR PARTICIPANTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), in calculating the outstanding leverage of a company for purposes of subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall exclude the amount of any investment made in a SBIR or STTR participant, if such investment is made in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this subparagraph or any fiscal year thereafter by a company licensed during the applicable fiscal year.

''(ii) LIMITATIONS.—

''(I) AMOUNT OF EXCLUSION.—The amount excluded under clause (i) for a company shall not exceed 33 percent of the private capital of that company.

''(II) MAXIMUM INVESTMENT.—A company shall not make an investment in any one SBIR or STTR participant in an amount equal to more than 20 percent of the private capital of that company.

''(III) OTHER TERMS.—The exclusion of amounts under clause (i) shall be subject to such terms as the Administrator may impose to ensure that there is no cost (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) with respect to purchasing or guaranteeing any debenture involved.

''(iii) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph, the term 'SBIR or STTR participant' means a small business concern that receives contracts or grants pursuant to section 9 of the Small Business Act.''.

SEC. 5. ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION IN THE MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(tt) ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION IN THE MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall provide an increase to the past performance rating of any small business concern that has participated in the SBIR or STTR program that serves as a mentor under section 45 to a small business concern that seeks to participate in the SBIR or STTR program.''.

SEC. 6. ANNUAL MEETING FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES WITH A SBIR OR STTR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(uu) ANNUAL MEETING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency required to have a program under this section (or a designee) and the Administrator (or a designee) shall meet annually to discuss methods—

''(A) to improve the collection of data under this section;

''(B) to improve the reporting of data to the Administrator under this section;

''(C) to make the application processes for programs under this section more efficient; and

''(D) to increase participation in the programs under this section.

''(2) REPORTING.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an annual meeting required under paragraph (1) is held, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, a report on the findings of such meeting and recommendations on how to implement changes to programs under this section.''.

(b) FUNDING FOR ANNUAL MEETING.—Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking the ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(K) the annual meeting required under subsection (uu).''.

SEC. 7. INCREASING PARTICIPATION OF UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS IN THE SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(mm)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) OUTREACH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—A Federal agency participating in the program under this subsection shall use a portion of the funds authorized for uses under paragraph (1) to carry out the policy directive required under subsection (j)(2)(F) and to increase the participation of States with respect to which a low level of SBIR awards have historically been awarded.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9(mm)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(6)) is amended by striking ''paragraph (2)(A) and any use of the waiver authority under paragraph (2)(B)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act of 2019. For almost 40 years, our Nation has experienced increased innovation and job creation through the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program.

As a direct result of these programs, breakthroughs have been made in a wide range of sectors, from agriculture,

to energy, and most notably, healthcare. Research conducted by SBIR and STTR awardees has helped address our country's most important technological and research-based challenges while generating tremendous economic growth and employment opportunities.

These programs encourage small firms, where much of today's cutting-edge ideas are born, to explore their potential while also providing the incentive to profit from its commercialization.

Yet, as with any program, improvements can be made to further strengthen the program and its impact on our economy.

By incentivizing more experienced SBIR and STTR firms to mentor newer companies and rewarding mentors through a past-performance rating increase, Congressman ROUDA's legislation, H.R. 206, positively promotes integrating these program participants into the larger Federal marketplace.

Just as we are concerned with the broader ability of SBIR and STTR firms to compete more broadly, it is important to ensure the participation of all businesses within the program. Just like with geography, when it comes to demographics, it is important that the SBIR and STTR are serving all entrepreneurs.

This measure requires participating agencies to use part of their SBIR allocation to conduct outreach to minorities and underrepresented States by removing the waiver of this requirement from the statute. Doing so, guarantees that a wide range of ideas are provided the opportunity to thrive.

□ 1630

Finally, H.R. 206 requires an annual summit of these agencies to share best practices to improve data collection and streamline processes across the programs. As a result, I believe this bill is crucial to modernizing the program and preserving our Nation's competitiveness.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act.

I want to commend Mr. ROUDA on his work to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program, or SBIR and STTR as they are more commonly known.

These critical programs provide exceptionally innovative small firms with the kick-start they need to develop the next big thing and turn their companies from small businesses into large ones. These innovations have saved lives on the battlefield, in the hospital room, and made immeasurable advancements in communication technology and countless other improvements to technologies we all use on a daily basis.

Among other things, this straightforward bill updates and harmonizes the definition of research and development in the Small Business Act, providing an avenue for more experienced SBIR companies to mentor newer companies, and improves oversight.

Furthermore, this bill encourages collaboration and sharing of best practices among Federal agencies to enhance the efficacy of the SBIR and STTR programs. Federal agencies housing these programs would be required to meet annually to discuss potential data collection and reporting process improvements, ideas to increase small business participation, and will be required to update Congress on the outcomes and recommendations arising from these meetings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA), who is the author of this bill.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act.

The Small Business Innovation Research program, or SBIR, and the Small Business Technology Transfer program, or STTR, were established to spur innovation and job creation throughout the country. Since their inception, these programs have awarded over $40 billion to small innovative firms, including $34 million in California's 48th District. Together, these programs are some of the Federal Government's largest technology development programs.

For many research companies in my district and around the country, these two programs serve as a gateway to the Federal contracting field. The continued success of these programs depends on three primary factors:

First, the program must remain highly competitive;

Second, applicants and awardees must have access to financing of all types, including venture capital;

Third, we must ensure these products make it to the market.

But the lack of competitiveness and diversity continue to raise questions, with the participation of women-owned and minority-owned firms in these programs declining.

According to the Small Business Administration's annual report for fiscal year 2013, only 15 percent of total award dollars went to women-owned small businesses, and only 10 percent to socially or economically disadvantaged small and HUBZone-certified small businesses.

This bill addresses both issues by requiring participating agencies to use part of their SBIR allocation to conduct outreach to minorities and underrepresented States by removing the waiver of this requirement from statute.

To address the need for outside financing, this bill includes small business investment companies in the SBIR and STTR programs as possible investors and increases the capital levels that can be invested by private investors.

Finally, H.R. 206 also provides an avenue for more experienced SBIR and STTR companies to mentor newer companies. It is clear that the SBIR and STTR programs have promoted our shared goal of fostering innovation, but we must continue to provide vigilant oversight of these programs to ensure their maximum effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the Small Business Investor Alliance.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTOR ALLIANCE,
January 14, 2019.

Hon. HARLEY ROUDA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROUDA: Since 1958, the Small Business Investor Alliance (SBIA) has been the voice of Small Business Investment Companies (SBICs). We write in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act, which is being considered by the House of Representatives today. The bill is a simple, modest improvement to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 that would encourage more investment in job-creating American small businesses.

SBICs are highly-regulated private funds that invest exclusively in domestic small businesses, with at least 25% of their investments in even smaller enterprises. The nearly $28 billion SBIC debenture program is a market-driven platform that serves an important public purpose of facilitating private investment in domestic small businesses. After raising private capital and successfully navigating a rigorous licensing process, a licensed SBIC is permitted to access a line of credit (leverage) to increase the amount of capital to be invested in domestic small businesses. Generally, the ratio of leverage to private capital is a little less than 2:1, with some strategies utilizing an even lower leverage ratio. With the private capital in a first-loss position, a modest leverage ratio, and the benefits of the portfolio effect, the program operates by law at zero subsidy, further exhibiting effective protection for the American taxpayer. As a testament to the underlying structure of the SBIC program, it is one of the few government programs that was able to continue to operate at zero subsidy through the Great Recession.

H.R. 206 seeks to encourage more investment in Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) companies. The stated mission of the SBIR and STTR programs is to "support scientific excellence and technological innovation through the investment of Federal research funds in critical American priorities to build a strong national economy." Both programs seek to increase private sector commercialization of innovations arising out of federal research and development. H.R. 206 would include SBICs in SBIR and STTR and would allow SBICs to exclude a percentage of their SBIR and STTR investments from their leverage calculation, with the goal of spurring more investment in technology and innovation.

H.R 206 would make thoughtful improvements to the SBIC program and thereby help domestic small businesses. SBIA thanks you for your leadership on this legislation and for your commitment to expanding economic opportunity in America. We look forward to working with you during the 116th Congress

to continue strengthening the SBIC program.

Sincerely,

BRETT PALMER,
President, Small Business Investor Alliance.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for her support and leadership of innovative small business. I also want to thank Representative ESPAILLAT for his work on this issue in the last Congress, and I urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, the SBIR and STTR programs are often the first place small innovative companies come to do business with the Federal Government. They are widely popular here on Capitol Hill, in the administration, and in the industrial base as well. They provide that initial kick-start of funding for ideas that could change the world, literally, for the better.

Mr. Speaker, the reforms contained in H.R. 206 make it easier for those ideas to become a reality. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) for introducing today's bill to increase the assistance to SBIR and STTR firms.

Since their inception, over $40 billion in awards have been made, proving their success as a funding source for small innovative firms.

As we have done before, we must ensure the longevity of the program by guaranteeing it reflects modern R&D practices. It must also optimize participation through mentorship incentives and Phase 3 awards, in addition to including small business investment companies in the SBIR and STTR programs to stimulate investment.

This bill achieves this goal and guarantees the program meets the needs of our next generation of SBIR and STTR firms. H.R. 206 makes certain that the program remains a catalyst for not just innovation, but also the economic empowerment and job creation that is associated with these scientific advances.

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the new Chair of the House Small Business Committee Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ for her leadership on this issue and for working with me during the 115th Congress when the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act first passed in the House. I also want to congratulate Congressman ROUDA on his success in moving this issue forward in the 116th Congress and thank him for his commitment to spur innovation and address the issue of underrepresentation of minorities in the small business community.

The Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act is thoughtful and constructive legislation. Even in this modern day, we have heard from many minority and women-owned small businesses that they continue to face institutional challenges to growing their businesses. A 2013 report commissioned by the Small Business Administration found that women-owned small businesses do not have equal access to capital from the private sector as compared to their male peers. Furthermore, the Small Business Administration's own Office of Advocacy has said that, "There are fewer minority-owned businesses representing high-patenting industries than in all industries."

Through the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs, the Small Business Administration works with partners in eleven federal agencies ranging from the Department of Agriculture to NASA to support small businesses, especially those that are owned by members of identified disadvantaged communities. While these programs have made some headway in encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship among women and many minority communities, this vital investment can only be used for research and development. There is no consideration given for testing and evaluation, an extremely resource-heavy task for small businesses. What good is a product or a method when you don't know if it works effectively or efficiently? The Small Business Innovation Act addresses this problem by including "testing" and "evaluation" among the activities for which SBIR and STTR applicants can seek funding. This will empower more underrepresented entrepreneurs to develop new products, expand upon new ideas, and gain respected external validators.

The Small Business Innovation Act also includes a number of other provisions that I believe will significantly help expand entrepreneurship in underserved communities. For example, the bill incentivizes mentorship with previous SBIR- and STTR-recipient companies that have found success in the programs to impart their knowledge and share their experience. It also welcomes investment by Small Business Investment Companies into SBIR and STTR projects, which will increase the investment of capital from more diverse streams of funding. The bill also prioritizes data collection and reporting, ensuring that evaluation of the program leads to increased efficiency and additional participation. Finally, and most importantly, the bill makes explicit commitments to increasing the participation of underserved populations in the small business community.

So again, I thank my colleague, Mr. ROUDA, and Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for taking up this important cause and I congratulate them both on a job well done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 206.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 14, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 14, 2019, at 3:19 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of the Honorable John Chester Culver, former United States Senator for the State of Iowa S. Res. 16

Appointments:

Syria Study Group

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control for the 116th Congress

United States—China Economic and Security Review Commission

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

EXPANDING CONTRACTING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES ACT OF 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 190) to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate the inclusion of option years in the award price for sole source contracts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 190

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 "Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO CONTRACTING AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) QUALIFIED HUBZONE SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 31(b)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657a(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS.—A contracting officer may award sole source contracts under this section to any qualified HUBZone small business concern, if—

"(i) the qualified HUBZone small business concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of such contract opportunity;

"(ii) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more qualified HUBZone small business concerns will submit offers for the contracting opportunity;

"(iii) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

"(I) $7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

"(II) $4,000,000, in the case of all other contract opportunities; and

"(iv) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.".

(b) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SERVICE-DISABLED VETERANS.—Subsection (a) of section 36 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657f) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS.—In accordance with this section, a contracting officer

may award a sole source contract to any small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans if—

''(1) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of such contract opportunity;

''(2) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans will submit offers for the contracting opportunity;

''(3) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

''(A) $7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

''(B) $4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity;

''(4) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price;

''(5) the contracting officer has notified the Administration of the intent to make such award and requested that the Administration determine the concern's eligibility for award; and

''(6) the Administration has determined that such concern is eligible for award.''.

(c) CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—Section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

''(7) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women described in paragraph (2)(A) and certified under paragraph (2)(E) if—

''(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

''(B) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more businesses described in paragraph (2)(A) will submit offers;

''(C) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

''(i) $7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

''(ii) $4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity;

''(D) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price;

''(E) the contracting officer has notified the Administration of the intent to make such award and requested that the Administration determine the concern's eligibility for award; and

''(F) the Administration has determined that such concern is eligible for award.''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

''(8) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN IN SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES.—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women certified under paragraph (2)(E) that is in an industry in which small business concerns owned and controlled by women are substantially underrepresented (as determined by the Administrator under paragraph (3)) if—

''(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

''(B) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more businesses in an industry that has received a waiver under paragraph (3) will submit offers;

''(C) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

''(i) $7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

''(ii) $4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity;

''(D) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price;

''(E) the contracting officer has notified the Administration of the intent to make such award and requested that the Administration determine the concern's eligibility for award; and

''(F) the Administration has determined that such concern is eligible for award.''.

(d) ELIMINATION OF THE INCLUSION OF OPTION YEARS IN THE AWARD PRICE FOR CONTRACTS.—Section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637) is amended by striking ''(including options)'' each place such term appears.

SEC. 3. SBA CERTIFICATION PROGRAM NOTIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall notify the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate when the Administrator has implemented each of the following:

(1) A program to certify small business concerns owned and controlled by women (as defined in section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m))).

(2) A program to certify small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as defined in section 3(q)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q))).

(b) ADDITIONAL NOTICE.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit a copy of a notification required under subsection (a) to the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives so that the Law Revision Counsel may execute the amendments required under section 4.

SEC. 4. REMOVAL OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION UPON IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS.

Effective upon the notification described under section 3, the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 8(m)—

(A) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F); and

(B) in paragraph (8)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F); and

(2) in section 36(a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6).

SEC. 5. GAO REPORT.

(a) STUDY.—With respect to the procurement programs of the Small Business Administration for small business concerns owned and controlled by women (as defined in section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m))) and for small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as defined in section 3(q)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q))), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation of the policies and practices used by the Administration and other Federal agencies to provide assurances that contracting officers are properly classifying sole source awards under those programs in the Federal Procurement Data System and that sole source contracts awarded under those programs are being awarded to eligible concerns.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the Small Business Administration implements the certification programs described under section 3, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate containing the findings made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

(c) SBA CONSIDERATION OF GAO REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall review the report issued under subsection (b) and take such actions as the Administrator may determine appropriate to address any concerns raised in such report and any recommendations contained in such report.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—After the review described under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall issue a report to Congress—

(A) stating that no additional actions were necessary to address any concerns or recommendations contained in the report; or

(B) describing the actions taken by the Administrator to resolve such concerns or implement such recommendations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019.

The Small Businesses Act sets forth a governmentwide 23 percent goal of Federal contracts that should be awarded to small businesses. Each Federal agency is charged with setting its own small business goals, which are to reflect the maximum possible opportunity for small business within that agency.

Regrettably, small firms face barriers in securing Federal contracts. According to the SBA, small businesses won $105.6 billion in contracts during fiscal year 2016, representing 23.88 percent of total Federal contract dollars. That is why the Small Business Act gives agencies the ability to limit, or set aside, contracts for small businesses to bid and compete against one another.

The SBA administers several set-asides that are designed to increase the participation of several socioeconomic categories, including the 8(a) program, HUBZone program, women-owned, and service-disabled veteran-owned small business programs.

While most contracts are awarded through competition, sole source contracts also exist if certain criteria are met. However, current sole source awards have become complex and underutilized in recent years. They do not represent the changing nature of Federal contract awards and have become outdated. H.R. 190 raises the dollar amount of sole source awards to reflect modern contract awards.

I applaud Mr. MARSHALL and his cosponsor, Mr. SCHNEIDER, for introducing this bill providing flexibility to contracting officers when awarding sole source contracts under SBA contracting programs.

By promoting the use of sole source contracts to small businesses, this bill adds to the government's pool of suppliers. This results in higher quality goods and increased job creation for the economy, as these direct awards require the small business to do the majority of the work and not subcontract out.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for working in a cooperative and bipartisan manner on this important legislation.

The bill we are considering today passed the House last September because it is both good for small businesses and good for the Federal Government. By raising the potential amount of sole source contract awards, this bill encourages Federal agency contracting officers to do more work with women-owned, service-disabled veteran-owned, HUBZone, and socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses.

The bill will also strengthen the integrity of the sole source award process by requiring the SBA to actively determine that a women-owned or service-disabled veteran-owned small business is qualified and eligible to receive the award before it is made.

Finally, the bill tasks the Government Accountability Office with assessing Congress' ability to oversee proper spending through sole source awards.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who is a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019. I am proud to again introduce this bill with my friend from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

As they did in the last Congress, I encourage my colleagues to join us in passing this important bipartisan legislation.

Women-owned businesses, companies owned by service-disabled veterans, and other types of small firms have unique opportunities to work with the Federal Government through sole source contracting.

Unfortunately, regulations governing these types of contracts, specifically the maximum value amount of the contract, have not kept pace with inflation, and many small business owners often won't pursue these opportunities due to their diminished return. Furthermore, the law includes option years towards the cap, reducing the projected returns and lowering the appeal of sole source contracts.

For these reasons, many eligible small businesses overlook sole source contracts as a quality opportunity to do business with the Federal Government. Our bill would bring the sole source contracting requirements in line with inflation and only apply base years, not the option years, to a contract's cap.

Additionally, programs such as sole source contracting currently depend on small businesses certifying their own eligibility. It is important that we better ensure the integrity of these programs.

H.R. 190 protects these programs through a process whereby the Small Business Administration would confirm eligibility of a participating company. Sole source contractors should present a real opportunity for eligible small businesses. Our legislation would make these contracts more competitive, while enhancing how we ensure they are awarded to eligible companies.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced this bipartisan legislation with Dr. MARSHALL to help small businesses, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

□ 1645

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), one of the chief sponsors of the legislation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019.

Small business sole source contracting can be a valuable tool for both Federal agencies and small businesses. However, our Federal procurement processes are rapidly changing, and the sole source authority provided by the Small Business Act has not kept up with these changes. By adjusting the dollar amount thresholds for these contracts, this bill will increase the opportunities available to certain small businesses utilizing the Federal procurement process.

While it is critical that agencies maximize opportunities to small businesses, it is equally important that they have clear guidelines to guarantee only eligible and qualified firms receive the awards. This bill will apply new oversight procedure that requires agencies to coordinate with the SBA to ensure only eligible candidates are awarded a sole source contract.

I am proud of this legislation and its mission to promote small business growth, strengthen oversight, and incentivize Federal agencies to work with small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague Congressman SCHNEIDER for teaming up with us on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill as well.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I have no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Dr. MARSHALL as well as Mr. SCHNEIDER for their work and their leadership on this important legislation.

This bill brings the dollar amount of sole source awards in line with the size of current contracts and strengthens oversight by instituting a new eligibility determination check by the SBA before sole source contracts are awarded.

Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kansas as well as the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this important legislation to provide flexibility to contracting officers when awarding sole source contracts.

H.R. 190 promotes the use of sole source contracts to small business concerns through the SBA contracting programs by raising the dollar threshold of these contract types to account for inflation.

It promotes and preserves a strong, competitive marketplace for our Federal agencies while also strengthening the ability of women, service-disabled veterans, and socioeconomic businesses to participate with the single largest purchaser of goods and services in the world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 190.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2019

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 430) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through June 30, 2019.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 430

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 ''TANF Extension Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH JUNE 30, 2019.

Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act shall continue through June 30, 2019, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2018, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 430, the TANF Extension Act of 2019. This bipartisan legislation would extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, known as TANF, and the Child Care Entitlement to States, or CCES, through June 30, 2019.

Due to the stalemate in budget negotiations, TANF and CCES funding lapsed at the end of 2018. Enacting this legislation will allow the Department of Health and Human Services to send States, Tribes, and territories TANF and CCES grants for the second quarter of the fiscal year, which are now late, and to make on-time payments to States for the third quarter.

States depend on Federal TANF and childcare funding to help level the playing field for struggling parents trying to work and support their families. These grants help pay for important programs such as childcare, transportation, and job training. Funds are also used to help cover basic necessities like food, housing, and diapers.

Right now, our failure to pay for what was promised is hurting State budgets, and pretty soon it will begin to affect family budgets as well.

CalWORKs, as my home State of California calls its TANF program, provides help to over 50 percent of poor children in California, which is over 1 million children, but California has a very small reserve of unspent Federal TANF funds to cover the Federal lapse in payment.

Our reserve is about the level of Federal funding the State will use in just over 2 weeks of operating CalWORKs.

California's counties are currently implementing the changes to CalWORKs that we hope will make it even more effective in stabilizing families and lifting them out of poverty. Disrupted Federal funding would make achieving that goal much harder.

We need to do far more to help children and families, and States need more stability and certainty to operate their programs. This is why the first bill that was passed in this new Congress to reopen the government included provisions to extend TANF and childcare for 2 years.

This bill would also have provided Congress with new data on beneficiary sanctions, employment, and poverty outcomes. Unfortunately, the Senate has refused to take up that bill, leaving our government in a partial shutdown and causing Federal funds for TANF and CCES to lapse, as well as payments to the States.

In the meantime, as the two Chambers continue discussions, this legislation will allow us to quickly restore payments and ensure that families who rely on TANF and childcare assistance are not collateral damage in the Trump shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 430, the TANF Extension Act of 2019, which will end the lapse in the TANF program.

For my home State of Missouri, and specifically my district, temporary assistance is a vital lifeline of resources for families. I represent one of the most economically distressed regions in the country and the poorest congressional district in Missouri. In my State, more than 20,000 people and nearly 10,000 families currently rely on TANF.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reauthorize this program. Since TANF was created in 1996, funding for the program had never lapsed like this, until now. Federal funding of TANF has now lapsed for 2 full weeks.

TANF has never been tied to a border security debate before, and it shouldn't be now. Mr. Speaker, 20,000 people in Missouri need TANF for a hand up to get out of poverty and back to work.

Tax reform created a roaring economy, but our job is not done. Americans are no longer asking ''Where are the jobs?'' Instead, employers are asking ''Where are the workers?''

When I meet with farmers and small business owners in southern Missouri, they tell me they desperately need more workers.

We have an economy that is built for growth, but millions of Americans are on the sidelines. That is why we need the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program to refocus on the outcome of work.

I hope that, during the 6-month extension provided by this bill, my friends on the other side of the aisle will work with us to improve the focus of TANF on outcomes so we can stop only measuring the process. Let's work together to build on the efforts from last Congress so we can help families become self-sufficient through work.

There is pride in work, and a job is the best way out of poverty. When individuals and parents work full-time, the poverty rate drops to just 3 percent.

American taxpayers contribute billions of dollars every year to support those who are in need. It is our responsibility to ensure taxpayer dollars are being used in the most effective way possible. That is why we must reauthorize this program immediately and why I have pushed for reforms.

House Republicans want every person on TANF who is work eligible to have an individual plan for how to get back into the workforce. The new goal isn't to get someone into a job for 2 weeks. The new goal is to get them into a job and keep them there so they can start their career and build a better life.

That means we want to surround Americans with more support to allow them to build their lives, like childcare and transportation. That is what we will continue to push for as we work on a longer extension.

What has become clear is that we can do a lot better to address the needs of those struggling to get ahead. With this bill, we renew the program and set the stage to make additional reforms we know are needed to expand the opportunity so that everyone can benefit from strong economic growth.

Reforming TANF to improve the lives of more American families must be our priority, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to complete this reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 430, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), an incredible advocate for those in need.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague from Missouri in asking my colleagues to support H.R. 430 and to vote ''yes'' on this legislation.

Now, this is just a short-term, 6-month extension of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program because we could not sign off on the negotiated 2-year extension from the omnibus. Therefore, the program has lapsed, and it is imperative that we move this legislation quickly, get it cleared through the House, sent over to the Senate, and signed into law.

Needy Americans are relying on us to do this. There are several States that have absolutely no TANF dollars, zero carryover funds to insulate against the prospect that this reckless shutdown will persist and impact our most vulnerable citizens.

While my State is not one of the 23 States that have less than one quarter of Federal TANF funding in reserve, our reserve is not gigantic. At the current spend-down rate of funds in Wisconsin, we are projecting that these funds will only last until early May, so this is of some urgency.

Just let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, about the importance of extending this program. This bill will allow HHS to send States, Tribes, and territories overdue funds that they depend upon to help level the playing field for struggling parents trying to work and to support their families, tools like childcare assistance, transportation, job training, money for basic needs, and services like food and diapers.

I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that three-fourths of current TANF recipients are children, usually living in poverty with their parents or grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, as a former welfare recipient who rose out of poverty with the help of cash assistance, SNAP, and higher education, I understand how critically necessary it is for Americans to have access to our Nation's safety net known as TANF.

Mr. Speaker, I will never forget the spring of 1996, when Wisconsin Governor Tommy G. Thompson decided to end welfare as we knew it.

□ 1700

I was a State senator at the time. I stood on the floor and filibustered until the wee hours of the morning with 100 amendments. Then in the fall of 1996—it was a gigantic error of judgment, in my estimation—Congress, on a bipartisan basis, followed Governor Thompson's lead and replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children with TANF, a program that turned into a block grant, having absolutely no connection with people's ability to get work.

It imposed work requirements, whether there was any viable work there or not. It limited educational opportunity for women, thus creating a permanent underclass of workers. It does not provide promised childcare and training, the very things that are most helpful for helping people get employed.

While this proposal has been adopted by Congress and signed into law, I have known, since 1996, that I would spend the rest of my career trying to right-size this program and make sure that the program not only met people's basic survival-level needs but actually worked toward helping people lift out of poverty.

I am looking forward to this 116th Congress, when we can reenvision welfare reform, because this imperfect program needs to continue to assist struggling families to meet those basic needs. Forty-three million Americans currently live in poverty and some in extreme poverty.

I remind the Speaker that our Nation is only as strong as its most vulnerable population. Instead of criminalizing welfare recipients and creating more barriers for the poor, we must help lift them up so that they, too, can escape poverty, join the economy, and add to our tax base.

Let's pass this bill, and let's use the next 6 months provided by this legislation to work together to enact long-overdue changes to TANF that will restore childcare, incentivize education, and move away from punitive time limits.

I ask my colleagues to vote for H.R. 430, and then I urge them to join me in reenvisioning the program.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate we are here today, actually, but I do intend to support this short-term TANF extension.

I think it is useful to understand how we got here, because it certainly informs where we should be going. While the economy is expanding at greater than 3 percent, and the unemployment rate is now below 4 percent, we know not everyone is benefiting.

There are an estimated 67 million working-age American men missing from the labor force and 5½ million youth not in school or not working. This, combined with a generation of retiring workers, has left employers desperate to fill open jobs.

Our committee held a series of hearings last spring to learn how Congress can help close the jobs gap, the difference between what employers need to keep the economy growing and the number of workers in the labor force.

We heard from employers across the country and across industries—technology in Colorado, manufacturing in Indiana and Ohio, auto plants in Michigan, homebuilders in Arizona, and the aerospace industry in Kansas. They all expressed the same message: We are hiring, and if you are not already proficient, we will pay you while you learn to do the work.

In my own district, the need for workers is a common theme among employers. One employer I spoke with recently, whose facility is largely automated, told me his biggest impediment to growth is a lack of people to run and operate the machinery.

In addition to the needs of employers and our economy, we also heard about the dignity of work from the individuals reconnected to the workforce, whether recently out of poverty or even prison. We heard how these men and women were better able to provide for their families and engage with their communities because of the social and monetary support their efforts to advance in the workforce provided. We want everyone to have that opportunity.

TANF has an important role to play in addressing the labor shortage, and changes are needed to fit the program to today's economy. More than 20 years after TANF was created, the program is not living up to expectations, and many States have lost sight of what it was intended to do: provide short-term support while people get back into the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work we did in the House last year. We held seven hearings, including a legislative hearing, and we marked up legislation aimed at improving the program. Many of the proposals in our bill, the JOBS for Success Act, were supported by both parties' witnesses as well: one-on-one casework; measuring outcomes; refocusing the program on those most in need of assistance; and ensuring States could use their resources to both help people get to work, and, just as importantly, stay in the workforce and succeed.

Unfortunately, no one in the Senate took action on TANF until late last year. When they finally did deliver a proposal, it merely doubled down on, or attempted to paper over, the ongoing problems of TANF, which discourage States from helping their beneficiaries, rather than making a serious effort to help reconnect the population most in need.

Important progress has been made, both since 1996 and in the past year, but we are not done. I encourage my colleagues to support this extension and to continue working to refocus TANF to improve the lives of millions of American families.

More importantly, once this bill is signed, I encourage everyone, House and Senate, to come together and work with us to achieve solutions that help to connect Americans on the sidelines of the economy with the employers who desperately need them and to stay in the workforce long term.

We all know a check from the government is not the way out of poverty. Getting into and advancing in the workforce is.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 430, the TANF Extension Act of 2019, which extends the authorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF,

program through June 30, while we finish up our work on a long-term extension.

Our safety net is essential to helping people who fall on hard times get back up on their feet, but, too often, it becomes a web that traps people in the cycle of poverty. One of the keys to breaking that cycle is human interaction, rather than treating people and recipients like another number on a government spreadsheet.

It takes people on the front lines of the fight against poverty to make sure we are looking at the root causes of the problem and actually doing something to help people across the country build out and up on the economic ladder out of poverty. Those in the trenches fighting poverty need the flexibility to develop innovative solutions tailored to local needs that will empower individuals to move to work and to achieve the American Dream.

Over these next couple of months, we have a great opportunity to work together on a long-term extension of TANF that makes commonsense reforms to the program to ensure no one gets left behind on the sidelines.

Right now, the status quo is not working. But by focusing on workforce development, measuring work outcomes, and requiring States to engage with recipients at an individual level, we can and we will move people out of poverty, off TANF, and onto the road to success.

I thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY for their work on this issue. I look forward to working with them and my other colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee on a multiyear TANF extension.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as you have heard today, there is more that can be and should be done to address the needs of those struggling to get ahead. With this bill, we secure the additional time to reform and make the changes we know are needed to expand opportunity and help more families move ahead.

We have made considerable progress identifying the challenges and the solutions, but now we need to finish our work. Let's pass this extension and work together to complete this reauthorization for the people we serve.

Again, I urge support of H.R. 430, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this simple bipartisan legislation to allow us to meet our commitments to State governments and to families in need across this country.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 430, the"TANF Extension Act of 2019," which extends the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program and related programs.

The bill authorizes activities outlined in part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act to continue through June 30, 2019, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2018.

This extension is necessary so society's most vulnerable do not fall through the cracks.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program provides critical funding to states' anti-poverty efforts.

It helps ensure that families in poverty with children can meet their children's basic needs.

The TANF program, which is time limited, assists families with children when the parents or other responsible relatives cannot provide for the family's basic needs.

The Federal government provides grants to States to run the TANF program.

These State TANF programs are designed to accomplish four goals:

To provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives;

To end the dependency of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage;

To prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and

To encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

States have broad flexibility to carry out their programs.

The States, not the Federal government, decide on the design of the program, the type and amount of assistance payments, the range of other services to be provided, and the rules for determining who is eligible for benefits.

These social safety net programs provide necessary government assistance to help Americans families maintain a basic standard of living, and are a safety net for the poorest of the poor.

Millions of Americans, despite working two jobs, depend on these programs just to keep food on the table and a roof over their heads for their families.

In addition, the vast majority of full-time workers live paycheck to paycheck.

In fact, 70 percent of Americans rely on at least one means tested federal program throughout their lives.

America, one of the richest countries in the world, should be able to help families caught in, to use the celebrated LBJ biographer Robert Caro's famous phrase, the "tentacles of circumstance."

However, we have an Administration that is sensitive to the plight of every day Americans.

This Administration seeks to implement an agenda that reveals a patently racist and inaccurate portrayal of poor people as lazy "Welfare Queens" who would rather depend on the government than pull themselves up by their bootstraps, but nothing could be further from the reality that millions of Americans face.

Mr. Speaker, the President should know that it is unreasonable and it is cruel to expect the poorest people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps when they do not have boots.

Our nation's social safety net programs already fail to help all of the families in need:

Only 1 in 4 poor families with children receive TANF;

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) only provides $1.40/per meal; and

Housing assistance reaches just 1 in 5 eligible families.

That is because the federal government has failed to raise the minimum wage in almost a decade, so even if you work a full-time minimum wage job, you are still living in poverty.

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus are here to tell the American people, do not be fooled.

Donald Trump says this is about a "poverty trap," but the real trap is not raising the minimum wage.

Employers should be highly motivated to pay their employees a fair amount so that every American can enjoy the opportunity to live with dignity, with proper nutrition and proper health care.

A salary that is not commensurate with the current cost of living prevents people from enjoying life with dignity, and that is NOT what the American dream is about.

The President opposes increasing the minimum wage and eliminating labor protections for middle and lower income workers in the African American community.

Mr. Speaker, raising the minimum wage to just $12 per hour would save $53 billion in SNAP benefits alone.

Wage gaps are larger today than they were in 1979.

For example, African American men's average hourly wages were 22.2 percent lower than those of white men in 1979 and declined to 31 percent lower by 2015.

Young African American women have been hardest hit since 2000.

Average wealth for white families is seven times higher than average wealth for African American families.

Worse still, median white wealth (wealth for the family in the exact middle of the overall distribution) is twelve times higher than median African American wealth.

Wage gaps are growing primarily because of discrimination and racial differences in skills and worker characteristics.

Declining unionization has also had a role in the growing black-white wage gap, particularly for men newly joining the workforce.

African Americans have been disproportionately affected by the growing gap between pay and productivity.

Not only are the President's policies divisive along racial and cultural lines, they also serve to further increase economic inequality due to their clear design in favor of the wealthiest among us at the expense of everyone else.

Trump's billionaire tax heist robs the U.S. Treasury of $1.5 trillion in resources that could be invested in economic growth in underserved communities.

The President has proposed doubling down on the war on drugs, which drains the African American labor pool.

The President has taken every opportunity to harm health care for African-Americans from sabotaging the American Care Act to ending Medicaid as we know it.

Trump also wants you to believe that he wants a bipartisan infrastructure plan.

Do not be fooled.

Trump's review of "welfare programs" is an immoral attempt to gut the programs that provide a basic standard of living for Americans struggling to make ends meet, all to pay for

massive tax cuts to himself and the richest 1 percent.

Instead, he should raise wages and invest in job training programs to prepare Americans for the work of the future.

Mr. Speaker, our nation still has a long way to go before we achieve economic equality for all its citizens.

The President and Congressional Republicans should work with Democrats to put more money in the pockets of hardworking Americans.

At the end of the day, our constituents should be able to support their children with one full-time job.

Ultimately, we need to give families the tools they need to rise out of poverty, not undercut programs that keep them afloat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 430.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIRES) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

INVESTING IN MAIN STREET ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 116) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 2, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—403

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—2

Amash
McClintock

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei
Baird
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Davis, Danny K.
Duncan
Gibbs
Golden
Gosar
Hastings
Holding
Huizenga
Johnson (SD)
Jones
Lewis
Lipinski
Loudermilk
Marino
Mast
Payne
Pingree
Quigley
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Weber (TX)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1901

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

END THIS SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a letter I received from a constituent last week. He writes:

''Being out of work and not knowing how many days or weeks it will take to get back to work leaves me worried. These days off are no fun. So please, make them worthwhile by standing firm against the stupid Trump wall.

''This colossal waste of government funds could be spent doing so many worthwhile projects: fix the water in Flint, Michigan; hire more people to process the paperwork of people who want to be citizens; give more people access to healthcare.

''If Democrats cave during this shutdown, it will all be wasted.

''We Federal workers are unhappy, but we've been through this before. We can stand the wait and the frustration. What we cannot stand is the racism, cruelty, and criminality of this administration.

''We are with you. Please be with us.''

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are ready to go back to work. They resent having their livelihoods being used as bargaining chips, and even in this shutdown, they are very unhappy. They just want to do their work, and they are asking us to do ours.

COMMEMORATING MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY

(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. Madam Speaker, one week from today, our Nation celebrates the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Tomorrow is Dr. King's birthday. He would be turning 90 if his life wasn't violently cut short in 1968.

Madam Speaker, it was November 3, 1983, when President Ronald Reagan signed a bill to mark the third Monday of every January as Martin Luther King Jr. Day. The holiday officially began 3 years later.

Born on January 15, 1929, in Atlanta, Georgia, Dr. King was the son of a Baptist minister. He went on to receive his own doctoral degree in theology.

Dr. King was a powerful orator, and his talents were on full display when he delivered his famous ''I Have a Dream'' speech in 1963. 250,000 people gathered outside the Lincoln Memorial to hear his speech, which peacefully called for the end of racism. It is still regarded as one of the most influential moments in American history.

Madam Speaker, I am thankful for all that Dr. King did to advance the civil rights of all Americans, and I am honored to commemorate his life and legacy.

SHUTDOWN STORIES

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, on Friday, several of my Democratic colleagues and I met with hardworking Americans who are living with the consequences of the ongoing Trump shutdown.

We met an FAA employee, working without a paycheck, who has two kids in college, and they need money for books as the new semester begins.

We met a Customs and Border Patrol employee who said his friends think he is on vacation, but a vacation does not include calling your mortgage lender and your auto loan company to tell them you may not make a payment. He said he never expected to get rich as a public servant, but he thought he would be able to buy formula for his 5-month-old daughter.

We met a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration employee who told us weather forecasts for the Great Lakes will be impacted for months, which will, in turn, impact shipping.

We are on day 24 of the longest government shutdown in American history. Estimates say we are letting GDP growth take a hit of $1.2 billion every week.

The President has to stop holding the health, safety, and paychecks of the American people hostage and reopen the government immediately, because 5,200 Federal workers in Michigan are working without pay or are furloughed. I guarantee you that every one of them has a story like the ones I shared.

EUROPEAN UNION SANCTIONS IRAN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the European Union Caucus, I appreciate the EU has imposed sanctions on Iran for the first time in 3 years. Following the numerous plots against Iranian opposition leaders in Europe, the EU added two Iranians and a unit of the Iranian intelligence services to its terror list.

Iran has used its diplomatic facilities to plot attacks against its critics for decades. France concluded that Iran was behind a planned bombing attack on the Iranian opposition rally group in Paris last year. Germany arrested and expelled a high-ranking diplomat suspected of transporting explosives over the summer. The list of plots is endless, threatening European families.

The new sanctions are a good start, but more can and must be done. The EU should work hand-in-hand with America to hold Iran accountable for its promotion of terrorism throughout the world.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1915

DENOUNCING THE WORDS OF REPRESENTATIVE STEVE KING

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address what I call the tale of two Kings, one a Member of this body who wondered out loud to The New York Times why the terms ''white nationalism'' and ''white supremacy'' are offensive.

I would say to my colleague that the terms are offensive because the concepts are evil. And we have been counseled by Edmund Burke that all that is required for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing.

I have just introduced a resolution to express this august body's disapproval of Mr. KING's comments and condemnation of white nationalism and white supremacy in all forms.

Today, I denounce the words of Representative STEVE KING, and I do so invoking the words of another King, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who, if he had been allowed to live, would be celebrating his 90th birthday tomorrow.

Dr. King counseled that: ''We are going to be made to repent, not just for the hateful words and deeds of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people.''

Madam Speaker, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in breaking the deafening silence and letting our resounding condemnation be heard.

HONORING OFFICER NATALIE CORONA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and great sadness that I rise today to mourn the loss of 22-year-old Davis, California, police officer Natalie Corona, who was shot and killed a few days ago after what seemed to be a routine response to a traffic accident.

The motive remains unclear, but then what does it matter what the motive is? We have lost a beautiful, amazing young officer.

It comes just a few months after she was pinned as a new officer by her father, Merced Corona, who himself spent 26 years as a veteran of the Colusa County Sheriff's Office.

Young Natalie, after spending much of her time volunteering with the police force in Colusa County, graduated from the academy in July, an eager rookie, ready to protect and serve her community.

Even before joining the force herself, she frequently posted on social media to honor fallen officers and show support for the thin blue line.

Her police chief, Darren Pytel, had these words to say: ''She was just an absolute star in the department and someone that pretty much every department member looked to as a close friend, a sister. . . . She just worked like you can't believe.''

This is on the heels of Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. We are losing too many of our great officers in this country and California as well, especially a vibrant, young lady like Natalie Corona.

God bless her family and her memory.

BORDER WALL/AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, let's pay tribute to the thousands of America's patriots going to work with no

pay. It is wrong for the President to use his authority to harm our Republic. Public service employees hold our country together.

Take this story shared by Micah Maziar, an air traffic controller from Toledo, Ohio, who told his account of a new trainee struggling to make ends meet. He is not being paid. After a full day's work, a full shift in a very stress-filled job, the trainee reports to his apartment complex to pick up trash as part of a deal with his landlord to offset rent during this Trump shutdown. This is unacceptable.

The Commander in Chief holds our entire government hostage to his harebrained notion that you can stop drug trafficking with a wall. The drug traffickers must be laughing up a storm. They already dig tunnels under the existing walls and fly over them, too.

To secure the border, our Nation needs thorough inspection of cargo. We need enhanced electronic surveillance through drones. Most of all, we need a President who understands you don't stop the drug trade by furloughing border agents without pay.

For the hundreds of thousands of America's hardworking Federal patriots and for the American people whom they serve, we must reopen the government immediately.

CELEBRATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

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

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the University of Cincinnati.

In 1819, roughly 70 students were enrolled in what was then called the Cincinnati College. Today, nearly 46,000 students are enrolled at UC.

None other than Thomas Edison once credited UC with being important to the development of his education. President William Howard Taft, who later became Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and is, by the way, the only American to hold both those offices, was educated at UC Law, as was Nicholas Longworth IV, who went on to represent Ohio's First Congressional District and later served as Speaker of this very House.

On a personal note, my wife, Donna, is a UC grad, as is our daughter, Erica, who graduated from UC's DAAP program.

We are fortunate to have such a tremendous, fine institution in our community.

Congratulations to the University of Cincinnati for achieving this significant milestone, and best of luck for another 200 years.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a question of privileges of the House.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the form of a resolution appear in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ESCOBAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the United States has always been a proud multicultural Nation;

Whereas since early in our history our Nation has recognized the strength that our diversity brings by making our national motto E Pluribus Unum;

Whereas on July 13, 2006, on the floor of the House of Representatives, comparing immigrants to livestock, Representative STEVE KING of Iowa stated, ''We could also electrify this wire with the kind of current that would not kill somebody, but it would simply be a discouragement for them to be fooling around with it. We do that with livestock all the time.'';

Whereas on March 8, 2008, in an interview with KICD Studios, Representative KING stated, ''I don't want to disparage anyone because of their race, their ethnicity, their name—whatever their religion their father might have been . . . I'll just say this: When you think about the optics of a Barack Obama potentially getting elected President of the United States—I mean, what does this look like to the rest of the world? What does it look like to the world of Islam?'';

Whereas on May 21, 2012, while speaking with constituents in Pocahontas, Iowa, Representative KING compared vetting immigrants to choosing hunting dogs saying, ''You want a good bird dog? You want one that's going to be aggressive? Pick the one that's the friskiest.'';

Whereas in July 2012, at a tele-townhall, on President Barack Obama's place of birth, Representative KING stated, ''It would have been awfully hard to fraudulently file the birth notice of Barack Obama being born in Hawaii and get that into our public libraries and that microfiche they keep of all the newspapers published. That doesn't mean there aren't some other explanations on how they might've announced that by telegram from Kenya. The list goes on. But drilling into that now, even if we could get a definitive answer and even if it turned out that Barack Obama was conclusively not born in America, I don't think we could get that case sold between now and November.'';

Whereas on January 4, 2013, in a press release announcing the introduction of his bill, H.R. 140, Representative KING stated, ''The current practice of extending U.S. citizenship to hundreds of thousands of 'anchor babies' must end because it creates a magnet for illegal immigration into our country. Now is the time to ensure that the laws in this country do not encourage law breaking.'';

Whereas on July 24, 2014, in an interview with Newsmax discussing undocumented immigrants in the United States, Representative KING stated, ''For everyone who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds—and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.'';

Whereas on July 20, 2016, in an interview with The Washington Post, Representative KING stated, ''The idea of multiculturalism, that every culture is equal—that's not objectively true.'';

Whereas on July 18, 2016, in an appearance on MSNBC, Representative KING stated, ''Where did any other subgroup of people contribute more to civilization [than White people]?'';

Whereas on September 18, 2016, on Twitter, Representative KING stated, that ''Cultural suicide by demographic transformation must end.'';

Whereas on March 12, 2017, on Twitter, Representative KING shared a story about far-right Dutch politician Geert Wilders and added, ''We can't restore our civilization with somebody else's babies.'';

Whereas on March 13, 2017, on CNN, Representative KING stated, ''I'd like to see an America that's just so homogenous that we look a lot the same'' and ''There's been this effort, we're going to have to replace that void with somebody else's babies. That's the push to bring in [so] much illegal immigration into America, living in enclaves, refusing to assimilate into the American culture and civilization.'';

Whereas on June 12, 2018, Representative KING retweeted Mark Collett, a self-described ''Nazi sympathizer'';

Whereas on September 2, 2018, in an interview with Unzensuriert, a publication linked to a fascist Austrian political party, Representative KING stated, ''What does this diversity bring that we don't already have? Mexican food, Chinese food, those things—well, that's fine. But what does it bring that we don't have that is worth the price? We have a lot of diversity within the U.S. already.'';

Whereas on January 10, 2019, in the New York Times, Representative KING stated ''White nationalist, White supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive?'';

Whereas Representative KING's statements have drawn praise from known White supremacists like former Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke;

Whereas Representative KING dishonors not only immigrants but every American with his racist and xenophobic rhetoric; and

Whereas Representative KING has failed to retract his statement and apologize to the Members of the House

or Americans across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa, by his despicable conduct, has dishonored himself and brought discredit to the House and merits the censure of the House for the same;

(2) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa be censured;

(3) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and

(4) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Illinois will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 40. Condemning and censuring Representative STEVE KING of Iowa.

Whereas, on January 10, 2019, in an interview published by the New York Times, Representative STEVE KING asked, ''White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive? Why did I sit in classes teaching me about the merits of our history and our civilization?'';

Whereas Representative KING's comments legitimize white supremacy and white nationalism as acceptable in today's society;

Whereas Representative KING's comments are abhorrent to the founding principles of our Nation and our rich history of diversity and tolerance of those whose backgrounds and beliefs have made America the envy of the world; and

Whereas Representative KING's comments reflect negatively on the House of Representatives.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that

One, Representative STEVE KING of Iowa be censured;

Two, Representative STEVE KING forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and

Three, Representative STEVE KING be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Ohio will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

MR. PRESIDENT, OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as I entered Bush Intercontinental Airport today, terminal B was shut down, shut down because, of course, we do not have enough TSA officers, as the terminals were shut down in Miami.

I understand the circumstances and the difficulties of these working people in this crisis of no paycheck and no opportunity to pay their bills.

At the same time, a headline in our local newspaper, ''Coast Guard families left 'in a fog,' ''—families who have little babies with medical conditions, who cannot pay their bills. The reason, of course, is the Coast Guard comes under Homeland Security.

And a President who has the audacity to say they can adjust, let them adjust, where is the heart? Where is the recognition that we are jeopardizing our skies with air traffic controllers who are overworked and working overtime with no pay, TSA officers? I came home on Friday and gathered with those.

What about a Federal employee couple who has indicated that they have no ability to pay their bills and are taking money from their son's scholarship fund?

Mr. President, open the government.

Finally, let me say to Mr. KING, it is shameful, your words, and I would offer that I join all of my colleagues in seeking censure.

CELEBRATING SCHOOL CHOICE

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, this week, I am delighted to celebrate the promise of school choice alongside thousands of teachers, students, and their families.

Every student deserves an excellent education, and school choice empowers parents to choose the right education for their children. Through school choice, all students have increased access to charter schools, magnet schools, private schools, homeschooling, and other innovative programs designed to help students achieve their goals.

When we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, we advanced reforms to widen the reach of school choice and empower families and communities.

I am proud of these accomplishments and look forward to continuing the work to protect and expand school choice and help students succeed.

□ 1930

REMEMBERING THE ABBAS FAMILY

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Abbas family.

This beloved family perished last week in a car crash as they were heading back home from Michigan on a family vacation.

Northville and the Metro Detroit area have lost a cornerstone of our community. Issam and Dr. Rima Abbas were loving parents to their three beautiful children: Ali; Isabella; and their youngest, Giselle, who was only 7 years old.

As the children of immigrants from Lebanon, Rima was the granddaughter of the founder of the prominent mosque in which their memorial services were held, the Islamic Center of America in Dearborn.

They touched the lives of their neighbors of all faiths, and the interfaith community has come out in solidarity with the Abbas family.

My prayers are with their family and our community. They will always remain in our hearts, and we will cherish their lives for all time. We must act to make sure this never happens again.

BORDER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, it is a sobering time to be here because we are in the 24th day of a government shutdown, something that none of us wanted, and something that could be fixed very, very quickly. I am hopeful that it will.

We have heard some speeches tonight from individuals calling on the President to open up the government. But the reality is that the House, in December, voted to fully fund the government, and all of the Democrats voted no, and the Senate voted no.

So here we are. We voted to keep the government open, and we provided border security at the same time. We need to do that.

Tonight, I think it is important that we have a discussion with the American people about why we think it is important to secure our border. Can we do both? Can we find $5 billion in an almost $4 trillion budget to secure our border? Can we open our government and make sure our government employees have the funds that they need to pay their bills? Absolutely, we can do that.

I am ready to work with those on the other side of the aisle. I find it so interesting how they have changed their position. I just want to review with everyone listening tonight about the position of some of those who are now, all of a sudden, voting no.

During the previous administration, all 54 Democrats in the Senate voted to double the length of a new border fence with Mexico, double the number of border agents to 40,000, and spend $40 billion on border security. All the Democrats in the Senate, in the last administration, voted for $40 billion for border security just a few years ago.

Before that, in 2006, 64 Democrats in the House joined Republicans to pass the Secure Fence Act to build 700 miles of fencing along the border. In the Senate, when we had 64 Democrats join the House to pass it, to build 700 miles of fencing, Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, and CHUCK SCHUMER all voted for it.

Then Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER voted in favor of the 2007 DHS appropriations bill, which included $1 billion for fencing along the southwest border. The same Speaker who said it is immoral now voted for money for fencing just a few years ago. I find that interesting.

And CHUCK SCHUMER voted for it, and he said: ''Illegal immigration is wrong, plain and simple. Until the American people are convinced that we will stop future flows of illegal immigration, we will make no progress on dealing with the millions of illegal immigrants who are here now and on rationalizing our system of legal immigration.''

Then he said: ''Any immigration solution must recognize that we must do as much as we can to gain control of our borders as soon as possible.''

This is the same CHUCK SCHUMER who now thinks that we shouldn't have it, but just a few years ago he did support it.

So why are we fighting to secure our border? It is because we care about people.

There is a drug crisis in this country, and the drugs are coming across our southern border into our States. I know they are in Missouri. We have to stop it.

I had the chance, in October, to go to a port of entry down in Arizona, the Nogales-Mariposa port of entry just south of Tucson. What I saw there was eye-opening.

What I saw is that we are at war there. It is a war between the drug cartels and our dedicated Border Patrol and Customs officials down there on the ground. Just last year, they confiscated 1½ million pounds of drugs, and they talked about how they had no idea how many more millions of pounds they didn't stop, but we know.

All of us here tonight who talk to our law enforcement at home, who talk to our families who have lost their children due to a heroin overdose, who talk about how much cocaine and meth is in our communities, those are the drugs that they didn't catch.

Last year, 72,000 Americans died from a drug overdose. Now think about that. That is more who died of a drug overdose than died during the entire Vietnam war. It is more people than last year died, in total, of car accidents and homicides. If you put all of the traffic fatalities and all of the homicides together, it doesn't equal the number of people who have died from drug overdoses. We have to stop this.

Part of the drugs coming across is fentanyl. They caught 1.2 tons of this deadly drug. That is enough, they tell me, to kill every person in the United States. It takes only 2 milligrams of fentanyl to overdose, so that could kill that many people.

In 2018, Customs and Border Patrol seized enough cocaine to fill more than 141 1-ton pickups. I wanted to make this poster because we all know what a pickup looks like, and you think of a 1-ton pickup. If you can picture, here are 141 of these 1-ton pickup trucks full of cocaine. That is how much that our Border Patrol caught. We don't know how much more they didn't catch.

Also, they caught enough methamphetamine to fill 124 pickups, 124 tons, and over 3 tons of heroin. In fact, 90 percent of the heroin in the United States comes across the southern border.

Now, we have an opioid crisis in this country, and I am doing everything I can in my district, and I know many of us are, doing what we can to address the opioid crisis. Heroin is a type of opioid; fentanyl is a type of opioid; and 90 percent of that is coming across our southern border.

What that ends up being is it ends up impacting people. Here is a poster of some people who have been impacted by the drug crisis we have in our country.

This mother and son, on the far right-hand side, she was addicted to meth, gave birth to her little boy, and he was drug addicted at birth and went through withdrawal.

The young man in the middle, Eamon, he passed away, sadly, due to a heroin overdose.

And Kristin and her daughter, Reese, she lost custody of Reese because of her drug addiction. She is trying desperately to get off drugs, but she has lost custody.

We have a crisis in our foster care system now because of the drug problem. We are having trouble finding enough individuals to become foster parents. There are so many children who have been taken away from their parents because of their drug addiction, and it is not safe for them to be home.

We have a drug crisis, and we have tons, literally tons, of drugs pouring across our southern border. That is why we have to find $5.7 billion in order to secure our border.

But it is more than just the drugs. It is also our safety. It is our security.

Just last year, our Customs and Border Patrol interdicted 17,000 individuals who had a criminal record. That is how many they caught with a criminal record. But, sadly, there are a lot of people who make it across, who are here in our country because we don't have a border, and they end up hurting our families.

Just last month, our hearts broke for Officer Singh and his family, a police officer from California who did it right, who came here legally from Fiji, and whose dream was to become a police officer. He went through the training. He learned English, his third language. He went to the police academy, driving 4 hours every day for months in order to complete his police academy.

He was so proud to become a police officer, and he was a good one. He was respected; he was amazing; and he was brave. He was a legal immigrant we are so proud of.

Then, sadly, right around Christmas, he was shot and killed by an illegal immigrant, someone who had come across the southern border.

And you wonder why we think it is important to secure the border. It is because of heartbreaking stories like this. It is because of families who are losing their children to drugs. That is why we have to find the money, and we can do it.

My colleagues and I tonight want to share why this is so important, and why it is important that we get this done now.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER). She is new, but we are so thrilled that she is here. I would like her to come and share a little bit on this very important issue from West Virginia's perspective.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight with my colleagues to speak about the important issue of border security.

We are in the midst of a crisis on our southern border, and it is time for our colleagues across the aisle to stop playing politics and to start focusing on our national security.

While Washington Democrats toe the party line and oppose President Trump and anything he supports, our Nation is under assault from unchecked illegal immigration, from terrorists, from human traffickers, and from drug smugglers.

Sadly, as West Virginia and the Nation are battling an opioid epidemic,

the Democrats continue to turn a blind eye.

In the last year alone, the amount of fentanyl and heroin confiscated at our southern border was enough to kill every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The security of our Nation rests with a strong border. We need to build this wall.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to discuss this important issue.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments tonight. It is a serious matter before us right now as a nation. That is why we are having this conversation tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), and I thank him for being here this evening. I think he is the first person, certainly tonight and the other night we had a discussion, from California to be here, so I appreciate him coming. I would like to hear about what he thinks about where we are at and what we need to do.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative HARTZLER, for having this Special Order tonight and for allowing me to be part of it.

I join her in my great concern for the crisis that is happening at our southern border. I agree with our President that it is a humanitarian and national security crisis that has been ignored for far too long.

Being from California, I can name three names, just right off the top of my head, that are the sign of our porous borders and the tragedy we have seen from them.

We all remember Kate Steinle, killed in San Francisco with her family; Jamiel Shaw from southern California, needlessly killed; and, as Mrs. HARTZLER mentioned, most recently, Ronil Singh from central California, a police officer, as she mentioned, who did it the right way, serving in honor to help keep our streets safe, all mowed down by illegal immigrants in our country.

□ 1945

Now, some will downplay this. Some downplay the necessity of a strong fence at our southern border. There areas of our border that already have barriers that are significantly better at preventing illegal trafficking.

In San Diego, illegal traffic has decreased by 92 percent since a physical barrier was constructed back in 1992. There are few situations that I can think of where 92 percent isn't seen as a win and as effective. The fact is that these barriers work.

There are long stretches of our southern border where even more sturdy fences would be more effective. Many of my Democratic colleagues seem to know this, but they are apparently more interested in obstructing this President than in reaching a compromise to reopen our government, secure our border, and provide disaster funding to the West Coast and the Southern States.

Now, this is only a few years after passionate speeches by major Democratic leaders and the votes to back it up. We saw, again, Mrs. Clinton, President Obama, Senator SCHUMER, as well as President Bill Clinton right at this dais a few years ago passionately speaking about the need for this.

It is about giving Border Patrol agents the tools they need to be successful in protecting our Nation's sovereignty from gunrunning, human trafficking, and the mass flow of high-risk drugs, as so eloquently outlined by Mrs. HARTZLER, by all of these violent gangs that have free access to our borders.

The complete and total lack of negotiation by our Democratic colleagues is telling. They are not happy to reopen the government. They are just fine with our porous border the way it is. I guess, does this poll well?

I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans are not happy with it. They want solutions for border security, for the coyotes who are preying on those who are seeking passage into this country—unspeakable things that happen to women in these crossings by these coyotes and others who take advantage of them. Is that compassion?

We seek legal entry for people who seek work permits for agriculture and other work needs and a DACA solution that we can all come to the table and find common ground on. So, indeed, real negotiations need to happen in good faith to reopen our government and secure our border, as is our duty to our sovereign Nation that we swear an oath to protect.

I thank Mrs. HARTZLER for yielding me the time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman; he makes a great point about the safety of the individuals who are coming here. Because we have this open border, it is incentivizing people to make this very dangerous trek.

Doctors Without Borders has reported that 30 percent of the women who make this trek, who have given their money to coyotes to bring them here, are sexually assaulted. Now, that should be upsetting for anyone. That is another reason I believe we need to close the border and then enable and help and work with individuals to come here legally.

I think the gentleman makes a great point, too, that there is a lot of negotiation that could take place right now if the Democrats would be willing to sit down. We do have the DACA situation. We do need more workers. We do need to work on our visas. We need to reform our immigration our laws so that individuals like Police Officer Singh and others who want to come and contribute can come here easier.

We all have an immigration story, and I support legal immigration. So let's sit down. Let's talk about the changes that need to be made to our immigration system, but let's also secure our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) to share his thoughts on this matter, on why he thinks it is important that we secure our border.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her efforts in organizing this Special Order this evening.

As we continue to fight for the safety and security of our fellow Americans, I want to highlight safety and security because that is our number one role in this country. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight with many of my colleagues to address the significance of this crisis we are facing on our southern border.

Just last week, President Trump addressed the Nation from the Oval Office for the first time about the importance of border security and mentioned the devastating story of Robert Page, who was violently murdered by an illegal immigrant in my home State of Georgia. A 76-year-old grandfather's life was needlessly cut short at the hands of an individual who was in our country illegally.

There are far too many families in our country who are coping with tragic losses like this as a result of insufficient border security. The bottom line is, whatever we are doing for border security, it is not working. We must do more.

That is not to mention the illegal drugs that are coming into the United States. As the President mentioned in his letter to Congress, 300 Americans are killed every week from heroin, and 90 percent of that heroin comes across that southern border. This is a humanitarian and national security crisis, and it must be addressed immediately, and it must be done properly.

We are supposed to be a nation of laws. How can we stand by and let lawlessness continue?

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to keep the best interests of the American citizens in mind as they continue to deny funds for commonsense solutions to this growing crisis.

It is this body. It is the United States Congress that appropriates funds. Then it is sent to the President. I say this: Congress, appropriate the funds. Let's build a wall. Let's send the bill to the President and reopen this government.

With an average of 60,000 illegals a month on our southern border, our law enforcement professionals must have the additional resources to successfully execute their jobs and keep the American people safe.

From the day President Trump announced his candidacy, he made it clear that border security was a priority and his administration has been built on promises made are promises kept. I can tell you that the good folks in Georgia's 12th Congressional District want to secure our border with a

wall. We want to do it the right way. We must stand behind our President. The security of our Nation depends on it.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, the gentleman makes some excellent remarks. The 300 deaths a day due to overdoses, the opioid crisis with 90 percent of the opioids coming across the southern border, that is why we have got to secure the border.

I agree; we have a humanitarian crisis. There are 60,000 illegals caught a month trying to cross our border. In Missouri's Fourth District, we don't have very many towns that even have 60,000 individuals. That is a lot of people per month coming across.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my colleague. I thank the gentleman for coming tonight, and I look forward to hearing what he has to share about this important topic.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Missouri for taking this on this evening, to make a point that we are not just talking politics here, but we are talking lives. We are talking freedom. We are talking opportunity. We are talking security.

We must secure our border, Madam Speaker. Driving to the Detroit airport today to fly here, I took note of the number of walls that have been erected along Interstate 94 just to secure the communities developed along the highway from noise and sight problems.

We take a lot of effort to do those type of things, but we have some people who, for some reason—political, I believe—want to stop a wall or a barrier from being developed that the people of this country want to see.

It is not because, as it has been said, that we hate people outside of the walls. It is that we love people inside of the walls, and we want to pass that love on to people who desire the American Dream and desire to be part of the American ideal.

We see 31 percent of all the women migrating up from the southern countries who are sexually assaulted on the way up, and 17 percent of the males have been sexually assaulted on the way up. We have a human trafficking problem that reaches all across the United States. A lot of those problems result from a border wall that is not secured.

We have an opioid epidemic in our country that is devastating the dreams of a generation or more. There are too many families in my district and your districts who know the pain and suffering that comes from this crisis.

Just a couple of months ago, our community lost a young man, Christopher Risner, from Jackson, a wonderful young guy, a good athlete in high school and student in college, until he got caught in the opioid, heroin abuse trap. Fighting to extricate himself from it, surviving it, he fought the battle valiantly. He went through a number of treatment centers, came out, and began to work his life forward.

I had the privilege of going to a number of forums, speaking to high school students and others, telling his story of the battle that he faced and what he was doing to try to succeed and change. But it was just 2 months ago that he lost that battle, and I stood in front of his open casket and thought: Are we doing everything we can to secure our people against this type of scourge?

Madam Speaker, I suggest that we aren't if we are unwilling, for political reasons, to stop a President, to stop many Members of this Congress from doing what we know needs to be done.

All of us have heartbreaking stories from our back home experiences of families that are losing loved ones far too soon.

I am proud of the bipartisan work we have done to combat the opioid crisis. Sitting on the Energy and Commerce Committee, I saw the number of bills that we put forward—I believe, 70 in all—and saw the President sign that just last November.

But we must redouble our efforts. And as we do that, one priority is we must keep these deadly drugs off our streets in the first place. In fiscal year 2018 alone, U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized a total of 1.7 million pounds of narcotics.

To curb the flow of drugs into our communities, we must secure our southern border. There is no doubt we need a comprehensive solution. A border wall is just one component of what we need to do. We also need more surveillance technology, more border agents, and more resources to address the humanitarian crisis at the border, yes. But as the experts at the border tell us, a border wall, a security barrier must be part of that solution.

At a time when hundreds of Americans die each week from overdoses, we need to give our border agents all the tools they need to stem the tide of these deadly drugs and to protect them as well. It is time for Speaker PELOSI to get serious about border security, to negotiate to a solution.

Let's stop the political games and negotiate a solution that keeps the American people safe, keeps illicit drugs off our streets, puts an end to this partial shutdown, and, may I suggest as well, gives greater opportunity and security to those who deem it their purpose in life to legally experience the American Dream. We want to see that happen, Madam Speaker.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, that is so powerful. I thank the gentleman for sharing Christopher's story. I can't imagine how helpless that made him feel to stand at his casket, at his funeral, and to realize that we here in Congress have passed a lot of bills dealing with opioids to address this, but it is still flowing across our borders. We need to do more.

So I thank the gentleman for sharing that story. We do need to work in a bipartisan fashion. These bills that Representative WALBERG talked about were passed in a bipartisan fashion, over 70 bills. Democrats and Republicans came together last year and said: This is a crisis. Let's send this.

Now we need to complete that. We need to complete and stop them from coming in to begin with, in addition to continuing to provide money for people in treatment and our law enforcement and mental health issues and those other things, to go after the opioid crisis. But we need to stop them flowing here to begin with. So I thank the gentleman for sharing that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON). He is right there at the border in the State of Texas, along the edge. I thank the gentleman for being here tonight and would like to hear what he has to say about this topic.

□ 2000

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I am very concerned, to my friend and the gentlewoman from Arizona, to put it mildly. I am troubled that our Nation and our Nation's leaders here in this great body of the United States House of Representatives would not put politics aside and put our country and our citizens' safety first. It is the number one job. It is the most important job, to provide for a common defense and to ensure the safety of the United States citizens. We can never be distracted from that, and we can never allow partisan politics from fulfilling that first responsibility and duty.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for bringing this discussion to the floor so that we can speak directly to the American people about our strong support for our Commander in Chief who is simply asking for the tools and resources to do that which he ran for the Presidency on, was elected to do, and is now doing everything with unwavering commitment to follow through on that promise to secure the border. Border walls and barriers are a fundamental component of security.

As a Texan, I can tell you being on the front-lines—and the gentlewoman knows this as well being on the front-lines as well from the great State of Arizona—that this is costing our States billions of dollars, $12 billion in the great State of Texas. We see the drugs that are flowing in, the gangs, the crimes, and the criminal activities.

Here is a statistic: since 2011, 186,000 illegal immigrants were charged with more than 290,000 criminal offenses costing $1 billion, tearing apart families and devastating communities. And this President is asking for the resources necessary to secure our border.

Madam Speaker, I say to Mrs. HARTZLER, I find it ironic that Democrats have spoken in favor and have even supported physical barriers. I find it hypocritical that Speaker PELOSI has talked about walls being immoral when she has spent probably half of her life being protected by those very walls. I find it disingenuous that

Democrats have said that they actually want to do something to secure the border; they just don't want to have anything to do with walls or fencing.

Madam Speaker, I have got a list—and I don't have enough time—but last Congress, which was my first term in Congress, we put several bills to do just that, to secure the border and stop illegal immigration, from Kate's Law to No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and Securing America's Future.

For the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, 188 Democrats voted no; Kate's Law, 166 Democrats voted against it; Securing America's Future Act to give DACA recipients peace of mind, 190 Democrats voted against it.

Then they were crying out saying that we have to abolish ICE, abolish the people who risk their lives to keep us safe. Then we put a very simple resolution: we support you, we love you, we are behind you, we know what a tough job you have; and 133 Democrats voted present, and 34 voted against that resolution. I wonder how that makes the folks in uniform who defend this country and protect our communities feel.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs. HARTZLER for her generosity in allowing me to speak in her time and during this Special Order. I would just call on my Democrat colleagues and the Democrat leaders to be leaders, not politicians, and put this country first and work in good faith with this President who has been willing to negotiate every step of the way to secure this border and protect our people.

God bless America.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for sharing those heartfelt words and those statistics. They really matter. I totally agree with the gentleman that our number one job is to keep America safe. The number one job is to keep America safe. That is why we want to find $5.7 billion to build the wall and reopen government.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) to share his thoughts on where we are at today.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for not only her service but also this Special Order. This is such an important issue.

Madam Speaker, having spent so many nights all night on the border, it is incredible what you see down there. But what is even worse is what the Border Patrol can tell you about, things that you can find on the internet, there are videos and there are pictures. I have daughters, and there are some things I would just rather not see.

But as long as our border is porous and as long as we don't have a wall or a fence where we need it, people are being drawn into this country. Mexico alone has about 130 million people. Obviously we can't have an influx of 100 million people without destroying the economy, and then we are no longer able to provide light to so much of the world.

But if we secure our border—wall, fence, barrier—where we need it, it cuts off the tens of billions—maybe over 100 billion now—going to the drug cartels and the corruption comes to a crawl. But as long as we have this porous border, we are funding some of the most evil and horrendous human tragedy that is going on anywhere in the world.

The police try to stand up—it is not hard to see pictures, find the stories—mayor—they end up with their head cut off and put on a pike.

How callous, how mean-spirited does somebody have to be and how politically driven to say ''we don't care about that''? This is a political issue. We don't want the President to have a win, so we are just going to let the border stay as porous as it is.

They talk of rape trees where women are tied to the trees and repeatedly raped. Objectively groups say that maybe 37 percent or more are molested sexually, normally multiple times. How callous do you have to be to say, yeah, but this is political. It is helping our party. We want to keep it going.

It is time to do the right thing by the people of the United States and, for heaven's sake, to do the right thing by the people of Mexico.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

To the gentleman's point, a reminder that in 2006, 64 Democrats in the House joined the Republicans to pass the Secure Fence Act to build 700 miles of fencing along the border, including Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and CHUCK SCHUMER. Then the next year there was some money in an appropriations bill for the wall, and both Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER voted for it. So I think the gentleman is right. It is time to work together to get this done.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN), who is a new member of Congress.

I am glad to see Dr. MARK GREEN. I am glad that he is here. We are excited to have the gentleman serving with us here in the body and being a former service member from the Army who is part of the elite unit that helped capture Saddam Hussein.

The gentleman knows a little bit about security, so I appreciate the gentleman's sharing his thoughts on where we are at tonight.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague from Missouri for putting this Special Order together highlighting the need for border security and, most importantly, to put our American citizens first.

We could spend our time debating what a physical barrier should consist of, but let's make one thing clear: whether it is in the form of a wall or a fence or some barrier combined with 21st century surveillance technology and increased Border Patrol agents, a barrier is an effective defense against entry by criminals, gang members, drug smugglers, and, yes, even terrorists.

My colleagues across the aisle are now arguing that physical barriers are ineffective. Some have even said that they are immoral. Now, this is not the position they held in the recent past. President Trump has asked for $5.7 billion to help secure the border. Under President Obama, Democrats were willing to spend $40 billion for border security.

What has changed?

Is it possible the only difference is the occupant in the White House?

Some argue that border security is not necessary because too few known or suspected terrorists have been captured on the southern border. They say that only eight have been captured. I would suggest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that one terrorist gaining entry into this country is too many. I would like to point out that there were only 19 terrorists who carried out the attacks on 9/11—just 19. The fact that we know ISIS is encouraging their followers to try to enter the United States across our porous southern border should itself warrant better scrutiny.

This leads me to direct some questions to my colleagues and friends across the aisle.

Is it worth the risk?

Is it worth the possibility that one or two or a dozen or 19 terrorists could cross our southern border and carry out an attack that kills innocent American men and women?

I would pay $5.7 billion to stop the next 9/11.

Terrorism is not the only threat to our national security. In 2017, an estimated 72,000 Americans died from drug overdoses with the biggest increase in drug overdose deaths being attributed to fentanyl and heroin. It has been reported that roughly 85 percent of the fentanyl and 90 percent of the heroin is coming across our southern border.

Does that death toll not warrant putting aside the issues with our President long enough on this national crisis to fund additional barriers and to fund additional and better drug detection technology and surveillance technology to try to stop the flow of these deadly drugs across our southern border?

Would it be worth it if we saved 1,000 lives? 100? A dozen?

What number would justify putting differences aside and joining this effort?

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his perspective, both as a doctor and as a military officer. His speaking of security means a lot. I think it is a good question.

What number is it going to take?

Are we really going to say: let's work together and let's do this?

I think we need to sit down right now. I am hopeful maybe this week we will do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) to come share what he thinks maybe we could do this week to get this government opened and at the same time secure our border.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman HARTZLER for her efforts on this Special Order.

I don't know that I can add a whole lot to what has been said. But let me tell you about a conversation I had with a liberal who did not believe in a wall. He didn't think it worked. He happened to go to the national championship game between Clemson and Alabama.

I asked him: How was the game?

Of course, he was a Clemson fan.

I said: Did you have tickets?

He said: Yes.

I said: Let me ask you, did you have any trouble getting in?

He said: No, I had tickets.

I said: Did you go to a point of entry?

Yeah, we had a line.

I said: Well, could you not just walk in? Was there a wall?

He said: No, there was a fence.

I said: Okay, there was a fence. But was there a barrier, whether concrete or steel? Was there a way that you could not get in and you had to go in to a certain point of entry?

He said: Yes.

I said: Well, explain to me what is different with our country? If anybody can walk in that stadium, would they not take your seat? Would they not violate what you paid for?

He just kind of looked at me.

I said: Do you not see the similarities?

He did, but he didn't want to admit it.

Madam Speaker, I am very frustrated with the inaction of Congress. I am appalled that we haven't taken the security for our great Nation seriously.

How many Kate Steinles are going to have to be shot?

How many Mollie Tibbetts are going to have to be raped and killed?

How many police officers on the border are going to be shot before we say that we have got a crisis in this country?

I have got a chart behind me that shows what $5 billion is to our total Federal budget spending. It is one-tenth of 1 percent. Madam Speaker, you try to look and see what percentage this is. You really can't see it. So as has been said, it is not about the money. I really don't think that those who argue against it can really say that they don't work, as my friend who went to the college football game knows it works, because he said it did.

□ 2015

Now is the time to take action, not to hold this President in contempt, like has been done, for political reasons, having the safety of this country and all Americans at risk.

We shouldn't even have to have this debate. I urge Congress to take action. I urge Congress to put partisan politics behind.

Let's do right for the country. Let's do right for America.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I love the analogy that the gentleman just shared about the Clemson game and going into a football game and how you have a ticket and there is a fence and you go through a point of entry and how the system works that way. It is common sense for us. So I thank the gentleman for sharing that.

I would like to visit with someone else who has a lot of common sense. We serve on the Committee on Agriculture together. We are from rural America, and we just have some common sense about these things.

The gentleman is from Washington State, and I would love to hear his thoughts about the importance of securing our border as well as reopening government.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend Mrs. HARTZLER from Missouri for putting this evening together to help us make some important points about a very important issue facing our country. So I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me some time.

I just wanted to relate a couple of instances. Madam Speaker, last June I had the opportunity to tour the same southern border area that President Trump toured just this past week. In fact, he was briefed by some of the same officials that I was, including Acting Chief Patrol Agent Raul Ortiz of the Rio Grande Valley sector. It was a very interesting conversation.

Chief Ortiz said, so far in 2019, his sector has apprehended people from 41 countries around the world. On a single day, Chief Ortiz's sector apprehended 133 people from countries other than Mexico or countries in Central America.

Madam Speaker, we absolutely have a crisis at the border. It is a humanitarian crisis. Even President Obama said as much back in 2014.

President Trump now is, rightly, citing the growing numbers of families and unaccompanied minors crossing the border as a crisis, yet he is met with partisan criticism for saying so.

The numbers will tell you the truth. Just last month, 20,000 migrant children were brought illegally to our country—20,000. Our border facilities just are not equipped to handle this influx of families and minor children. We are being overrun. Therefore, this results in a humanitarian crisis.

Securing the border and coming to a solution on immigration reform should not be a partisan fight, but, rather, we should see this as an opportunity to find the common ground about which the gentlewoman was speaking.

Americans support a deal to secure our border, reform our immigration system, and—another point—provide certainty to DACA recipients.

Just this weekend, I polled my constituents on this very solution. You know what they told me? Madam Speaker, 69.8 percent said they support a border security and DACA solution compromise deal. President Trump has made it clear that he is open to a broader immigration reform deal that includes DACA recipients if the border is secured.

So I think our time to achieve both is right now. The fact that we have a crisis at the border must be addressed. But congressional Democrats must be willing to make a deal with President Trump to support broader solutions for our Nation.

Speaker PELOSI's flippant comment of being willing to only give a single dollar for a barrier at the border, that is a slap in the face to the men and women, like Chief Ortiz, who are working selflessly to keep our Nation safe.

Madam Speaker, let's reopen the government, secure our border, and reform our broken immigration system. We can do all those things.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Well said. This is so important. And we have a moment in time right now in the history of our country where we have had the government—part of it—shut down for 24 days, yet we have, like the gentleman said, all of these individuals coming into our country, some of them terrorists or gang members hurting our citizens.

So here is an opportunity to come together and work in a bipartisan fashion to fix our broken immigration laws. I agree that the DACA situation needs to be taken care of, and we need more agricultural workers. We need to expand our visas. We need to expand in several areas. We need to streamline the process.

Right now there are 600,000 individuals in the process of trying to come here legally into our country. I don't know if the gentleman has worked with some of the individuals. I know, in my own district, my office and I are helping some individuals who are trying to get their family members here legally.

It has been very interesting to see the paperwork that they have to go through and the amount of work. The paperwork that I have seen has been even this high, the documentation that they have to submit. Then they have money that they pay along the way, and then there is such a large time frame. Some have waited over a year, 2 years, or more to go through this process legally.

But it is worth it because they want to live the American Dream, and I applaud them. But we need to streamline it and help those individuals who are going through the process to get here and make it easier, the ones who want to be upright citizens and contribute.

But the problem is that it is not fair, for those 600,000 individuals who are trying to come here, who are waiting in line, to just have somebody go

across the border and not follow our laws, disregard our laws. It is just not right.

So it is important that we build this wall, that we come together in a bipartisan fashion to find a solution to this, that we find $5.7 billion, which is hardly anything.

You saw the chart earlier from Representative NORMAN about what a small sliver of our entire budget that would be. Surely all these lives of individuals and our families' security and safety are worth finding that sliver amount of money.

We pay over $50 billion every year in foreign aid, and we want $5.7 billion for a wall. Madam Speaker, $50 billion we send to other countries, many times for them to secure their border, yet we can't find $5.7 billion or we can't get support for that from the other side of the aisle so that we can secure our own border. That just doesn't make sense.

We can do better.

I appreciate all of my colleagues who have come down tonight to have this conversation on this topic and to talk about how it can come about for us to come together to find this solution, reopen government, and to make sure that we have a secure border for our Nation, to stop the flow of drugs, and to keep our country safe.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker on Friday, January 11, 2019, announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 24. An Act to provide for the compensation of Federal and other government employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 15, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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. STAUBER (for himself, Mr. EMMER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 527. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving Federal land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Weeks Law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 528. A bill to provide a safe harbor from licensing and registration for certain non-controlling blockchain developers and providers of blockchain services; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. EMMER (for himself and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 529. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a national intersection and interchange safety construction program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 530. A bill to provide that certain actions by the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 531. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may only be removed for cause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 532. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to use alternatives to detention for certain vulnerable immigrant populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 533. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to require the head of each executive agency to consider the existence of qualified training programs of contractors in the award of certain contracts; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 534. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, in relation to requiring adrenoleukodystrophy screening of newborns; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 535. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to shall designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BUDD, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 536. A bill to provide tax relief for the victims of Hurricane Florence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 537. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COHEN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 538. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require a quarterly report on security clearances for individuals working in the White House or the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 539. A bill to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. MORELLE (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. REED, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 540. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the ''Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO,

Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 541. A bill to limit the separation of families at or near ports of entry; 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 Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 542. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 543. A bill to require the Federal Railroad Administration to provide appropriate congressional notice of comprehensive safety assessments conducted with respect to intercity or commuter rail passenger transportation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 544. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide accrual of annual and sick leave for Federal employees of an agency subject to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 40. A resolution condemning and censuring Representative Steve King of Iowa; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H. Res. 41. A resolution rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. STAUBER:

H.R. 527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and it subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Post Offices (e.g., naming post offices; creating)—Article I, Section 8, clause 7 provides Congress with the power to establish post offices.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a ''uniform rule of Naturalization.''

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (clause 18), which grants Congress the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 27.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .''

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 28.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .''

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 26: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 31: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 38: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 92: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 95: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BACON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. LAMB, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 96: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 116: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 117: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 125: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 141: Mr. LAMB, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 150: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 154: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 190: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 195: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 230: Mr. ROUDA and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 273: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 280: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 282: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 294: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 296: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 330: Mr. COHEN, Mr. ROUDA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 350: Mr. CASE and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 367: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 371: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 372: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 415: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 444: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 446: Mr. ROUDA, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 489: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 504: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 511: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 512: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. COMER and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 17: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Res. 23: Mr. LAMB.

H. Res. 35: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 37: Mrs. FLETCHER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.J. Res. 27, Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.J. Res. 28, Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2019 No. 7

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

O God, our Father, we thank You for setting eternity in our hearts. You are the ultimate source of peace and knowledge, presiding over our universe with the majesty of Your power.

Today, we present ourselves to You with the humble request that You would move mightily in the hearts of our legislators. Lord, lead them toward the path of unity, empowering them to accomplish Your work on Earth.

God, we thank You for the freedoms that You have given us and ask that through our Senators these liberties will flourish. And, Lord, please bring an end to this partial government shutdown.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY). The majority leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, although three-quarters of the government is funded and fully operational, important Federal functions continue to be unduly affected, and hundreds of thousands of Federal workers have now missed paychecks.

By now, everyone in America understands the basic faultlines of this disagreement. The Speaker of the House has decided that opposing President Trump comes before the security of our borders.

The President has asked for a reasonable new investment, $5.7 billion—about one-tenth of 1 percent of Federal spending—for the same kinds of border security that prominent Democrats actually used to brag about supporting, for the very same kind of reinforced steel fencing that the Obama administration bragged about building, and for precisely the kinds of barriers that the men and women of law enforcement there on the ground insist are vital for their mission.

It is for precisely the same kind of physical border security in which a number of my Democratic colleagues here in the Senate were perfectly happy to vote to invest billions of dollars just as recently as last Congress. The 2017 funding measure that passed the Senate with 47 Democratic votes included upgraded border fencing; that was in 2017, just this past Congress—last year. And 40 Democrats voted for the bipartisan spending deal that was cleared just this past March. It included more than $1.5 billion for border barriers. Then, of course, the Appropriations subcommittee and full committee approved another $1.6 billion for border security in a bipartisan vote just this last June, and 10 of 15 committee Democrats voted to report the final package to the full Senate. Those are billions of dollars for physical border security, winning Democratic votes just last year.

Well, that was before we had a new Speaker of the House. That was before Speaker PELOSI and her far-left base decided that the politics of obstruction would come before commonsense policymaking.

Here is how serious the Speaker is about ending the impasse and getting the government reopened: She now proudly boasts that she would allow exactly $1—$1—for border barriers.

There was bipartisan support in the Congress for billions of dollars of physical barriers at the border before Representative PELOSI was Speaker. Now congressional Democrats support just $1—$1—for border barriers since she became Speaker. You have to ask yourself, what is the reason?

Earlier this month, Speaker PELOSI declared that the concept of any physical wall on our southern barrier was ''an immorality''—an immorality.

''A wall is an immorality.'' That is what Speaker PELOSI said. Look, that is not a serious statement. It would be laugh-out-loud material if hundreds of thousands of Federal workers weren't going without pay because the Speaker has decided this absurdity is now her party's official position.

Immoral? Was it immoral for Democrats to vote for the Secure Fence Act in 2006? Was it immoral for President Obama's administration to proudly build the same kinds of steel slat barriers that President Trump now wants more of? Is Speaker PELOSI calling sitting Democrats immoral because they voted to invest billions in border security over the past few years alone?

I would like to see how this new philosophical opposition to the existence of walls plays out in practice. Shouldn't the Speaker introduce a bill to destroy the walls and fencing that already exist if they are immoral?

Or maybe this actually isn't a new, principled stand by Democrats. Maybe this is all one big political game—no negotiations, no collaboration. It is political game playing.

Consider the latest tactic by my Democratic colleagues. They have said that the President just needs to drop his request and agree to the Democrats' plan to reopen the government, and then—and then—they will talk about border security—except they couldn't even keep up that act either.

When President Trump and Speaker PELOSI met last week, the President

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

Printed on recycled paper.

put the question to her directly: If the government were reopened, would Democrats, after 30 days, then compromise and agree to more border security?

No, no, said Speaker PELOSI. They would not.

So here we are, day 24, because the Speaker of the House has decided that enforcing our own laws is now immoral, because she has decided it is better to prolong this partial shutdown than invest $1 in something that both parties agreed was a good idea until about 5 minutes ago—funding that Obama administration border experts continue to argue is a good idea, an essential idea.

Here in the Senate, I am sorry to say, my Democratic colleagues seem to have just fallen in line. Based on their actions, my colleagues across the aisle seem to agree that it is better for Federal workers to keep going without pay than to invest one one-thousandth of Federal spending in the same kinds of border security that they themselves have voted repeatedly to fund in just the past 2 years.

I have a hard time believing that every last one of my Senate Democratic colleagues really stands with Speaker PELOSI on this. It is hard to believe. It is hard to believe that Senate Democrats now agree their own recent votes on border security were actually immoral, that it would be better to keep the government shut down than to invest one one-thousand of Federal spending in fencing that the Obama administration bragged about building.

It is particularly hard for me to believe that my distinguished colleagues from Maryland and Virginia, who are understandably very concerned with the circumstances of the Federal workforce, would rather echo Speaker PELOSI's fringe position—rather echo Speaker PELOSI's fringe position—than work with the White House to find a real compromise and reopen the government.

What is happening here is that Federal workers are paying for this far-left ideological crusade. Lots of American families are facing great uncertainty because Senate Democrats apparently agree that the same kinds of reasonable investments they happily supported last year and the year before have now become completely immoral this year simply because Speaker PELOSI suddenly now says that they are wrong.

That isn't really what has happened. That isn't what has happened. Enforcing our laws has not become unethical overnight. The physical barriers at the border that Democrats used to support in past Congresses and in the Obama administration have not somehow become radical rightwing positions.

Walls and fences still work. Border security still matters. American families still deserve safety. Reality is still reality. When Democrats are ready to reaccept these realities, they can negotiate seriously with the White House and bring an end to this impasse.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed to S. 1.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, here we are, January 14. Twenty-four days ago, the border security funding and 25 percent of our government funding lapsed.

Democrats refuse to come to the negotiating table with a legitimate offer that would end this partial government shutdown and provide vital funding for border security measures. Their negligence has harmed 800,000 Federal workers who are not being paid while this standoff continues, and it has completely stalled the work here in the Senate because the minority leader, the Senator from New York, has gotten his colleagues to fall in line to block the legislation that is currently on the floor that would offer aid and comfort to our friends and allies in the Middle East, countries like Israel and Jordan. So it has completely stalled our work here in the Senate, as well, and, sadly, their efforts have sought to make border security more of a political football than the national security issue that it is.

What I find so cynical is the fact that Democrats have drawn a line in the sand over something they have largely supported in the past. For example, in 2006 we passed the Secure Fence Act. This legislation called for more than 800 miles of fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border, and it authorized additional layered security that we keep discussing—things like vehicle barriers, sensor technology, cameras, and lighting. That bill passed by 80 to 19—80 to 19—exactly the same kind of border security measures we are talking about today and that Democrats have shut down 25 percent of the government over—80 to 19.

Barack Obama, CHUCK SCHUMER, and Hillary Clinton all supported the Secure Fence Act. Yet their opposition to President Trump and anything and everything that he wants has somehow become an article of faith for the radical left.

A few years later, in 2013, the Senate, with Democrats holding the majority, voted on the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, sometimes known as the Gang of 8 comprehensive immigration bill. That bill, among other things, provided funding for infrastructure—that is, barriers along the border—as well as personnel—the types of things we continue to advocate for today. In total, that bill appropriated $46 billion for border security.

So the Democrats—Senator SCHUMER and Speaker PELOSI—have shut down the government over $5 billion that the President has requested for border security. Yet 54 Democrats—every single one, in 2013—voted for $46 billion for border security.

Well, today, they turn their nose up at the President's request for $5.7 billion, and it makes no sense whatsoever unless you look through the lens of partisan political gamesmanship, because rational actors, reasonable people trying to find a solution, could easily come up with a solution based on this history. It wouldn't take 24 days. It wouldn't take 24 hours—maybe 24 minutes—to come up with a bipartisan, bicameral solution that the President would sign.

So what are we talking about?

Well, we are talking about the same thing we talked about back in 2006 and in 2013. We are talking about infrastructure. The President likes to call it a wall. Other people call it a fence. But it includes things like vehicle barriers along the Arizona-Mexico border. This is exactly the sort of things we talked about and voted for in 2006 and 2013. The majority of Democrats supported those measures in the past. Yet today they seem proud of what they have wrought, which is that one-quarter of our Federal Government is being held hostage over the same exact measures.

Their continued intransigence and refusal to get serious about negotiating shows one of two things: either their party has completely flipped their position on commonsense border security measures or they simply refuse to work with the President because they loathe him. Either way, they should be ashamed, they should be embarrassed, but they are not.

While Democrats continue to sit on their hands, the President has said he will consider declaring a national emergency—left with few other options—in order to provide funds for border security. I don't believe declaring a national emergency is either necessary or productive, although I do support the President's request for $5.7 billion for border security. One of the most fundamental constitutional responsibilities of Congress is to provide funding for our government. It is our job. It is our job, not the President's job. This standoff should be resolved as all other funding disagreements have been in the past, where everybody comes to the table with a serious offer and everybody negotiates in good faith. In a democracy, nobody gets 100 percent of what they want.

I support the President's effort to secure our borders, period, full stop, but I also believe taking a step like declaring a national emergency and diverting disaster relief to border security would seriously hurt those who are still recovering from the impact of natural disasters like Hurricane Harvey. The storm that hit my State was the largest rain event in American history. More than 50 inches of rain fell on parts of Houston over about 5 days. It destroyed homes, businesses, and communities, and though a great deal of progress has been made, we are still healing.

Last year, Congress and the President worked very hard to secure nearly $90 billion in disaster relief for the people of Texas and other States and territories impacted by the devastating hurricanes and wildfires during that time period—an effort, by the way, that the administration strongly supported. In Texas, that money was needed to both support recovery and rebuilding efforts as well as fund projects that would mitigate future flooding from hurricanes. Hurricane Harvey isn't the first hurricane we have sustained, and it will not be the last. We need to get ready for the next one. Diverting those funds away to support border security would be a major step backward and could further harm the victims of Hurricane Harvey.

So what Democrats, by their intransigence, have forced the President to do is look at other options like taking money away from disaster relief for border security, but the fact is, we need to do both. We can't rob Peter to pay Paul. We need to do both.

I have been grateful for President Trump's continued support of my State as well as other States affected by natural disasters, and it is critical that every dollar of the money supporting Hurricane Harvey recovery is preserved to finish the job. I know that is true, and I know we all feel that way about natural disasters that have hit our State.

Sometimes the Senate is referred to as the greatest deliberative body in the world. At times like this, when congressional leaders like Senator SCHUMER and Ms. PELOSI refuse to negotiate with the President, I wonder whether the Senate is actually blocked by Senate Democrats from proceeding to consider important foreign affairs legislation. I wonder if we can still look ourselves in the mirror and call ourselves the world's greatest deliberative body.

Historically, we have been able to reach a consensus on very tough issues, far more controversial than this, because we all believe American interests should come first, that our constituents should come first, and we are there to serve their interests, not merely to play political games and score political points.

So it is time for our Democratic friends to come back to the negotiating table so we can finally end this unnecessary and harmful shutdown, and, hopefully in the process, the 800,000 Federal workers who missed their paycheck last Friday can get paid during this next pay period, and we can reopen the Federal Government so we can serve the interests of the American people, as we should have done 24 days ago.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as the government shutdown enters its fourth unfortunate week, its effects are widespread and worsening. As of Friday, 800,000 public servants were without pay. Tomorrow, roughly 41,000 Active-Duty Coast Guard members won't get their paychecks. By the end of the week, our Federal courts will start running out of operating funds. Farmers and small businesses remain unable to access loans and assistance. Some working families are unable to access home loans. Food safety inspections are curtailed. Airport terminals are closing amidst widespread staffing shortages at TSA. The Trump shutdown is even affecting the opioid crisis. The DEA is in charge of approving a critical daily medication used by doctors in the recovery and treatment of opioid addiction. As long as the DEA is shut down, that is not happening.

It is all the more shameful because the Trump shutdown is a completely manufactured crisis—manufactured by Donald Trump. The only reason the government is shut down right now is that President Trump reversed positions the day before the government funding ran out, bewildering Senate Democrats and Republicans who were assured he would sign a stop-gap bill to fund the government.

Leader MCCONNELL is trying to blame the current Speaker of the House. He is way out to lunch on that one. We are here because the President reversed himself, and the last Speaker of the House failed to use his responsibility to put the Senate-passed bill on the floor. This House has voted to reopen the government. It is the Senate that hasn't done it because Leader MCCONNELL won't bring the bill to the floor.

President Trump has stubbornly refused to negotiate or soften his position from the get-go. Democratic leaders and staff have been over to the White House over and over again to urge the President to open the government while we negotiate over border security. We are all for border security. There are different ways to do it. Everyone wants it. But why shut down the government while we are negotiating that? Every time we have asked that of the President, he has been intransigent and uncompromising. He refuses to back down from his position that the price to reopen the government is $5.7 billion of taxpayer money for a wall he promised Mexico would pay for.

I want to remind all my Republican colleagues and the American people that Democrats only want to reopen the government. We offered a proposal that would separate the government shutdown from our disagreements over border security.

The House has passed six bills to reopen the government, each of which was drafted and approved by Senate Republicans. Let me emphasize that point. The Democratic proposal to reopen the government is to pass the Republicans' government funding bills. Democrats are not demanding any added policy changes, no Democratic agenda items, no nothing. These bills are noncontroversial. Leader MCCONNELL has voted for each of them.

According to a Quinnipiac poll that just came out, the American people support our plan by an overwhelming majority—63 percent to 30 percent. A healthy minority of Republicans are for the plan. Thirty-nine percent are for the idea, while only 52 percent are opposed. So even Republicans are moving to the position: Open the government, and then debate border security.

President Trump started this shutdown. He is the person continuing it. It is irresponsible of him to do it. Make no mistake—Democrats are happy to negotiate about the best way to secure our border, but we need to open the government first.

The fact that President Trump refuses to consider our proposal means that he is holding the government and the American people hostage as a political tactic. To President Trump, innocent, hard-working Americans are no more than bargaining chips. He will bluster, mislead, and storm out of meetings until he gets what he wants. That is not how our system of government works. We don't—we can't—govern by temper tantrum. No President has done it. If we do not reject government by extortion now, what is to prevent the same thing from happening

over and over again under this President? What will he do when the debt ceiling needs to be renewed?

Before the Christmas holiday, we had a solution in sight. We believed the President would support a true compromise to end the shutdown. At the last minute, he reversed himself and said no. And now he is continuing the shutdown.

It is clear that the President doesn't want to end the shutdown—at least not yet. He has flatly refused our proposal to reopen the government while we negotiate on border security. He has contradicted his own deputies—the Vice President, the Chief of Staff—after they made offers to Democrats. Just this morning, he refused to consider one of his closest allies, Senator GRAHAM's proposal to open the government temporarily while we negotiate border security.

How many more reasonable offers can the President reject? How much more suffering must the President cause before Leader MCCONNELL realizes it is time to move ahead without him? It seems clear to nearly everybody but Leader MCCONNELL that Congress needs to move forward without the President. At every juncture, the President has been the obstacle to progress. We need intervention.

It is time for Congress to fulfill our constitutional duty to govern, even without the President. It is time for Leader MCCONNELL to realize he has the power to break this impasse and pass the House legislation to reopen the government—legislation his party already supports and legislation Leader MCCONNELL has voted for and bragged about. The President is unwilling to move the ball forward, so Congress must. I urge my friend Leader MCCONNELL to allow a vote on the House-passed legislation to reopen the government. It seems to be the only way out right now.

RUSSIA SANCTIONS

Madam President, on another matter—Russia sanctions—before the end of last year, the Trump administration moved to relax sanctions on three companies owned and controlled by sanctioned Russian oligarch Oleg Deripaska.

As a reminder, an overwhelming, bipartisan majority of the last Congress supported additional sanctions on Russia as a response to President Putin's malign activities, particularly in Ukraine. Oleg Deripaska and a number of companies he controlled were placed under U.S. sanctions because Mr. Deripaska was effectively acting as an agent of Putin's interests abroad, leveraging the wealth he had accrued through control of these companies.

In my view, the Trump administration's plan to provide sanctions relief to these companies is deeply flawed and wrong.

First, it fails to sufficiently limit Mr. Deripaska's control and influence of these companies. Even though this plan brings Deripaska's ownership interest in these companies down from 70 percent to 45 percent, the terms allow for other Russian shareholders with family and business ties to Deripaska to maintain shareholder interests. His ex-wife and father-in-law will still own a combined 7 percent in the company, and a sanctioned Russian bank is acquiring more shares. Even with the 45 percent, he would probably control it—many American companies are controlled with far less—but with these additional people owning shares, there is no doubt that Deripaska continues to control the company.

Second, it must not be forgotten that Mr. Deripaska is wrapped up in Special Counsel Mueller's investigation and has deep ties to former Trump campaign chairman Paul Manafort. There should not be sanctions relief for President Putin's trusted agent before the conclusion of Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. Just days ago, it was revealed that former campaign chairman Paul Manafort provided Trump campaign polling data to a close associate of Mr. Deripaska's. We don't know what Special Counsel Mueller knows. And the timing—at a time when these things are coming forward, to undue the sanctions on Rusal is very suspect.

Lastly, removing sanctions on these companies will benefit President Putin's government and economy since the export of metals, such as aluminum, is a key revenue generator for a country that needs revenues. At a time when Russia has failed to curtail its hostile action against our Nation and our allies—this is not the moment to give up a source of leverage over the Russian Government.

Tomorrow, the Senate will take up a motion to disapprove the Treasury Department's proposal. I strongly believe the Senate should vote to disapprove. And in a short time, I will be sending a letter to every single one of my Senate colleagues—Democratic, Republican, Independent—to urge them to block this misguided effort by the Trump administration and keep those much needed sanctions in place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, it is interesting—we have entered the 24th day of the Trump shutdown. That means that for 24 days, hundreds of thousands of Federal workers have lived with the uncertainty of when they will get their next paycheck. Tens of thousands, probably hundreds of thousands, of private contractors know they will never be paid. For 24 days, nine Federal Departments and dozens of Agencies have been closed for business. They have withheld vital services from millions of Americans. I want to point out that the millions of Americans who are not receiving these services pay taxes to have these services. It has now become the longest government shutdown in history. Taxpayers have lost billions of dollars. The country has lost billions of dollars.

The United States should be considered the most powerful country in the world, but the rest of the world sees our government being held hostage to the whims of an undisciplined President who is proud of the shutdown and shows no concern for the chaos he is causing to all Americans, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Ask people at home what this means to them, no matter whether they are Republicans or Democrats, that the President seems not to care that the Food and Drug Administration has stopped inspecting seafood, fruits, and vegetables, and Americans are at the risk of eating tainted food and feeding their families tainted food. He seems not to care that the Environmental Protection Agency has stopped inspections of chemical factories, water treatment plants, and other industrial sites, leaving our country vulnerable to dangerous pollutants seeping into the air we breathe and the water we drink. Ask any parent how they might feel about their child going to school and drinking water that is tainted with chemicals solely because we closed down the Agency that is supposed to inspect those chemicals.

He seems not to care that over 800,000 dedicated Federal workers have gone without a paycheck this month. As a result, across this Nation, hundreds of thousands of families are wondering how to pay their bills and put food on the table. It doesn't make any difference whether they are Republicans or Democrats or Independents; they are hard-working Americans.

Just a few days ago, the President's own chief economic adviser went on national television and said furloughed workers were better off from this shutdown because they don't have to use up vacation days during this time they are being forced to take. Does he actually know what he said? Can you even believe such an arrogant, out-of-touch dismissal of hard-working Americans? The President's economic adviser is going to get paid and doesn't have to worry, but this cavalier way of treating hard-working, honest Americans is indefensible.

I hear from Vermonters every day about the impact the shutdown is having on their lives. None of these Vermonters—Republican and Democratic alike—are better off. Let me give you an example.

The other day, I heard from a single mother who works at the Department of Homeland Security in Vermont. She has been working without pay since December 22, when the Trump shutdown began, and it has taken a toll. Remember, this woman works for Homeland Security.

She writes:

> I love my job and country. I do have a child to feed and bills to pay. I have been working a second job to get some money coming in, but when you are working full time and you have a family to care for, there are only so many extra hours you can work, especially if you are not getting a paycheck for some of the work you are doing.

I heard from another mother. She is worried about her daughter. Her daughter works for the U.S. Institute of Peace. She has been furloughed. She just missed her first paycheck, and she is unable to pay her bills and her student loans. Her daughter dedicates her life to combating terrorism, and now she is not only unable to do her job, but she is getting into financial trouble. She is worried, and her mother is worried, as any mother would be, but she does not have the financial resources to help her daughter.

Then there is the story of Anthony Morselli, who is a TSA agent at the Burlington International Airport. I see him often as I fly back and forth. The local paper recently reported he was forced to start a GoFundMe page in order to raise money to help his family pay the bills during the shutdown. His wife is also a TSA agent. They are both working without pay during the shutdown—it is a double hit—and they have two children to support. He points out that almost everyone seems to understand except the President.

Mr. Morselli says:

> To see a zero balance in your bank account really hurts. Some of us live paycheck to paycheck. Today would be payday, and no money is coming in.

Another Vermonter called in who also works for the Department of Homeland Security in Vermont. He says he has a month's worth of money available in his savings account, and then he runs out of money entirely. He has a mortgage to pay, and the bills are piling up. He is scared. He works for the Department of Homeland Security. He says he wants to keep his job, but the shutdown is beyond reason. He says he certainly does not feel valued at all by the President and this White House. He points out that while the President says he wants border protection, he has been holding the pay from the people who protect our borders, including this Vermonter. I couldn't agree with him more.

Last week, the Senate and House passed a bill to ensure that all Federal workers will get backpay as soon as the shutdown is over. I was a cosponsor of that bill. I am glad to hear the President will sign it. It is the least he can do, considering the fact that he is the one who caused the mess. While this bill offers assurance to Federal employees that they will eventually get their paychecks, it does absolutely nothing to help them now. It does not help the people who call my office—the TSA agents, the DHS employees, or the State Department employees—because their bills are due now. This is not a case of, ''Oh, don't worry about it. Someday, you will get a check.'' The bills are due now, and the President has threatened that his Trump shutdown could last months or years. This is untenable.

The President says it is about border security. You could have fooled me. The examples I just talked about—and I could give so many more—all involve dedicated Federal employees who are working to keep this country safe. They are proud of the work they do to keep America safe and are proud of the service they perform for their country, but they are all caught in the crosshairs of the Trump shutdown. The Trump shutdown is not about border security; it is about fulfilling a cynical campaign rally chant the President made to spin up his base. He even gave his word that Mexico would pay for the wall, while knowing, even as he said it, that it would never happen.

Congress is a coequal branch of government. We are not in the business of throwing taxpayer dollars around to build monuments to the Presidential egos of the Presidents of any party. Everyone knows the $5.7 billion wall he wants to build is a waste of taxpayer money. Everybody knows it will not address the immigration challenges in this country.

The President has manufactured a sense of urgency on the southern border solely to generate support for his ridiculous wall. The President likes to spin up his base by talking about the invasion of illegal immigrants, but that is not the reality. Apprehensions at the southwest border have dropped 75 percent since 2000. More people are here in this country illegally because they have overstayed their visas, not because they have snuck across the border. Every Member of the Senate supports border security, but I would argue we need to invest in smart border security, not spend billions of taxpayers' dollars on a 30-foot wall that determined people will be able to go over, or through, or under.

The President is now asserting that Democrats are for open borders. That is nonsense. In fiscal year 2018, the Democrats supported $21.1 billion in direct appropriations for border security and immigration enforcement. That followed a similar amount in fiscal year 2017. This funding supports investments at our northern and southern borders to help stop the flow of dangerous drugs like opioids, fentanyl, and methamphetamines. It targets money where it is needed. It pays for 19,500 Border Patrol agents nationwide, including, roughly, 16,500 on our southern border. It pays for 23,500 Customs Officers at our ports of entry, including 6,815 who are assigned to the southwest border's ports of entry. In fact, with Democratic support, the number of agents and officers we have is at a record high, even though illegal border crossings are at the lowest level we have seen since 1971.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans came together and agreed upon $1.7 billion in targeted border security investments. This included over $1 billion to be used between the ports of entry for improved facilities, tactical communications equipment, additional air assets, integrated fixed towers, video surveillance systems, ground detection systems, tactical aerostats, and money for countering cross-border tunnel threats. This is from Republicans and Democrats working together. It included $580 million for security at our ports of entry by increasing funds for intelligence capabilities at the National Targeting Center, nonintrusive inspection equipment so as to detect illicit contraband, and opioid testing equipment. It also included another $615 million to help address the root causes of migration from Central America.

These are investments that Republicans and Democrats can all agree on. This is how you protect our borders. It is more complex, but it is more effective than building a 30-foot wall. A 30-foot wall would not begin to do what this does. The shutdown is not about border security. Let's just be honest. It is about the President's own ego. It has to end.

In a few minutes, we are going to be voting on another bill that is one the Republican leader keeps bringing up. It is S. 1. At a time when people are desperate and are out of work here in America, we are to bring up this bill which has nothing to do with funding the government or border security. Rather than voting on the appropriations bills that would put Americans back to work, S. 1 authorizes more than $800 million, in this year alone, for Israeli defense contractors as part of $38 billion for Israel over the next 10 years. It is money that will put Israelis to work. It will pay for them to go to work. That is fine, but couldn't we take time, first, to put Americans back to work?

It also includes the boycott, divestment, sanctions legislation. This is an open violation of our First Amendment. It would give up Federal authority over matters of foreign policy to our State and local governments. I might not like a particular boycott, but the right to boycott is fundamental. Just pick up any one of our books about the U.S. civil rights movement and wonder if Martin Luther King and others would have been successful if they had not been allowed to have boycotts. It is not up to the government to pick and choose which boycotts citizens should support or oppose.

We have bills that are supported by Republicans and Democrats alike that could reopen the government. That should be our focus. We could talk about creating jobs in Israel at another time. Let's create jobs in America. Let's reopen our government.

I call on my friends, the Republicans, to stand up to the President and put a stop to this madness. Otherwise, the shutdown will not be just the President's fault but the fault of the Republicans in the Senate.

I implore Senator MCCONNELL to bring up H.R. 21 and H.J. Res. 1 and send them to the President. Let Democrats and Republicans join together in voting for them. We could pass them with a veto-proof majority.

Congress is a coequal branch of government. We should not be intimidated

by any President of any party. We should start acting like a coequal branch of government. Frankly, we have 800,000 people in this country who will be paid for their work immediately if we start acting like we are supposed to—as a coequal branch of government. There are hundreds of thousands of others who need to work—contractors and all.

Let's stand up for Americans. We have the money for border security, but let's stand up for Americans. Let's put them to work. Let's let them get paid for what they are doing. These are our neighbors. These are people I see in the grocery store in Vermont when I am home on weekends. They are the people I see coming out of church on Sunday. These are the people I see when I am walking down the street to pick up my newspaper. These are good, hard-working people. Of the ones I have talked to, I have no idea whether they are Republicans or Democrats. All I know is that they want to do their work for this country. They support this country. They want to help this country be secure, but they can't understand why a temper tantrum at the White House will allow their paychecks to be stopped.

I yield the floor.

I don't see anybody seeking recognition.

So I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask for the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. 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. CARDIN. Madam President, this is day 23. For 23 days, we have had a partial shutdown of the Federal Government. It is now the longest shutdown in our history. That is not a proud record.

Government workers have now gone a pay period without getting their paychecks. Those who have been working have picked up their pay stubs, and their pay stubs show zero. Those who have been furloughed have not received a paycheck.

I think the American public would be outraged to think that we are asking our dedicated Federal workers—our frontline of public service—to work and not get paid. That is not what this country stands for.

It has an effect on their work. It is difficult to show up every day and do your work and mission for the public and be worried about how you are going to have money to make your monthly mortgage payment or to pay for your children's needs or to meet your medical needs or your family's food needs. These are real decisions that government workers must make. Many are falling in default.

The largest number of Federal workers live paycheck to paycheck. In other words, they can't make it without their income coming in. That is a fact of life for American workers. Yet the government is in a partial shutdown.

I ask why? What is the disagreement we have here that keeps us from opening the government? Why is the President holding the American people hostage to his agenda?

I say that because the House of Representatives has passed over to us a bill that would pass the appropriations for six appropriations bills, opening up most of those Agencies, all except for one that comes under Homeland Security. Those would be opened up. They are not in any disagreement. The appropriations specifics were agreed to by the Senate in four of those six bills, and the last two were passed out of the Appropriations Committee 31 to 0 and 30 to 1. Under Republican leadership, in a bipartisan manner, we have already approved these six appropriations bills. So why don't we act?

I asked the distinguished majority leader for us to consider that bill, and he objected. Quite frankly, I don't understand why, because if we bring it up for a vote, we will pass it by overwhelming numbers, and the government will open for those Agencies that are under those appropriations.

Then, my colleague Senator VAN HOLLEN asked unanimous consent that we bring up a continuing resolution for Homeland Security, which passed this body in late December by a unanimous vote, so we could have the government open and then we could negotiate the border security issue. We agree on border security for the country, but we disagree with wasting money for a wall that will not keep us safe.

In fact, those who had been involved in negotiating border security in the Senate have been arguing for spending more money for technology and personnel but not for a wall. That is what we should be doing.

Some people ask me: Well, can you negotiate a compromise?

It is hard to negotiate a compromise with the President while he is holding America hostage. It is hard to negotiate with the President when he undermines his own negotiators every time we get close to an agreement.

It makes no sense at all for the government to be shuttered while we debate these issues. The only ones we are hurting are our government workers, our constituents, and our economy.

Today, I met with government workers at BWI, or Baltimore/Washington International Airport. I met with people who represent the workers who are working for airline safety and for passenger safety on our flights. These are people who do safety inspections. These are people who work for TSA and who screen us as we get on the planes. These are air traffic controllers, who make sure that the air is safe. These are professionals who are showing up and working every day right now because that is their professional responsibility—to keep us safe.

They acknowledge that they are distracted. They are distracted because they don't know how they are going to pay their bills. They are distracted because they don't know when they are going to get a paycheck for working. They are distracted because they don't know whether they have to find other employment in order to pay their bills.

They don't have the full complement in because there are some who are out on furlough. Some safety inspectors aren't there. How do they carry out their mission unless we have the full team in place?

Of the 800,000 Federal workers, approximately half are furloughed without pay. That means the critical mission on behalf of the American public is not being done—whether it is food safety, whether it is approving a loan so that a person can buy a home, or whether it is a small business owner who needs help from the Small Business Administration and can't get that help, can't close on a loan, can't do what they need to do, and can't run their business. So it is not only 800,000 workers who are not working or working without pay. It is also those businesses that depend upon it.

When you look at the small businesses around Federal facilities, with so many of the workers not being there and others not having money to pay—they are not using those services—these businesses are losing customers and are laying off people.

It is not hypothetical. We know of specific companies that have shuttered as a result of the Federal Government shutdown. We know of nonprofits that had to lay off workers because their contracts with government Agencies expired.

Today, at BWI, or Baltimore/Washington International Airport, I heard directly from these individuals. Each one had a story to tell about how they are really fighting to make sure that airline safety issues are maintained and about the challenges they are facing, et cetera. They told pretty direct stories.

There was an AFGE worker there who told me of the situation where he had to try to explain to his young daughter why he could not pay the fee so she could continue in a dance class. He didn't have the money. It broke his heart. These are affecting real people.

Last Friday, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN, we met with a group of Federal Government workers. We had a chance to talk to them. They are from different Agencies. One was in the Justice Department. He is an excepted employee. So he is there doing his work, trying to keep us safe, but he said the necessary investigative work that should have been done so that he could get his job done to keep us safe was not done because the person who would be doing the investigative work was on furlough as a result of the government shutdown. Why should the Justice Department be shut down? Why? They are not part of the border security debate, and yet they are.

We had another of our government workers show up and say that they could not settle on a home. They have a contract to settle on a new home. They are starting a family. The reason they can't settle is that they are required to bring in their two most recent pay stubs showing that their income is what they say it is. The problem is their most recent pay stubs—and they have them—show zero as income. They no longer qualify for their mortgage.

These are real-life people—800,000 of them. Yet this shutdown continues. It is dangerous. It is irresponsible. It is wrong.

We have the votes in this Chamber to change it tonight. I hope that Leader MCCONNELL will bring up the two votes that passed the House of Representatives. We have already acted on those bills in the previous Congress. Let us open the government. It makes no sense whatsoever. The Congress is a coequal branch of government.

We know that what the President is doing is wrong. Each of us knows that in our hearts. We know he has shut down government for no legitimate reason. We can debate the issues with the government open and prevent the loss to individual families and to our economy. We are a coequal branch of government, and we should act. Let us vote on opening government.

Quite frankly, I hope we will have the votes that would show the President we would override any veto he may impose. That is our responsibility as a coequal, independent branch of government. Let us exercise our responsibilities, and let us take action tonight. This shutdown needs to end. It needs to end now.

I urge my colleagues to bring up this legislation. Let's pass it, and let's show that we can exercise our responsibility. We recognize the President is wrong. We have a responsibility to do what is right, and this is what we have done in the past.

I see my colleague from Maryland is on the floor. The two of us have been pretty active over the weekend, talking with Federal workers. I want to explain to the people of Maryland that we are going to do everything in our power to open up government. We are prepared to take all steps necessary to get government open. We know that people are hurting. We know that people are worried. This is irresponsible. It is costly, and it needs to end.

I hope President Trump will end this. If he doesn't, we, as a coequal branch of government, should take the necessary actions to open the government.

I urge the Republican leader to bring these bills to the floor. We are for border security. We are not for wasting money on a wall. We are for negotiating. Let Congress determine where money should be spent, not the President. Let us all work together for the safety of our Nation and for the protection of our workforce.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, first, I thank my colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, for his steadfast efforts to bring this shameful shutdown to an end. He and I have met with Federal employees all over the State of Maryland to bring their stories here to the floor of the Senate.

While they are under incredible hardship and incredible duress, the first thing they tell us at every meeting is that they want to get back to work for the American people, to do their job for the American people. These are civil servants; these are public servants; and they want to get back to helping the country.

To my friend and partner and colleague, Senator CARDIN, I thank him for all of his efforts in this shameful episode of our history.

President Trump often falsely boasts that he has accomplished what no other President in American history has been able to do. This time, he has succeeded. This time, he has succeeded in closing down the Federal Government for a longer period than any other President in United States history—24 days and counting.

President Trump said just a few weeks ago that he would be proud—proud to shut down the government if he didn't get his way. But President Trump should know that reaching this historic milestone is nothing to be proud of. It is unnecessary, and it is shameful. Every day that goes by, we see mounting harm around the country both in terms of members of the public who are denied important services and denied important health protections and, of course, Federal employees and Federal contractors who are either going without pay—all of the Federal employees who are going without pay, and Federal contractors have been laid off in many cases.

Every day that this shameful shutdown goes on, our colleagues on the Republican side and the Republican leader have to own up to their share of the responsibility. Every day that goes on where we do not have a chance to vote on the two House bills that are on the Senate calendar, which we could take up this afternoon—every day that we do not vote on those bills, which have had bipartisan support here in the U.S. Senate, the Senate is an accomplice in the shutdown, and those who prevent us from turning the keys to reopen the government are complicit in the harm that is increasing every day around the country.

On Friday, 800,000 Federal employees began to get pay stubs that showed zero pay. I have one in my hand from somebody who is an air traffic controller. If you look at the area that says net pay, it has a big goose egg—zero. Among these 800,000 Federal employees, of course, are hundreds of thousands of people—like the folks at TSA, like the folks along the border—who are working every day, but in the mail or in their electronic pay stub they get zero for their pay.

Of course, there are hundreds of thousands more who are being furloughed, who want to get out and do their work for the American people, and they are being locked out of their jobs.

I have been talking with many of my constituents over the last several weeks, and I have shared many of their stories here on the floor of the Senate. They talk passionately and personally about how they want to get back to work and also about how they worry about their ability to provide for their families.

I met with Edward last week. He works at the Census Bureau. He is the only person in his family to have gone to college. He is very proud to be a civil servant and wants to do his job. He owns a home, and his mortgage payments are coming due every month, like those of millions of Americans. While those mortgage payments are coming in, his paycheck is not. He told me he is very worried that he will soon miss a payment.

It is important to understand that the harm from this shutdown is not just felt in the Washington metropolitan area. Of course, Americans around the country are losing access to services, and it is a fact that 80 percent of the people who work for the Federal Government live outside the Washington metropolitan area. TSA officials at airports throughout the country are just one example.

It is also important to recognize that about 30 percent of the Federal workforce are people who previously served our country in uniform. They were in the military. That means that as a result of this shutdown, 250,000 Americans—in fact, a little more than that—who served our country in the military are also suffering and going without pay.

One of those veterans is somebody I spoke to last week, an Air Force veteran who works at the Office of Personnel Management. He told me he was worried that he wasn't going to be able to pay his electric bill on time. He told me he had contacted the electric company and said: Look, I am not going to be able to pay you this month because I am not going to get a check. Can you just hold off? Can you defer my bill?

They told him: Sorry, that really isn't our responsibility.

It really is our responsibility here in the U.S. Senate—and, of course, the President of the United States, who said that he was proud to shut down the government. I would like the President to visit Maryland and look at that Air Force vet who now works as a civil servant and tell that Air Force vet that he is proud to be shutting down the government.

There are other veterans around the country. As I said, the harm from this is not confined to the Washington metropolitan area. Toby Hauck served our country in the Air Force and continues

to serve as an air traffic controller in Illinois. His son and daughter-in-law are about to deploy overseas, and Toby and his wife are going to care for their 2½-year-old daughter—their granddaughter—during this deployment. Toby says that the continued lack of pay adds stress to their already hectic jobs. This is something I have heard from other veterans, air traffic controllers, and others going without pay throughout the State of Maryland.

In fact, we know from a lot of the Federal employees who work in law enforcement that the impact on their jobs is hurting our national security. Just reading from an article in the Washington Post, ''Shutdown threatens national security, FBI agents group warns,'' it goes on to say: ''A group representing FBI agents warned Thursday that the partial government shutdown is threatening national security as thousands of federal law enforcement professionals, working without pay, grow anxious that personal financial hardships may jeopardize their security clearances and as furloughs of their support staffs slow investigations.''

I spoke to a Federal law enforcement officer just last week. He made exactly the point made by others in this article, which is that his entire support team has been furloughed. These are the folks who track down DNA analysis; these are the people who do the investigations. When they are furloughed and when they are not on the job, it puts their colleagues who are on the job—in the FBI or other Federal law enforcement missions—at greater risk, and it puts the public at risk to the extent that those FBI agents are not able to fully do their job.

The harm is spreading. We know that a lot of Federal contractors, including a lot of small business folks who do work with the Federal Government, have had to lay off people. I know that because, in my State of Maryland, a small outfit that contracts with the Federal Government to help seniors find work just had to lay off 173 employees last week. Senior Service America is the name of the organization. They do great work, but they just had to send pink slips to 173 people saying: At least for now, you are out of work, and you are out of a paycheck.

Again, this is something we are seeing and witnessing around the country. A business in Denver, CO—Sky Blue Builders—had to stop work on several Federal contractor jobs for Federal construction projects they were doing. The GSA—General Services Administration—put their projects on hold, and a 50-person company had to lay off 8 carpenters and a superintendent because of the shutdown. They will need to lay off more in the days ahead if the shutdown continues.

Every day that goes on, we see a mushrooming effect in terms of the damage and harm being done throughout the country. A lot of the folks who work for these small business Federal Government contractors are already getting low-wage paychecks; now, they are out of income altogether.

One of those workers is Lila Johnson. She is a janitor at the Department of Agriculture. She works for a company, and that company contracts with the Department of Agriculture to provide janitorial services.

Lila is 71 years old. She has bills coming due for her rent, her credit card, and her car. Here is how she has described the impact of the shutdown:

> I don't have enough from my retirement and my Social Security to make ends meet. Everything is piling up on me, and I don't know how I'm going to have the money to pay these bills.

I don't know how many of my colleagues saw President Trump the other day. He sort of waved off reporters when they asked him a question about the harm being done as a result of the shutdown. The President said he can relate to these people who are just one paycheck away from not being able to make a mortgage or not being able to make a medical copayment. He said:

> I can relate. I'm sure the people that are on the receiving end will make adjustments. They always do.

Give me a break. The President clearly doesn't realize that 40 percent of our fellow Americans cannot pull together even $400 for an emergency. They do live paycheck to paycheck.

When you have grown up with a background of privilege, as the President has, you really have not experienced that kind of hardship. Between Trump Tower, the White House, and Mar-a-Lago, it is pretty clear the President doesn't have a clue about what our fellow Americans are experiencing in this shutdown.

Because all of these Federal employees are unable to do their jobs—in many cases, for the country—and because the small business contractors are not able to do theirs, every day you are seeing the growing, harmful impact of the shutdown in terms of denial of important services and protections for the American people.

We know now the FDA is no longer conducting their routine food safety inspections. We know the EPA has halted inspections of major polluters, including chemical factories. We know 1,000 affordable housing contracts have expired because of the shutdown, which can delay critical repairs and place families at risk of eviction. We have seen trash and waste piling up at our national parks.

Despite the efforts of the administration to hide a lot of these impacts, the result has been a disaster. At Joshua Tree National Park, we saw motorists cut down several of the iconic Joshua trees so they could drive in areas of the park where vehicles are banned, and vandals have sprayed graffiti in the park. That is just one example among many.

Why is this happening? It is because the President says, if he doesn't get his way entirely, he is going to be ''proud''—that is his word, not mine—to shut down the government.

I can tell you what it is not about. It is not about the need for strong border security. We need secure borders. I think Senators on both sides of the aisle know that over the years, we have worked on a bipartisan basis to do that. We certainly can continue to work on a bipartisan basis to do it going forward.

I know Senators on both sides of the aisle recognize that wasting taxpayer dollars on a 2,000-mile-long wall is not the answer. For goodness' sake, the President's own Acting Chief of Staff—a former colleague of mine in the House of Representatives—Mick Mulvaney said a couple of years ago that it was childlike to believe that building that 2,000-mile wall was going to actually provide the kind of security we need.

We need a multilayered approach. Yes, there are areas along the border where we need barriers, fences, walls. Call them what you want. They are already there. They were there before President Trump was ever elected President.

What was the President's budget request this year for this part of the Homeland Security budget? What was his request in the official document he sent for this fiscal year? He asked for $1.6 billion. That is what the Senate Appropriations Committee voted for on a bipartisan basis, $1.6 billion.

It was only in December, when all of a sudden you have the rightwing talk show hosts going 24/7, spinning the President up, that all of a sudden, oh, boy, I guess I didn't really mean what I asked for; I need something else.

Then, to justify the $5.7 billion, he did this national address the other night. What was the very first example he gave for why we needed this border wall? The very first example he gave was to interdict and stop the flow of drugs across the southern border. That was the first item he mentioned in the speech. He focused on it. By focusing on that, he demonstrated the argument against spending all this money on a 2,000-mile border wall.

As everybody knows, including his Department of Homeland Security, to the extent we have drugs coming across the southern border—and this is a big issue—they are actually coming through the legal points of entry, so building a wall on all sides of the legal points of entry will not do a thing. We all know that on a bipartisan basis, we have looked for new technologies and new investments to better detect drugs that are flowing through those legal ports of entry.

My goodness, we can certainly talk about further steps that can be taken, but the leadoff point in the President's speech showed his ignorance about the overall issue on how we need effective border security.

We should not be spending what will ultimately be $30 billion on a 2,000-mile wall the President said Mexico was

going to pay for. Make no mistake. We are talking about $30 billion because the President may ask for one amount this year. It started at $1.6 billion. That was his official request. Then, in December, it was $5.7 billion. Now he is going to threaten to shut down the government every year if he doesn't get his $30 billion, which Mexico was going to pay for.

I know he is doing all sorts of dances, saying that is not quite what I meant, but that is what he told the country.

Since we are talking about border security, let's talk about some of the men and women who, right now, today, as we gather here, are defending that border, providing border protection. I will tell you what, the folks at Customs and Border Protection have had enough. The Customs and Border Protection officers are suing the United States. They are suing the President because of this shutdown and demanding that they get paid for the work they are doing.

I know the President likes to talk about the good work a lot of those men and women do at Customs and Border Protection, and they do, do good work. They are now suing the President of the United States and the U.S. Government because they are out there providing border security, and they are now getting big goose eggs, big zeros for net pay for the work they are doing.

I know Members of this body are not ''proud'' of this shutdown, as the President of the United States is. He said he was proud. He hasn't said otherwise, although he started pointing fingers now at everybody else. He said he was going to take responsibility; that he would be proud to if he didn't get his way.

Every day that goes by in this Senate that we don't take action, which is within our power to take, this Senate becomes an accomplice in President Trump's government shutdown. That is why, together with my colleagues, we are going to continue to press the Senate and the Senate Republican leader to take up the two House bills that are on the Senate calendar, which are the keys to reopening the government.

The House of Representatives, on their very first day of the new Congress, said their priority is reopening the government, and they did. They passed those two bills.

I have had them on the floor before. I am going to show them again because they are still on the calendar. They haven't disappeared. They are still right there. One is H.J. Res. 1. It is a very simple bill. It is a bill that would reopen the Department of Homeland Security through February 8. It is identical, with respect to the Department of Homeland Security, as to what this Senate did by a voice vote before Christmas—identical. It says: Let's reopen the Department of Homeland Security at current funding levels while we discuss the best and most effective way to provide border security.

That bill was on the Senate calendar. Last week, standing right here, I asked for unanimous consent to take it up and vote on it right away. The Senate Republican leader denied that request.

Just last week, standing right over there, Senator CARDIN brought up the other bill that is on the Senate calendar that was passed by the House to reopen eight of the nine Departments of the U.S. Government that are closed and have nothing to do with Homeland Security or the wall—nothing to do with it. That bill is right here, H.R. 21. Senator CARDIN asked for the Senate to vote on it. Again, it was blocked by the Republican leader on behalf of the caucus.

As many of us have discussed, the great irony is, these are pieces of legislation that have bipartisan support in the U.S. Senate.

As I said, the bill to reopen the Department of Homeland Security through February 8 while we work on the best and most effective way to provide border security is something we passed by voice vote. Republican colleagues thought it was a good idea about 5 weeks ago. I don't know why it is not a good idea to do the same thing today.

The other bill, which contains the funding levels through the remainder of this fiscal year for the other eight of the nine Federal Departments that are currently closed, also had broad bipartisan support. One of the parts of that bill dealing with the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department, the Interior Department, the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development passed this Senate by a vote of 92 to 6.

The House of Representatives said: Do you know what? We like the funding levels the House put together, but let's send the Senate a bill that was already supported by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the U.S. Senate, 92 to 6.

This bill, H.R. 21, contains those Senate funding levels voted on 92 to 6 to reopen all those Departments. This bill also includes measures that were overwhelmingly passed in the Senate Appropriations Committee. One measure was adopted in the Senate Appropriations Committee by a vote of 31 to 0—Republicans and Democrats voting for it. That is in the bill the House sent over.

The other bills relating to the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice passed the Senate Appropriations Committee vote 30 to 1. In this package the House sent us, you have bills that passed the Senate Appropriations Committee by 30 to 0, 30 to 1, and the floor of the U.S. Senate by a vote of 92 to 6.

It is a very simple question: Why is it that the Republican leader refuses to allow this body to vote on measures that have already had overwhelming support in this body and would reopen the government today?

The answer we get is, well, you know what, the President of the United States says he will not support it.

Do you know what? We are an independent branch of government. We are a coequal branch of government, although these days I begin to wonder if we relegated ourselves to the very bottom of the totem pole here.

There is no excuse not to vote. Ninety-two to six? That is a veto-proof majority. Let the President veto it. It has to come back here? Ninety-two to six. I will tell you, the fact the others passed 30 to 0 and 30 to 1 in the Senate Appropriations Committee—that is a pretty good indicator of their strong, bipartisan support. So let's not go hide out. Let's not go hide out. Let's do our job in the Senate, and if the President wants to veto it, let him do it. That is how the system works. But nobody here should be hiding from accountability to their constituents because the Republican leader refuses to hold a vote today on what the Senate supported overwhelmingly in weeks past.

I do want to thank my colleagues for a measure that we passed last week, passed it on Thursday or Friday. The Senate passed a provision that was introduced by Senator CARDIN and me and many other Senators and that had some bipartisan support and cosponsorship and strong bipartisanship here on the floor. We said that Federal employees should not, at the end of the day, be the ones who have to bear the entire burden of this shutdown they had nothing to do with. So we passed legislation to make sure that when this shutdown is over, Federal employees will be made whole in terms of their pay. That then passed the House, and it is on the way to the President. It was on the way to the President before the weekend. The Republican Senate leader said that the President said he was going to sign it. Of course, that is what the President said about the bill that passed the U.S. Senate before Christmas to provide stopgap funding, so we will see. I hope that is the case because Federal employees, at the end of the day, should not be the ones who are penalized and never made whole.

But it doesn't address the problem before us right now, which is that while those Federal employees—hundreds of thousands of them—are not working, they are not there to provide important services for the American people, and the harm done from the denial of those services is growing every day. And of course it doesn't help those hundreds of thousands of Federal employees—in fact, 800,000 Federal employees—who are not getting paid now but have their bills coming through the door every day. That creates great harm because when they can't pay the bills, their creditors come after them. Even though, whenever this shutdown ends, whenever it may be, they may get back pay, it is going to be very hard for them to get back their credit rating. It is going to be very hard to undo the damage that is being done to them by their inability to pay their bills because of our inability to vote on two House measures that the Senate

has already supported on a bipartisan basis. So it doesn't solve that very, very real problem, which is growing every day.

I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are hearing more and more from their constituents—hearing from their Federal employees who are going without pay, hearing from small business contractors who have had their contracts cut and are at risk of going belly-up, from those small contract employees who live paycheck to paycheck—and from the American people who are being denied services on a growing basis.

So let's open the government. Let's vote on these two bills that would accomplish that. We could do it tonight. Do it right now, as soon as the Republican leader comes in.

I can assure you that my colleagues and I will continue to ask consent to bring up those bills. We are going to continue to move to bring up those bills because they are the one thing before the Senate right now that we could vote on that would at least demonstrate that we in the Senate are doing our job. It is the President's job to decide whether he thinks it is a good idea, and if he thinks it is a bad idea, he can veto it, and then it comes back to us.

Let's do our job here. Let's not contract to the President of the United States our constitutional responsibilities. That is not how it is supposed to work. And we need to do our job. Let's end the shutdown. Let's reopen the government. We can have a conversation on the most effective way to provide border security, but for goodness' sake, let's release the hostages here. Let's release eight of the nine Federal Departments that have nothing to do with homeland security or the wall. Let's release the 800,000 Federal employees who are not getting paid. Let's release all of the small businesses that do contract work for the Federal Government, many of which are at risk of going belly-up. Let's release the Federal contract employees who are now being told not to come to work because the contract is not in effect during the shutdown. Let's release all those hostages who have nothing to do with the political dispute here.

Nobody should be proud of this shutdown, and so I say to the President of the United States: Let's not take pride in being the President of the United States who is now overseeing the longest shutdown in American history. That is not a first that any President should be proud of, and it is not something this Senate should be complicit in.

Let's reopen the government. Let's vote on the House bills.

I yield my time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

Todd Young, Mike Rounds, Richard C. Shelby, James E. Risch, Mike Lee, Josh Hawley, John Boozman, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Cory Gardner, Roy Blunt, Steve Daines, Marco Rubio, Rob Portman, John Barrasso, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 3 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Ernst	McSally
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blackburn	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Roberts
Capito	Hoeven	Romney
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Cornyn	Johnson	Sasse
Cotton	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Sinema
Enzi	Manchin	
Sullivan	Tillis	Wicker
Thune	Toomey	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Heinrich	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Brown	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Markey	Tester
Carper	McConnell	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	
Hassan	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—7

Burr	Durbin	Perdue
Crapo	Isakson	
Duckworth	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 43.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to urge my Republican colleagues to do the right thing and stand with us to reopen the government and end this completely unnecessary and, really, absurd crisis.

President Trump's latest government shutdown is now the longest one in American history—24 days of workers unsure of when their next paychecks will come, 24 days of economic impacts in communities all over this country, 24 days of slowdowns at our airports, 24 days of small business owners waiting on loans. Twenty-four days of trash piling up and irreparable damage being done at our national parks. Twenty-four days of dysfunction. Twenty-four days of chaos. Twenty-four days of the government simply not working at its most basic duties, not being allowed to work by its own leaders.

There have been 24 days of story after story here in the United States of America that would embarrass citizens of far less developed nations.

One woman from Seattle—she is a Federal employee and has been there 25 years—wrote that the stress of not knowing how she will manage her bills is causing her sleepless nights—nights she is worried about her credit score taking a hit if she can't pay her bills on time. She is trying to balance all of that while helping take care of her father, who is a Navy veteran suffering from a progressive neurological disease.

Another man wrote to me. He is not a Federal employee, but he and his wife own a small business frequented by people who are. He told me that the

shutdown has brought his business to a halt and that he is not sure how much longer he can make it work.

A U.S. Forest Service worker wrote to me saying that he is pretty sure he can weather the shutdown financially, but he is very scared for his coworkers who cannot, and he is worried about the deeper damage now being done to his restoration work that is supposed to be happening in the Olympic National Forest.

I know every one of my colleagues is getting letters like these, hundreds of thousands of them. They need to read some of those letters. I would challenge them and anyone who doubts the sincerity and fears so many Americans are feeling right now to sit down and hear from their constituents who are being impacted—face to face.

This past weekend, when it became clear the Senate would not get a chance to vote on reopening the government, I flew home to Washington State. I walked through security lines on my way out and thanked the men and women of TSA who are working to protect us, not knowing when they are going to get paid. When I got to the airport in Seattle, I sat down with people who had tears in their eyes, who were describing their fear over the uncertainty this Trump shutdown has caused. I talked to an air traffic controller who worked overtime during the busy holiday season and who worries about the added stress and distractions on top of an already very tough job. I heard from a Coast Guard spouse who talked about friends in a similar situation returning Christmas presents to pay bills. Story after story—workers with their families, small business owners, and many more. This is about individuals and their stories, but it is also rippling across communities.

(Mr. SULLIVAN assumed the Chair.)

This is about individuals and their stories, but it is also rippling across communities.

Right now in my home State of Washington, paychecks are frozen for nearly 13,000 workers. They are workers who are not going out and spending money at local businesses the way they usually do. They are at risk of missing their rent payment or their mortgage payment or their car payment or their phone bill or their credit card bill. They may know they will get their pay back eventually when this shutdown finally ends, but that is not going to cover late fees or interest fees, and it will not compensate them for the emotional anguish and deep uncertainty. And that is just those 13,000 workers and their families. Millions of people in my home State, like every State, are affected by work that is not happening or at risk of being cut off, such as routine inspections on Washington State ferries, an accident investigation report concerning a deadly train accident, decisionmaking on the ongoing Hanford nuclear site cleanup process, applications for Federal financial student aid, Federal food safety inspections, emergency food supplies for hungry families, and assistance for domestic violence survivors and crime victims.

The government can't even pay its bills. Just this morning, I saw the headline ''Layoffs hit two space companies.'' One of those is in my home State. Tethers Unlimited said it is going to lay off 20 percent of its employees because it hasn't been paid for its government work during this shutdown. This is absurd. This is no way for a country like ours to run. It is shameful. Once again, this has to end.

Those whom I just talked about are just a few of the stories. Those are just a few of the impacts. There are so many more—big ones, small ones, narrow ones, broad ones, from individual workers and their families who are being impacted in unique and specific ways, to entire industries and regions that are being harmed.

This is not a theoretical issue. It is not just a debate here in DC. This is very real for millions and millions of people, and that number grows with every passing day. I and other Democrats are going to keep making sure these stories aren't forgotten or pushed aside. We are glad to be joined by a growing number of Republicans who are also hearing from their constituents and who know this shutdown simply cannot be justified and cannot be explained. We are going to keep up this pressure. We are not going to stop until President Trump agrees to end this crisis or until Republican leaders in the Senate finally decide to stand up to him and work with us to end it for him.

Let me close with this final point: Although no shutdown is good, this one is particularly obscene and particularly unnecessary. Democrats and Republicans right here in this Senate voted unanimously just a few weeks ago to keep the government open without any funding for President Trump's wall, and the House voted to do the same. Whatever one thinks about using American taxpayer dollars to pay for President Trump's wall—a wall, I would remind us, he promised Mexico would pay for—there is absolutely no reason to keep this government shut down while we have that debate. All that does is hurt people and hurt communities and hurt our country for absolutely no reason at all.

President Trump and some of his Republican allies may see this as a political fight they somehow need to win, but I see this as a fight for the people we represent, for a government that functions, and for a country that we all know can do better than this.

This is about whether we send the alarming message that President Trump can make outlandish demands, throw a tantrum, not care how much instability he causes or how many people he hurts, and get away with it, or whether instead we make clear here in this Senate that his bad behavior will not be rewarded. Tantrums and dysfunctional governing are not the path to success.

I call on Republican leaders to allow a vote on the bill the House passed, allow a vote to reopen the government. That bill would pass overwhelmingly, just as it did last month.

Let's send a message to President Trump that the people who sent us here want this dysfunction to end. Let's end this Trump shutdown, and let's then get back to work to fix the problems it created. Let's get our country back on track.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to follow my colleague from Washington and talk about the effects of the shutdown. If I am really fast on a given day, I kind of have a mind-meld with her. I kind of have a little bit of a mind-meld now because I want to talk about the effects on America's national security.

I was on the floor last week talking about the effects on Federal employees, so many of whom live in Virginia. I had a roundtable on Friday in Alexandria, where they came out and talked about having to reschedule medical appointments, worrying about missing their mortgage payments, and withdrawing monies from their IRA and having to pay a penalty to do it to cover their bills. These Federal employees all share how passionate they are about serving the public. That is all they want to do. They shared the hardships that are visited upon them and their families by not getting a paycheck.

I heard another, different story today that is not about a Federal employee but a dentist in Alexandria who shared with our office how many of her patients are canceling their appointments. People don't have copays—people are worried about whether they will have copays, so they are canceling and postponing. So now it is not just the Federal employees, but it is also this small business woman who runs a medical practice who is seeing the effect of it.

I want to talk about something different tonight. I want to talk about national security. I want to do that because the President tweeted something interesting on Saturday. He said his whole motive for the shutdown was because ''I promised safety and security for the American people.'' That was the quote—''I promised safety and security for the American people.'' I want to take the floor to say that this shutdown is actually hurting the safety and security of the American people, and I want to go over this in some detail.

Of the 450,000 Federal employees who are working without pay, more than 150,000 of them are in charge of keeping America safe. So, arguably, the most punished group of Federal employees in this shutdown are those charged with keeping us safe.

I say to the Presiding Officer, you are a veteran. You served in the military.

A third of Federal employees are veterans. So it is not just people whose current job is keeping America safe, but one-third of Federal employees are veterans. Veterans are very affected by this.

Just to kind of run through some examples, of the 450,000 Americans working without pay—and we had representation from a number of these Agencies before us at the roundtable last week—41,000 of those working without pay now deep into the third week are Federal law enforcement and correctional officers, 2,600 are ATF agents, nearly 17,000 are Bureau of Prisons correctional officers, more than 13,000 are FBI agents, 3,600 are marshals, and 4,400 are DEA agents.

I had an experience last year that was very vivid to me. I visited a Federal prison in Petersburg, VA, and I had a chance to really eyeball the challenges our prison guards deal with. The staffing ratios are such that one guard—especially on an evening shift—is responsible for a wing of the prison where there may be 100 to 150 inmates. It is a very tough situation from a security standpoint because if there were to be a problem in one of the rooms and if a guard went into the room and there were 25 people in the room—and that was not uncommon—while tending to a problem, others could overpower that one guard. And on the entire wing, there is just one.

This is a very, very difficult job, and the notion that these correctional officers are now deep into week 3 and that they are not being paid is just shocking. I have a letter sitting on my desk from Federal prison guards at a Federal prison facility in southwest Virginia imploring us to reopen the government because their job is so difficult that it just compounds when they are not being paid.

When the President gave his speech last week, he talked a lot about how the challenges at the border are largely challenges with drugs and the interdiction of drugs.

If that is your worry, Mr. President, why would you not be paying ATF, DEA, U.S. Marshals, and FBI agents? If that is your worry—the safety and security of the American people—why are these people the ones you want to punish? You make us less safe by doing so.

All of these people are hard-working public safety professionals, but they are human. When they are on the job, they are focused on keeping us safe, but they are human. There are going to be issues rattling around in their brains, just like all of us have issues rattling around in our brains during the day. Do you really want our DEA agents, the AFT, and the U.S. Marshals having about 10 percent of their mind mad that they are not getting paid and the other 20 percent of their mind worried about making the mortgage payment or rescheduling the kids' orthodontist appointment? It would be unrealistic to expect these people to wall that off completely even when they are at work. Why are we subjecting them to this, which makes us less safe?

Fourteen thousand of those who are working without pay are air traffic controllers. Many of them are not just working, but because of other job shortages in the profession, they are working tremendous amounts of overtime.

If you were to ask me ''Who would be a public safety professional you would most like not to be mad, most like not to be distracted, most like not to be diverted and thinking about something else?'' it would have to be an air traffic controller.

The last thing I would want is for somebody who flies a lot—and so many Americans do—to think that their air traffic controllers are sitting in the tower—last Friday, I came back, and I tendered about 100 pay stubs from air traffic controllers, most of which had zeroes on them. They had just gotten these pay stubs. One was for one penny, and one was for $41.75. You get that in the mail as a hard-working professional. You are in the tower trying to do your job, and that is going to be working on you, thinking about what that means for the tuition check that gets written in the middle of January for your kid who is going to school for the spring semester, or the Visa bill that is the biggest one in the year because Christmas purchases are on it, or the heating bill that is the biggest one of the year because this is the coldest time of the year. I don't want air traffic controllers' minds filled with anxiety and anger because they got a pay stub that said ''one penny'' on it.

Eighty-eight percent of DHS security employees are furloughed. That is 54,000 Customs and Border Protection agents, 42,000 Coast Guard employees who interdict drugs, DHS's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency. If the issue is security at the border, what possibly would be the reason why we wouldn't take up the bill that is at the Senate desk to fund that function at least through February 8 so we could find a legitimate compromise on border security and immigration reform? If the President is really worried, as he said, about the safety and security of the American people, why would you punish the very people who are at the frontlines providing that safety and security on our border?

The FDA is having to recall furloughed employees to ensure public health because of the prolonged state of the shutdown in its third week. It has forced the FDA to suspend a large portion of food safety inspections. Again, with flus and viruses and all kinds of challenges and recalls of lettuce or recalls of other unhealthy foods, this is an important part of keeping America safe and secure. What possibly can be gained first from furloughing and sending them home or then bringing them back and not paying them?

The Transportation Security Administration. There was news about this today: Because of the pain of having to work without pay, there has been a spike in people calling in ill. That is leading to longer lines at Dulles, longer lines at Hartsfield in Atlanta, and longer lines at the Miami International Airport, and that is likely to continue. We all know the hassle of any line at the TSA. We don't like it, but we also want the TSA to do their job and stop people from getting on the planes if they have weapons or some other issue.

There was a story about somebody being able to get through a TSA line carrying a weapon that could be attributed to the staffing shortages and the challenges we are putting them under. Again, if this President wants to care about the safety and security of American personnel, why punish TSA agents?

Today, there was an announcement that TSA will reallocate screening officers on a national basis to meet staffing shortages that cannot be addressed locally. So now not only will Federal workers be unpaid—not only will they be unpaid—but they will be forced to relocate to do work to cover staffing shortages elsewhere.

My colleague from Virginia is here, and I want to cede the time to him, but the Presiding Officer understands the point I make. The first job of any of us in public life, at whatever level, is to protect the safety and security of the American people. There is absolutely no reason, if that is our goal, to take so many dedicated public safety professionals and mess up their lives so badly by not paying them and putting them in a situation where they have to call in sick and they have to worry about medical appointments for their kids. That is not conducive to American security and safety. We should reopen government and get these folks back to work.

Now that the Senate has passed the backpay bill, I would also point out, we will pay these people. Wouldn't we rather pay them to serve citizens rather than pay them and lock them out? We do not allow Federal workers to strike, but there should be an equivalent. We should not lock them out. We are now locking them out, even though we will still strike a backpay check to them. Wouldn't we rather they be providing safety and security services to their fellow citizens?

With that, I appreciate the opportunity to address the issue, and I yield the floor to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me pick up where my friend the Senator from Virginia left off.

We are now in the history books: the longest shutdown in American history on this President's watch—a President who, a few weeks back, said he would be proud to own this government shutdown; a President who, in the lead-up, said: Gosh, don't those Democrats know that most of the folks who aren't going to get paid are Democrats—

which was, frankly, one of the most insulting comments any elected official in my lifetime has ever made.

I wish the President or somebody from his White House had been with Senator KAINE and I when we sat down with Federal workers from Virginia last Friday. Senator KAINE may have already mentioned a couple of these stories. I am going to briefly recap a couple of them.

A number of Federal employees who came and sat with us said they were in Federal service because they thought it was national service, many of them former veterans who felt they had an obligation to continue to serve our Nation, to protect it.

One lady, who worked at a small Agency that investigates chemical spills—and there had been a chemical spill in Houston the week before—felt her job was to get out and investigate.

A young man who served in the military now was supposed to be approving the safety of helicopters that are supposed to be deployed to Iraq. This guy is not able to do his job. Who is going to watch out for the safety of those helicopters? What about the needs for those helicopters that may be for troops in harm's way?

There is the story of one worker who said she had a little bit and could get through with her savings, but she went into her IRA to draw down that money. As Senator KAINE mentioned, she will get repaid, but even if she gets repaid, she will not get repaid the tax penalty for an early withdrawal from her IRA.

Another employee was able to get a couple thousand dollar advance on a credit card, but even when he is repaid in terms of backpay, that will not make up for the fees and interest that is charged on the credit card.

My apologies to the Presiding Officer if the Senator from Virginia already recounted this story. A young couple, both Federal employees, brought their 7-week-old baby to this meeting and said they wanted to bring this small bundle of joy because they had the unthinkable happen. When they tried to get their daughter put on their Federal healthcare insurance, whoever was supposed to send in the form had been furloughed. So when they took their daughter to the doctor and the doctor prescribed medicine, at the drug store they couldn't pay the bill because the folks didn't have their insurance. They had done nothing wrong. In this case, it didn't end up in a tragedy. The insurance company, with additional documentation, put the child on the insurance plan, and this family was able to get medicine for their child, but no parent who has earned the right to have their kid covered by health insurance should have this kind of action interfere in their life.

I did hear Senator KAINE mention, we had some of the air traffic controllers there, and they brought a series of their checks. It almost added insult to injury to get checks that said 1 cent or a zero on it. It is better to not even send them a check. As Senator KAINE mentioned, do you really want, in the crowded airspace over Dulles, your air traffic controller spending 30 percent of his time figuring out how he will pay the mortgage or pay his kids' tuition? You want 100 percent of that Federal employee's focus on landing that plane safely.

So 800,000 thousand Federal workers, about half of them furloughed, half of them working not just full-time but in some cases overtime.

Another colleague, earlier today, had some folks working at a Federal penitentiary. A lot of the workers weren't showing up to work not because they were upset or because they want to rightly protest, they couldn't afford the gas because they live 2 hours away from the Federal penitentiary.

We have a President who is willing to go to the border and go on TV but who is not willing to sit down with any of this workforce. That is embarrassing and, frankly, disgraceful.

If you were saying this is only about Federal workers, that would be bad enough. What about the contractors? Even though there are a group of us trying to put legislation in place, even if we reopen government, many of these contractors will never be made whole.

We have in our State a number of small businesses. One veteran-owned business with nine employees had to shut down last week because she couldn't meet her payroll. Now, will that small business be able to reopen? I don't know.

We in Virginia are blessed with incredible National Parks, the Shenandoah National Park and around the area where Senator KAINE lives in Richmond, civil war battlefields. This isn't just Federal employees. What happens if you are a campground around the Shenandoah National Park? What happens if you are a little restaurant right outside of Petersburg Battlefield? When those facilities shut down, those small businesses will never see that income come back in.

We have a flourishing craft brewery industry in Virginia, as I know they have in New Mexico and I imagine even in Alaska. Port City Brewing, based in Virginia, can't bring a couple of new brews to market because ATF workers are furloughed.

There has already been mention of the growing lines at TSA and the airports. In fact, ag workers, farmers, are waiting to see whether the President's support checks are going to come in. They are not going to come in right now. You have bad trade policy reinforced with the bad business practices of a government that is shut down.

As a matter of fact, we can look at this at a more macrolevel. What is the cost to the taxpayer? The cost to the taxpayer has already exceeded $3.6 billion. Why, in good gracious' name, can't we at least just vote on what the House has already voted on, what 96 Senators voted on in the middle of December?

If we want to continue to litigate how we can better protect our borders, count me in. I am in favor of additional resources for border security. I am sure we can find a way to get to yes, but why hold 800,000 Federal workers and hundreds of thousands of contractors and, for that matter, the whole county hostage?

I know my friend, the Senator from New Mexico, is here. I am only going to take one more moment. In my career, I have spent longer in business than I have in government, and most of my career in business was about trying to do deals. I was a venture capitalist, which is all about doing deals. I was an entrepreneur.

Subsequent to that, I was Governor of a State that had a 2-to-1 Republican legislature. If I was going to get anything done as Governor, I had to find common ground with a legislature of a different party. I am proud to say, we did find common ground, and Virginia got independently recognized as best managed State and best State for business.

So I have had a little experience doing deals, and I will wager this; that when this shutdown comes to a conclusion, that business schools and management consultants will write case studies about how not to negotiate based on Donald Trump's activities. Donald Trump, who sold himself to the American people as the ultimate dealmaker, has, I think, in the last 24—even days before that—violated every cardinal rule of how to get a deal done. Let me briefly go through this.

The first thing you learn in business when you are trying to do a deal, even if you have a slight advantage, you try to make it at least appear like it is a win-win circumstance for both sides. There has been nothing out of this White House that has been any effort toward those who don't agree with the President any sense of a win-win. It has been all about my way or the highway. That is not the way you practice business.

The second rule of business is, if you have somebody negotiating on your behalf, you back up your negotiator. You don't cut their knees off. This President has humiliated not only the majority leader of the Senate, who had the misfortune of taking and accepting the President's word and having the Senate vote 96-to-2 on a plan that he thought the President was going to sign and then have his knees cut off, but a few days later, he had the Vice President come to Congress and offer a plan as at least a starting point. I don't think he even got back downtown before the President of the United States had cut off his own Vice President's negotiating skills.

In the last few days, one of the folks whom—I think, at least, based on reporting—a friend of all of ours, the President, is supposed to listen to, Senator GRAHAM from South Carolina, has been shot down as well.

Rule No. 2, don't kneecap your negotiators.

Rule No. 3, realize that no matter how important the deal is, there is always going to be another deal. You have to leave something on the table. This President has so broken faith with folks in his own party and folks on our side of the aisle, how can this individual think he is going to have any credibility—regardless of how we resolve this issue on any forward-going basis—to be a strong negotiator?

Rule No. 4, have somebody that is willing to speak truth to power. Unfortunately, in this administration, any independent voice has quit, been fired, or if they quit, as is the case of the Secretary of Defense, the President changes the terms and says he fired them, after all.

Finally, for management 101, if you are asking your workforce to go through tough times, show a little empathy. I have never seen a leader in our country, in my time in politics, ever be more disrespectful of the Federal workforce, and both parties have done this. Whenever, over the last decade, we have gone to the well to try to cut programs, the part of the programs we always cut are what we call in Washington-speak domestic discretionary. In English, that means the folks who work on food stamps, the folks who work at our national parks, the folks who work at TSA, and the folks who work on the Coast Guard. Yet there has been zero empathy from this White House for those workers who all of us have spoken about, who are asked to do more, who aren't getting paid, or are asked to work overtime. We are a better country than this.

The President who said he was dealmaker supreme, I think, will go down, at least in modern management history, and will be studied but not studied on how you get a deal done but, frankly, on how not to get a deal done.

So I think it is incumbent upon us in the Senate to do our job. We do not have to ask permission from this President to reopen this government, to pass legislation that could override his veto should he choose to do that, to make sure the 96 Senators who voted in favor of keeping the government open in December would have a chance to reaffirm that vote on a going-forward basis.

I appreciate the time to come to the floor. I am going to hand off to my friend, the Senator from New Mexico. It is my hope that we don't make further history this week and that we find some way in this next day or so to get this government reopened so we can get this Federal workforce back to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, let me say to Senator WARNER, my good friend from Virginia, who has an incredible empathy for the Federal workforce, we have the same thing in New Mexico, and to our good friend Senator BENNET from Colorado, we have Federal employees throughout this Nation that really give the extra bit. They go the extra mile. I am going to talk a lot about that, the same way Senator WARNER is and with the same kind of passion he has.

Today is day 24 of the Trump shutdown. Federal Government employees are furloughed, and others are working but did not get paychecks. Federal contractors have already received stop work orders. Not only are they not getting paid, but they will never receive backpay for work lost.

This Trump shutdown is now the longest shutdown in U.S. history. History will show this shutdown to be a political and financial fiasco of the President's making.

You can see in this map, published by the New York Times—and I am sure our Presiding Officer will see—that as you get more green on this map, you are hurt more by this shutdown.

You can see Alaska, Maryland, Virginia, New Mexico, Montana, and Colorado, and there are a lot of States that are really hurt. We have a large workforce in some of the Federal agencies that are currently shut down, including the Department of Interior, the Homeland Security Department, and the Department of Agriculture.

My staff estimates, conservatively, that we have at least 10,800 Federal employees affected, not counting law enforcement. We are a small State. This has a big impact. There are no good estimates of the impact on many New Mexicans employed by or under contract with Federal contractors.

Federal employees are true public servants who often forego jobs that pay more because they believe in public service. These men and women have families. Some don't have much in the way of savings. Some live paycheck to paycheck. One of those individuals is a Border Patrol agent from Las Cruces, in southern New Mexico, who has worked for Customs and Border Protection for 18 years. He tells me:

> I live paycheck to paycheck. If I don't get paid the money that I earn, I AM NOT GOING TO MAKE IT! Creditors are not forgiving any debts. I am asking you to please try and help me and all federal workers get paid. I feel stressed and helpless, please help.

This is from a Border Patrol agent—the folks we rely on to keep our Nation safe, which the President claims is his aim. This agent is hurting. The President is devastating these agents and their families.

While Border Patrol agents may or may not support a wall, they do not support going unpaid for the difficult and dangerous work they do in service to our Nation, in service to keeping our borders safe, which we all know is the President's claimed goal.

The President's unconvincing claim that he can ''relate'' to Federal workers not getting paid was belied by his completely out-of-touch statement that they can ''make adjustments'' and be just fine.

This President cannot relate to the professional support employee in the Las Cruces FBI office whose mortgage company, gas company, and credit card companies are giving her no leeway—making no ''adjustments''—while she goes without pay. She says she is ''a REAL human [being] who is being held hostage.'' She has worked for the FBI for 21 years, but she will probably leave Federal service early so that she has the financial security she needs to pay her bills.

She and the other 800,000 other Federal workers are being held hostage by a President who is willing to wreck American families for his vanity wall.

An occupational therapist with the Indian Health Service at the Gallup Indian Medical Center in northwestern New Mexico tells me, emphatically and in all capital letters: ''I AM NOT WITH THE PRESIDENT ON THIS ISSUE.''

She is working hard, providing needed services to Native communities, but providing for herself and with no pay, she is beyond stretched. She was helping her son pay off college loans. She has had to tell him that she can't help right now. She has an elderly mother she visits in Las Cruces. She can't plan a trip now.

In fact, Indian Health Service healthcare providers all over the country provide services essential to the health and wellness of nearly 2.2 million American Indians and Alaska Natives in over 800 hospitals and clinics in 37 States. These Federal employees and medical professionals—including over 2,000 nurses and nearly as many doctors, pharmacists, dentists, and physician assistants—aren't getting paid. They are forced to work without pay, and there is no end in sight.

Federal contractors really feel the brunt of the shutdown. Their contract payments are stopped. Contractors have never received back payments after a government shutdown.

We have a Federal contractor in Albuquerque, ADC LTD NM—a minority, woman-owned company that has 2,600 employees and contractors nationwide—with 330 employees in Albuquerque. The company conducts background check investigations for, ironically enough, the Department of Homeland Security and other Federal Agencies. This company's work has come to a complete stop. This slows down DHS's ability to hire qualified employees, inhibiting its mission to keep our borders and Nation safe.

This company is losing tens of thousands of dollars a day. This, you can imagine, really hurts my State. Its loss in revenues translates directly to a loss in State tax revenue. The multiplier effect of the shutdown on New Mexico and the Nation will ripple throughout the economy.

This privately held company, owned by New Mexicans, whose lineage in our State goes back more than 300 years, is currently paying its employees, even though its revenue has stopped. The owners are sacrificing to do so, but they can't continue for the months or even years the President says his shutdown could last.

Federal employees will not stay in their jobs without pay for months or years. They have to feed their families and pay their mortgage or their rent. Last week, the Senate passed S. 24, sponsored by 43 Democrats and one Republican, by voice vote. The bill guarantees that furloughed Federal workers would be paid from retroactively as soon as possible. This is the least Congress can do for these workers. It does not resolve, however, the pain Federal workers endure through a shutdown or guarantee that their homes will not be at risk during a shutdown or guarantee that food will be on their table or ensure that the Federal workers will stay in their jobs during a prolonged shutdown like the one this President apparently foresees. The solution is to shut down the shutdown—to do it now, to do it immediately.

This Trump shutdown doesn't only affect Federal employees and contractors. It affects the tens of thousands of Americans who rely on government services or need approval for projects. A local Sante Fe small business—a construction company, Sarcon Construction Corporation—is ready to begin an $8.4 million project to build two new hangars at the Sante Fe Municipal Airport. This 32,000-square-foot project will generate $650,000 in local tax revenue, and it will employ 75 to 100 people. Many of those people are unemployed now, waiting for this project to begin. This project is a big deal for my home city of Sante Fe.

Do you know why the project is stalled?

Sarcon can't get the necessary approval from the Federal Aviation Administration because of the Trump shutdown. The FAA personnel responsible for approval are furloughed. As we can see, the shutdown has real consequences for real people, especially for people like those unemployed construction workers in New Mexico, ready and eager to go to work but unable because of our President's inability to do his job.

The President's ridiculous claim that many Federal employees who are not getting paid support his shutdown has no basis in reality. The Federal workers in New Mexico who are furloughed or are working without pay and the Federal workers we have heard from do not support this shutdown.

An employee with the Department of Interior in Albuquerque writes:

> While I am not sure how much good it would do, I emailed the White House to go on record that I am not one of the Federal employees the President is touting as wanting to be out of work without a paycheck until he gets his wall. I just want to go on record . . . that no, Federal employees do not want to stay out of work; we want to go back to work and get paid. This is not our fight, just his.

A husband and wife from Las Cruces who both work for the Environmental Protection Agency are also among the many Federal workers who did not support the Trump shutdown. They have three children, and they need their paychecks. They don't support Trump's wall either. As EPA engineers, they understand and oppose the environmental destruction it will cause.

A scientist for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico is one of the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who are essential and working without pay. He is working on critical space infrastructure and testing related to the Space-X launch scheduled for later this month. There is no good reason why this important work is not being paid for right now.

There is no good reason why any Federal employee is not getting their salary today. There is no good reason why Federal contractors' contracts are not being honored. This Federal shutdown hurts American families across my State and the Nation. It hurts our economy.

One Federal employee in New Mexico wanted to tell their story but was banned by their employer on the ground it would represent illegal lobbying of Congress. That is patently false. Federal employees contacting their elected representatives about this shutdown and its impact on their work and lives is not prohibited lobbying. The Trump administration has not only put these people out of work, it is now gagging them and denying them their free speech rights.

I call upon the President to end this terrible shutdown. He should do so immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON BARNHILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, when Paducah Police Chief Brandon Barnhill announced last October that he would be retiring at the end of the year, we knew he would leave large shoes to fill. During his 20 years with the department, including the last 5 it at the helm, Brandon helped develop a statewide reputation for excellence. Now, as Brandon retires to pursue new opportunities, I would like to take a moment to thank him for his service to the city of Paducah and the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Brandon graduated from Murray State University and earned a master's degree from Andrew Jackson University. It was at the Murray Police Department that Brandon began his noble vocation in law enforcement. He spent 3 years there before joining Paducah's police force in 1998.

Every day, Brandon wore the badge with pride. Out of love for his community, he faced down danger with integrity and professionalism. Our Commonwealth is blessed with an abundance of brave men and women who put themselves in harm's way to protect their fellow citizens, and Brandon fulfilled his duty with distinction.

It didn't take long for his potential to be recognized in Paducah. Promoted to detective the year after joining the department, Brandon continued to earn the respect of his colleagues both in Paducah and throughout the State. When the previous police chief announced his retirement in 2013, Brandon became the best choice to lead his colleagues to preserve the peace.

Brandon's leadership has helped place the Paducah Police Department among the most respected law enforcement organizations in Kentucky. One of his major initiatives was to strengthen the partnerships between the department and the local community. Brandon recently said he was particularly proud of the ''Chief's Community Forum,'' a way to receive feedback on the perception of policing in the city. Throughout his service, Brandon became an example of integrity and credibility in law enforcement, and the Kentucky Association of Chiefs of Police named him the Chief of the Year in 2016.

In recent years, I have had the privilege to work with Brandon to bring increased Federal law enforcement resources to Paducah in support of the work already being done there to combat the substance abuse epidemic. In 2018, the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation both committed to open new offices in Paducah and to dedicate assets to a partnership with State and local law enforcement. Brandon and the men and women of the Paducah Police Department were, of course, integral to this effort to keep our communities safe.

At his retirement celebration, Brandon was greeted with an outpouring of support and gratitude from the community he had spent two decades serving. I would like to take this opportunity to add my voice to those congratulating him for his remarkable success in Paducah. With his wife Renee and their children, Natalie and Reese, I wish him all the best in his next adventure. I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in thanking Chief Brandon Barnhill for his leadership at the Paducah Police Department.

TRIBUTE TO EDDIE ROGERS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, after 16 years of service to the people of Taylor County, KY, Judge-Executive Eddie Rogers is beginning his retirement. My friend leaves behind a legacy of passion for the men and women he represented, and I would like to take a moment to acknowledge Eddie's career in public service and to thank him for his commitment to Taylor County.

Eddie first entered the county's top job in 1999, and he worked closely with the members of the fiscal court to address the challenges facing the area. He made some difficult choices, but as he looked back on his career, Eddie said he always did what he thought was best to help attract new jobs to Taylor County and provide new opportunity for Kentuckians.

Serving in office a second time beginning in 2006, Eddie's leadership secured several major accomplishments for the county that will continue to be enjoyed for years to come. During Eddie's tenure, he oversaw the opening of the Taylor County Judicial Center and the construction of a new fire department. The county also built a new animal shelter, and in the near future, a technology center will open as a result of Eddie's work. These buildings will stand as lasting landmarks to Eddie's service and his success in Taylor County.

At his final fiscal court meeting as judge-executive, the county's other elected officials thanked Eddie for his leadership, his collaborative nature, and his record of achievement. They also noted his work with the Kentucky Association of Counties, helping other communities across the Commonwealth. In addition to his tireless work for Taylor County, Eddie's colleagues also thanked him for his personal friendship. I can echo those sentiments and say I have enjoyed working with Eddie on a broad range of projects for the community and our home State. Joined by members of his family, Eddie adjourned his last meeting with the appreciation of many throughout Taylor County.

At the end of his 16 years of dedication, Eddie has a lot to be proud of, and I would like to thank him for his hard work. With his children, Michele, Wynn, and Natalie, and his grandchildren, Dalton and Laine, I hope he will enjoy a well-earned retirement. I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating Eddie for his years of service to Kentucky.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from this evening's vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019, S. 1.

On vote No. 3, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture.•

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO WOODY CRAWFORD

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize the retirement of Mr. Millard ''Woody'' Crawford of Colebrook, NH.

Since 1975, Mr. Crawford has worked for the Colebrook District Office of the New Hampshire Electric Co-operative in the New Hampshire North Country.

The Colebrook District Office distributes power to about 1,500 co-op members in Columbia, Colebrook, Dixville, Stewartstown, Clarksville, and Pittsburg, NH and maintains miles of overhead lines.

Returning to New Hampshire after college in 1971, Mr. Crawford took a job digging and setting poles for the co-op, before making a pitch to the district representative as to why they should hire him as a utility lineman. He learned line work on the job, and bringing power to a household by connecting someone to the grid remained his favorite part of the job throughout his career.

In 1997, Mr. Crawford was responding to an outage with his partner, Mark Monahan, when they witnessed the shooting of a New Hampshire State Trooper. The gunman, having already killed another state trooper, a district court judge, and a newspaper editor, threatened Mr. Crawford and Mr. Monahan, but they drove to the main road to stop traffic and prevented the loss of more life.

Mr. Crawford's colleagues praise his professionalism and care for others, and I am proud to join them in congratulating him on his retirement.

I hope you will join me in honoring a dedicated Granite Stater, Woody Crawford.•

REMEMBERING GERALD BOSCHWITZ

• Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and pay tribute to Gerald Boschwitz, who passed away on December 30, 2018.

Gerry's life was defined by his enduring kindness and commitment to his family. The son of Ellen and former U.S. Senator Rudy Boschwitz, Gerry came from a family that valued service and decency. During his life, he embodied these values and passed them on to his children as well.

I went to Wayzata High School with Gerry. An accomplished student, he then attended Carleton College where he studied political science, a subject for which his family life prepared him very well.

Gerry, or ''the Gerb'' as he was known to his family, was the first of Rudy and Ellen's four sons and the leader of his pack. Gerry was a quintessential oldest son and big brother, serving as both a mentor and a sounding board for those he loved. Whether it was helping his father on the campaign trail, or his brothers make career decisions, Gerry always showed up, ready to give his support.

Gerry also worked alongside his siblings at the family's Plywood Minnesota/Home Valu Interiors business for 25 years, stepping in as CEO when his father was ready to pass the torch. He later cofounded a business of his own.

His commitment to his work often made him the first one up in the morning and out the door, but that didn't stop him from putting his family first, including leaving voicemails for his wife Janet at her work so that his voice was the first she would hear in the morning.

Gerry's family—his wife Janet and their sons David, Benjamin, and Michael—was truly the centerpiece of his life. Gerry was deeply committed to the Boy Scouts and served as an assistant scoutmaster for more than a decade. The Scouts played an important role in the lives of his sons as well—all three Eagle Scouts—something Gerry was very proud of.

Gerry fought valiantly against his multiple myeloma cancer for 4½ years, undergoing numerous treatments including a stem cell transplant and a natural killer cell transplant. In keeping with the kindness and generosity that defined so much of his life, Gerry's final gift to others was the knowledge researchers will gain from his experience.

That final act is no surprise to those who knew him best.

May his memory be a blessing.

Thank you.•

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 24. An act to provide for the compensation of Federal and other government employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

At 3:04 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 221. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes.

H.R. 266. 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 REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 221. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 266. 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.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 14, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 24. An act to provide for the compensation of Federal and other government employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. COONS):

S. 112. A bill to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 113. A bill to appropriate funds for pay and allowances of excepted Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 114. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide that activities relating to the training and readiness of the reserve components of the Armed Forces during a lapse in appropriations shall constitute voluntary services that may be accepted by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. Res. 17. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

S. 21

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill making continuing appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations act expires prior to the enactment of a new appropriations act.

S. 47

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 69

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 69, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 80

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 80, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 94

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 94, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 105

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 105, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 106

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 106, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 17—CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2018 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION 1 FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 17

Whereas the North Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as ''NDSU'') Bison football team won the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division I Football Championship Subdivision title game in Frisco, Texas, on January 5, 2019, in a convincing victory over the Eastern Washington University Eagles by a score of 38 to 24;

Whereas, with the 2018 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision title, NDSU has now won 15 NCAA football championships;

Whereas NDSU has won 7 of the last 8 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision titles, an exceptional achievement that is unprecedented in modern collegiate football history;

Whereas the NDSU Bison completed the 2018 NCAA football season with a perfect record of 15 wins and 0 losses, displaying extraordinary resilience and skill;

Whereas head coach Chris Klieman and the entire coaching staff led the NDSU Bison to an outstanding total of 69 wins and 4 national championships during the 5 seasons that Chris Klieman was head coach at NDSU, instilling character and perseverance in the members of the NDSU football program;

Whereas an estimated 17,000 NDSU Bison fans attended the championship game, reflecting the tremendous spirit and determination of Bison Nation that has helped propel the success of the team; and

Whereas the 2018 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision title was a victory not only for the NDSU football team, but also for the entire State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the North Dakota State University Bison football team as the champions of the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision;

(2) commends the players, coaches, and staff of North Dakota State University for—

(A) their hard work and dedication; and

(B) fostering a continuing tradition of excellence; and

(3) recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans who supported the North Dakota State University Bison football team during a successful quest to bring home another National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision trophy for North Dakota State University.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Douglas McDonough, a congressional fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this year.

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

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2018 fourth quarter Mass Mailing report is Friday, January 25, 2019.

An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable pdf document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states ''none.''

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically at http://webster.senate.gov/secretary/mass_mailing_form.htm or delivered to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510–7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records is open from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. when the Senate is not in session). For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224–0322.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115–232, on behalf of the Democratic Leader of the Senate and the Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, appoints the following individual as a member of the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence: Christopher A. R. Darby of New Hampshire.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 266

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that H.R. 266 has been received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 266) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for a second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2018 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 17, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 17) congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 17) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, January 15; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, over the weekend, as you may have heard, our government set a new record. It wasn't for the number of roads being built or repaired in this country. It wasn't for higher math scores or graduation rates for kids in the United States of America. It wasn't for passing the most bills or investing the most dollars in our future. It wasn't for paying attention to the next generation of Americans. It was for the longest shutdown in the history of the United States—a selfish act taken by partisan politicians that is an embarrassment to our country and to our future.

It has been 24 days. We have Federal employees all over the State of Colorado and I am sure the State of Alaska, the Commonwealth of Virginia, as we heard before, who are out of work because of what Washington has done to them. It is nothing they have done. They have fulfilled their end of the bargain. But because we have a screw loose around here because we are the only modern, industrialized country in the world that shuts down its government for politics—our allies don't shut down their government for politics, and our foes don't shut down their government for politics. No local government shuts down its government for politics. No school district shuts down its government for politics. No State would ever think of doing it. No elected official at any level of those governments would show their face in the grocery store on the weekend after they shut down the government and said to the citizens of Alamosa or the citizens of Durango or the parents in Denver public schools: Sorry. Your kids can't come to school today because we are shutting down the government for politics.

It is ridiculous.

I met an air traffic controller today who got her check on Friday after she worked through the entire holiday. She had a kid. I don't know how old he was, but he was a baby who had to be carried. She worked the entire holiday, was separated from her family, got her check on Friday, and it was for 77 cents. The people in this body might as well be standing outside and lifting their middle finger at her and at the TSA workers who were there today at Denver International Airport making sure that we were safe, that the traveling public was safe, and who were not getting paid, unlike the people here during this shutdown.

By the way, that airport, which we are very proud of in Denver and in Colorado, the Denver International Airport, is the newest airport that has been built in the United States of America, and it was built almost a quarter of a century ago because we are not making the investments that anybody else in the world is making.

As I said, no other advanced country in the world shuts down its government for politics. I expect us to have disagreements. We should have disagreements, but we shouldn't shut down the government over this disagreement. It has been 24 days.

While we were shut down, other countries were actually investing in their future.

In the last 24 days, South Korea broke ground on an expanded bullet train outside their capitol of Seoul.

While we were shut down, Canada announced support for a new 5-megawatt geothermal plant—the first of its kind in that country.

India issued tenders to set up 7.5 gigawatts of new solar capacity.

New Zealand announced millions in new resources to improve the safety of rural highways.

You should see our rural highways. And it is not just this shutdown; it is a decade—a decade of fiscal fights made in the name of fiscal responsibility that have put us in the position for the first time since the Vietnam war and before the Vietnam war to see our unemployment rate falling and the deficit going up.

This same wrecking crew who called Barack Obama a Socialist and a Bolshevik and was incapable of bringing themselves to help at a moment when our unemployment rate was at 10 percent and we were at the depths of the worst recession since the Great Depression has now closed the government and given us a $1.5 to $2 trillion deficit while the unemployment rate is falling. And every one of them promised their constituents and my constituents that these tax cuts would pay for themselves.

God knows, when they add it up, what this shutdown is going to cost the American people. It is not saving them money.

Vietnam opened a new international airport near Halong Bay to attract tourists and boost the economy.

Singapore is preparing an Underground Master Plan to maximize its urban space by moving things like data centers, utilities, and water reservoirs below ground.

A new report shows that for the first time ever, Germany drew more energy from renewable sources than coal in 2018.

Ireland, in contrast to what I was just saying about the United States of America, ended the year with a budget surplus. Imagine the flexibility it gives legislators and policymakers there to think, what are we going to do with this surplus? How are we going to invest in the next generation? How are we going to shore up our equivalent of Social Security? Maybe we can have a real middle-class tax cut or lift some people out of poverty in our country. We can't ask those questions today because of our fiscal imbalance and because the Government of the United States is shut down.

While we were shut down, other countries moved forward with a trade partnership that excludes the United States. Once it is fully in place, it will represent a trading block of nearly half a billion consumers whom our manufacturers should be selling to and our small businesses should be exporting to.

Not surprisingly, China has been extremely busy over the last 24 days while we have been shut down. While we have been shut down, China landed a spacecraft on the dark side of the Moon. That has never happened before in human history. There was a time in our history—you will remember it—when the Russians launched Sputnik. That caught our imagination. John F. Kennedy said: We are going to put a man on the Moon within the decade. That is what he said. That is what we did. Now, because of the fecklessness of this Congress, did you know that America cannot send an astronaut into space without asking the Russians for permission to ride on one of their rockets?

A whole generation of Americans that I was part of was inspired by the space mission that NASA led. Unfortunately, in my case, it did not lead me to understand anything about mathematics or science, but it inspired us as Americans to have a big vision for what our country could do and for what our country could do in competition with our adversaries around the world.

Do you think the Chinese are not observing what we are doing while they are putting a rocket, a spaceship on the dark side of the Moon for the first time in human history—something they will always be able to claim; something we will never be able to claim? Do you think the Russians know that we can't put somebody up on the space station if we want to, that we have to wait for them to let us do it? Just after they put that spaceship on the other side of the moon, China announced that it is planning another mission to the moon by the end of the year and a mission to Mars by as early as 2020.

It announced that it is planning to invest in 4,200 miles of new railway lines this year, including almost 2,000 miles of high-speed rail. Do you know how many more that is than we have? About 2,000, and that says nothing about the investments that they have already made.

They have begun operating new high-speed rail lines in East China and Northern China with initial speeds of 155 miles per hour while our government is closed. That is another plan; that is another set of tracks. China has plans for a 6-gigawatt wind farm on the border with Mongolia that, once completed, would become the largest in the world. China continues its pursuit of a vast space-based communications network that will cover every inch of the Earth. If we are not careful—if we are not careful—they are going to deploy 5G a lot more quickly than we will. That is what the rest of the world is doing while we are shut down.

My view of this is that we don't need to wait for the President on this. That is what the majority leader keeps saying. He keeps saying: Well, I can't pass something the President will veto because it will not become law.

I don't understand the logic of that, speaking of math. We passed a bill in this Senate—this Republican-controlled Senate; I think it was virtually unanimously—to keep the government open. The House of Representatives passed a very similar bill to keep the government open, and in the middle of this, in the midst of all of this, President Trump said: I am not going to accept that because I am going to use this moment to extort Congress for $5 billion for my wall.

He said to the people he refers to as ''Chuck and Nancy'': Give me the $5 billion.

They said: Why don't you just open the government? The Senate has passed it almost unanimously, and the House has passed it.

His answer was ''because I will lose leverage,'' meaning: I will not have the misery I am creating for the Federal workforce. I will not have people who can't pay their mortgage, who can't pay for their early childhood education, who can't pay for their education. I will not have their misery to use to extort Members of Congress into giving me $5 billion for my wall.

This is notwithstanding the fact that he promised over and over and over again when he was running for President that Mexico would pay for the wall. That is not my talking point; that is not my coming out here and being unfair and trying to exploit a weakness or a misstatement. I think it is fair to say that almost all of his campaign was based on the idea that there was going to be a wall and that Mexico was going to pay for the wall. He could not have been clearer about that.

Now he's trying to shut down the government because he knows that Mexico will not pay for the wall. The rest of us knew the whole time he was telling America untruths about it. He has now turned, instead, to the American taxpayer to say: OK. I wasn't telling the truth about it then, but don't pay any attention to that. You now have to pay for the wall.

Our first response to that is: No, you haven't even spent the money that has been appropriated for the wall to date. He has not built an inch of the wall. Look it up.

The second problem is that anybody who has studied this question for any moment of time knows that his proposal is a waste of money for the United States. I am not going to be lectured by anybody on the other side about the need for border security. I was part of the Gang of 8 that negotiated the immigration bill in 2013. That was a bill that had not $5 billion of border security in it, not $2.3 billion of border security in it, but $46 billion of border security. It got 68 votes in the Senate, never went to the House, was never allowed to have a vote because of the tyranny of the so-called Hastert rule, which requires people not to vote their conscience but to vote only along party and partisan lines—another disgraceful chapter in modern American political history. That $46 billion in that bill doubled the number of security agents at our border. It built 350 miles of what the President now refers to as steel slats, as if he invented that idea. It made sure we could see every single inch of our border.

If the Chinese are going to be able to see every single inch of the world, the least we could do is see every inch of our border, and in that bill we were able to do that.

Meanwhile, he tells his base—and FOX News repeats it every single night—that Democrats are for open borders; Democrats are for terrorists pouring in over the southern border.

I have become convinced—and we spent years working on immigration, years working on border security, years working with my most cherished Republican colleagues on this issue in a bipartisan way—that the President doesn't want the wall. He wants the entertainment of the wall. He wants to rally his base around the wall. Meanwhile, he is taking the leading economy in the world, a country with the largest capacity for self-defense in human history, and he has shut down its government over a $5 billion, phony wall. It is a disgrace.

It is a disgrace for all hard-working Federal workers—and their families who depend on them—who are out of work, who are being furloughed, who aren't being paid. It is a disgrace for every person who works in State and local governments and in school districts all across this Nation, who would never think about shutting down their government but who understand what they possess as civil servants is a sacred trust to their community and to the next generation of Coloradans or of folks from New Hampshire or of Alaskans or of Americans.

We can't wait for the President—and I will finish with this—because he either doesn't want the wall or he doesn't have the capacity to get to a solution to it.

So we have to do our work as Senators. We have to vote to reopen the government. If that were put on the floor tomorrow, it would pass, and I will bet that it would pass with a veto-proof majority. Why? Because the constituents of everybody in this place would say: Are you out of your mind? Don't come back here and have another townhall and explain why you shut down the government over politics.

Instead, Democrats and Republicans should come together in this Chamber and set an example for the American people and say: All is not lost. This exercise in a democratic Republic is going to live to fight another day. We have come to our senses. We are not going to beat our own constituents to death for the purpose of empty partisan slogans or ideas that aren't going to advance the interests of the next generation of Americans.

I worry every night that I am here about what kind of history the next generation of Americans is going to write, about what we did when it was our responsibility to make sure that we fulfilled our commitment to them, the same ones that generation after generation after generation of Americans have fulfilled for people who came after them. That is what it means to be a citizen in a Republic like ours.

We are violating every norm of that approach to the work and allowing our competitors around the world to create advantages for themselves and potential liabilities for us. We shouldn't let this thing go into the 25th day or 26th day or 27th day. We should end it now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my Democratic colleagues in sharing stories of what we are hearing from our constituents who are being impacted by this government shutdown.

I want to take a minute to thank my friend and colleague from Colorado for his thoughtful and comprehensive and passionate remarks about where we are and why. This is a needless and terrible exercise in politics, and we need to reopen the government.

This senseless shutdown has been dragging on now for weeks, affecting vital government services and leaving many Federal workers without pay. With every day that passes without a resolution, hard-working people are dealing with greater uncertainty, and many are facing tough choices in order to protect their families and the way of life they have worked so hard to build. Like many of my colleagues, I have heard from a number of people throughout my State who have been affected by this shutdown.

On Friday, I visited two nonprofits in New Hampshire, the Nashua Soup Kitchen and the Community Action Partnership—most of us know it as CAP of Strafford County—which provides vulnerable people with shelter, food, and support. They are now in danger of being unable to provide services that are a critical part of our safety net. They also fear an increase in demand for those services because unpaid Federal workers will be turning to them for help.

Federal employees and others affected by the shutdown in New Hampshire have also written to my office to describe the hardships they are facing and to urge us to reopen the government. One of those Granite Staters has been an air traffic controller for close to 19 years. Sadly, on Christmas Eve, her mother passed away, leaving her with a terrible loss but also with the stress and expenses of a funeral, all while having to work Christmas Eve and Christmas Day. On top of that, now she has not received a paycheck for that work.

She wrote:

> The government shutdown has been the last thing on my mind. But now the realization of not being able to pay my mortgage, credit cards from Christmas-time, and now this funeral is too much to bear.

She put it simply, saying:

> My colleagues and I deserve better.

I also heard from a Granite Stater who works for the IRS. He wrote to me saying:

> The prospect of not having a paycheck for an extended time is causing sleepless nights, and I am recovering from an extended bout of pneumonia that ended up putting me in the hospital right before Christmas. . . . My wife is worried about the bills for that. Last night, I worked pushing out the car payments. Today I applied for unemployment for the first time in 25 years, and talked to my mortgage company.

He continues:

> All this was under control a month ago, but now has me worried, and is costing me charges and interest.

He also detailed his concerns about a coworker who is terrified of losing her home if she is not able to pay her mortgage and of another who is waiting to address a health issue until she has a paycheck again. He said of him and his fellow Federal workers:

> We are hardworking, dedicated employees. Our jobs involve long hours, nights away from home, and risks to our health and safety. . . . All I want is to do my job and be paid fairly for it.

Finally, I heard from a Granite Stater whose husband is in the Coast Guard and recently relocated to New Hampshire. She said:

> To say this shutdown is impacting us is an understatement.

She wrote that she and her husband recently relocated to New Hampshire and spent every last penny purchasing a home in the State where they first met.

She said:

> We knew it was going to be tight with our two paychecks, but we would have enough to make ends meet. . . . That all changed after Christmas when we were informed that our President was prepared to shut down the government over a wall.

Since then, she and her husband have watched, hoped, and prayed that funding would come because now they fear they are going to have to call family members to beg and to borrow money to pay their mortgage and not go in default.

As bad as the direct impact of this situation is on Federal workers and on some of our most vulnerable and on people and small businesses who rely on government services, the shutdown also has ripple effects on other people and businesses across our State.

We must do better. The President's politically motivated crisis is devastating for too many hard-working families in New Hampshire and across the country. They deserve better than being used as pawns for a campaign slogan created by President Trump.

It is time for these games to stop, for the President's shutdown to end, and for our government to reopen. We need a vote on the floor of the Senate on the bipartisan bills that we already passed that would reopen this government with a veto-proof majority.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about the shutdown. I know the hour is late. I will cut short my remarks.

But we are now, as you heard and as many Americans know, in day 24 of the shutdown. This is a shutdown that the President, a number of weeks ago, said that he—I am not quoting him exactly,

but he seemed to want to have a shutdown, and then he went forward and executed it even after this body, the Senate, voted unanimously just before Christmas to extend funding for the government until February so we could continue debates until then. But he chose to upend that and now we have this shutdown lasting not just 24 days but now the longest in American history. That is not a distinction any President or administration or Congress—especially the majority here in the Senate—should be proud of.

I think it is very clear that there is a way out of this, and the way out of this would not foreclose—in fact, it would enhance—the chances that we can have a fulsome, thorough, policy-oriented debate on border security, which we should have. We should actually enlarge that to speak to or debate a lot of major immigration issues and maybe come up with a bipartisan bill like we had in 2013, where 68 votes brought forward a bill out of the Senate that had probably the best border security provisions in recent American history. It had a pathway to citizenship. It was a long and arduous path but a pathway, nonetheless. As well, it had guest worker provisions so that employers could have order, rules, and certainty as to their workforce and our immigration system.

We have a very broken system that we would have been 5 years, at least, into the fixing of or the repair of if we had passed that bill—or if the House had passed that bill. It had 68 votes in the Senate, but it died in the House. We haven't seen a bill like that since—certainly, not any bill that was as comprehensive.

Here we are with 24 days of government employees being held hostage by the administration. I think there is some complicity here in the Senate, as well, because we know there is a bill that would open eight of the nine agencies. That bill is here in the Senate. We could pass it tonight, tomorrow morning, or tomorrow afternoon. We could pass it very quickly because—remember, the first act of a Democratic-majority House was to pass Republican appropriations bills—they are bills that sailed through the Republican-majority Senate with little to no opposition.

That is where we find ourselves, with a way out of this predicament, which I believe would not only open up the government—which would be good for the whole country and for both parties all across the country and, especially, for the people mostly adversely affected—but it would also isolate the issue. Right?

The President says that he wants to have changes made, and he has a different view than I do, but let's have weeks of debate on border security or everything else he wants to talk about. Let's bring in the experts. Let's have a dueling set of experts. Let's see whom the American people support. Do they support one point of view that says we want border security or the other point of view that says that you want a wall or some steel barrier? That is kind of the choice. Do you want real border security or something else? We should have a debate about that.

If anything, the debate about the shutdown would be set aside because it would be over. The government would be opened. The country, the press, the Senate, and the House would naturally focus then on issues of dispute. That would isolate the issue.

But it is very difficult to maintain an argument or a reasoned debate—a debate based upon facts and policy and law, and, I hope, on the advice and consultation of border security experts, not just politicians. We have a lot of smart people in the Congress, but very few, if any of them, are border security experts. Let's listen to the experts. Let's take testimony from them like they had back in 2013, which undergirded the bill that got 68 votes. That would be a way to isolate and focus on the issue, instead of bringing misery to what is now hundreds of thousands of Americans—soon to grow to millions and, then, tens of millions—because those who miss paychecks today are a very big number. That number will grow when it starts to affect government services, which I will outline rather quickly because of the hour.

We have a lot of men and women in the country now working without pay or being furloughed, worrying about whether they can make a mortgage payment, put food on the table, or pay their heating bill. They don't have a choice. They can't just say: Well, sir, I can't pay the bill today because the government shut down. So just wait and you will be just fine.

No, they have to pay the bill. Thank God we passed legislation for backpay, but for some of these folks, backpay will not be enough because their credit will be adversely impacted. Their credit may be destroyed even if they get the backpay.

On Friday, 820,000 Federal workers, including 14,000 in my home State of Pennsylvania, missed a paycheck—more than 1,300 Department of Agriculture employees, 990 Department of Interior employees, 1,200 Federal Bureau of Prisons employees, 775 FAA and TSA employees, 700 EPA employees, as well as assistant U.S. attorneys in different parts of Pennsylvania.

I will share a small part of a longer letter that I got from a constituent. This constituent said:

> I am currently a furloughed U.S. State Department employee and one of your constituents. I will soon miss a paycheck and, with car payments, student loan payments, et cetera, on the horizon, my family of five will likely suffer. Beyond our personal hardship, this shutdown is both expensive and counterproductive to border security.

I couldn't agree more with that constituent and with the argument that constituent makes, but what is even more compelling, of course, is not the argument about the policy debate here in Washington. The more compelling part of that, of course, is missing car payments, student loan payments, and a family of that size suffering. That is real life. That is not just a Washington theoretical debate. That is real life for that family.

How about farmers? These are people who are not Federal Government employees, but they are affected by the fact that Federal Government employees are not at their desks or not in the field. Farmers can't visit their local Farm Service Agency office to get assistance.

We have a new farm bill. It is one of the great bipartisan achievements. Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, came together for a big farm bill. That is great. I am glad we got that done at the end of 2018.

The bad news is that some of that requires advice, consultation, and engagement with Farm Service Agency offices. They are not able to give that assistance.

How about seniors who rely upon transportation services and nutrition services provided by the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program? That and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, also known as the Senior Food Box, are now at risk of being isolated. These seniors are now at risk of being isolated at home and without food.

Approximately 2,400 units of low-income housing in Pennsylvania are in jeopardy because the Department of Housing and Urban Development will not be able to renew a contract. More than two-thirds of the people who receive this type of assistance are seniors and people with disabilities. The people who benefit from this type of housing assistance have average incomes of less than $13,000.

Two million Pennsylvanians receive food assistance. It is actually about 1.8 million, but it is almost 2 million Pennsylvanians who receive assistance through the SNAP program, or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. We used to call it food stamps. They may lose access if the shutdown drags on much longer.

I know the administration says: Don't worry. Everything is OK for February.

That is, in essence, what the administration said, and they haven't given us a definitive word about March.

So of those 1.8 million Pennsylvanians, a huge share of them have a disability, and a huge share of them are children in households who can't support themselves and can't afford food on their own because they are children. They benefit, as well. They are part of the 1.8.

A lot of them, of course, are seniors who deserve this program because that is what we do in America. We try to help people who need food assistance. That is called being America—being the strong country that we are, showing how strong we are not just by virtue of our military and our GDP—everyone knows that. No one comes close

in the world. But we are also strong because we say we care about people with disabilities. We want to make sure if they need Medicaid, they get that kind of healthcare. If they need food assistance, we will get that for them. We care about our seniors, too, because we are America and we are strong, and it is an American value.

These programs are important. When they are shut down, that is not an American value being upheld. When we talk about these programs and about food assistance, this is also real life—literally, today or the day when you lose food assistance. Why should that assistance even be the subject of uncertainty—uncertainty because someone doesn't get their way on a policy matter here in Washington?

I guess it is OK for any Member of Congress because we are a coequal branch of government. It is not like the President is higher than the Congress. We are coequal. I guess because the President wants to shut the government down to make a point about a policy matter, I guess that should be an option that any Member of the House or the Senate should exercise. So the next time, it will be a Member of Congress, when you lose a battle on a policy matter or you don't propose the funding on time, which is what happened here. They didn't ask for the money at the beginning of the year. So they tried to shoehorn it in at the end of the year. I guess if you lose the policy debate or your bill doesn't pass, you vote to shut the government down—take action to shut the government down like the President did.

I don't think that is the way any party or any country should operate. So 200,000 Pennsylvanians may lose access to the Women, Infants, and Children Program, which provides critical nutritional support to mothers and young children—200,000.

So there are the 2 million I talked about. There are 1.8 million people who are getting the benefits of the SNAP program, which, by the way, helps all Americans. People ask: What do you mean by that? It does. If you spend a buck on SNAP, you get $1.80 back in economic activity because people have to eat, and they tend to spend that money quickly. It helps everybody. So the SNAP program is not just a nice thing to do for people who have disabilities or for seniors or children; the SNAP program helps all of us because it helps to stimulate the economy.

Even if you are disinterested in supporting this program but are interested in having your own American economy grow, you should support the SNAP program. It is also the right thing to do because it is a darned good program. When you add 1.1 million people who are getting SNAP and then 200,000 people who benefit from the WIC Program, you will have gotten over 2 million just in one State.

These programs are not out of money this week or in the month of January or in the month of February, but we don't know about March yet. We haven't gotten any guarantees about March. Even if we get a guarantee about March, what about April? That is far from guaranteed. So that is what we are talking about here. Why should these people have to wait? Why should a farmer have to wait weeks or months to talk to a Farm Service Agency office? Why should families who have food insecurity as part of their lives not be able to get something to eat because we are having a policy debate here? Why shouldn't we give them the certainty that they vote for us to ensure?

It is unconscionable and unacceptable, and I wish I could come up with better words than that because they are not at all adequate. It is unconscionable that children and moms and hungry Americans will suffer because of this shutdown.

The President says he is concerned about crime and the flow of dangerous drugs into the country. I agree with him. A lot of Americans do, of course. Yet the shutdown is significantly impairing the FBI and the DEA's law enforcement efforts. These are part of the list of Agencies that are impacted. Agents are still doing their work to keep the public safe. They are dedicated, and they are going to do their work no matter what.

Yet, with many analysts on furlough, it is getting harder and harder to work effectively to keep the public safe. I want an FBI that has all of the resources it needs, with everyone on duty, with everyone working. If the FBI is undermined because of the shutdown, we are less safe. If the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, is undermined because of the shutdown, we are less safe. You don't have to be a law enforcement expert to say that.

It goes on from there. I have more, but I will not because of the hour. I will go back to the beginning.

There are adverse impacts today with people not being paid as of Friday. That alone is compelling and urgent and insulting, frankly, to us as Americans and is directly insulting to those families who don't deserve this. It is going to get a lot worse, though. That number is going to grow and grow, not just with those who are directly affected with their paychecks and in their livelihoods and their credit ratings and all of that but with people who depend upon the Federal Government for help when they are vulnerable, when they are hungry, when they want an answer to a question, when they want to close on a mortgage or do a long list of other things.

For the life of me, I do not understand why we would not pass a bill that is sitting in this Chamber that would open eight of the nine Agencies—that are closed—until the end of the fiscal year, September 30, so the shutdown will be over for those eight agencies. Then you would have one Agency, Homeland Security, that would get short-term funding, which would be another reason we could continue the debate and another way to focus attention on border security and anything else anybody wants to talk about here. It would focus the attention on that issue and remove the issue that is in front of all of us, which is that 25 percent of the government—and a lot of it affecting a lot of people—is closed, shuttered, not working, not effective, not delivering on results.

There is an easy solution here that not only does not close the debate on border security—effective, expert-recommended border security—but, if anything, enhances the possibility that there will be a more engaged debate on border security. As I said, I hope it will grow into a larger immigration debate.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:50 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 15, 2019, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING JAMES KING AND CHARLES COBB FOR THEIR 55 YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE KEESEVILLE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor both James ''Jim'' King and Charles ''Charlie'' Cobb for their 55 years of service in the Keeseville Volunteer Fire Department.

Jim and Charlie both started at the Department in 1964 and have shared countless stories and adventures together since then. Throughout their 55 years of service, regardless of changes to technology or personnel, the two have remained life-long friends and are steadfast in their commitment to the safety of Keeseville and the surrounding communities.

Jim has admired the fire station since he was a child and became the first in his family to join. During his tenure with the Department, he has held the positions of Fire Chief, Assistant Fire Chief, and Fire Commissioner, and started the Department's enhanced 911 system. Jim also served as President of the New York State Association of Fire Chiefs in 2003. Prior to joining the Department, Jim served for 15 years in the Army, which included a deployment to Korea and assignment to the 962nd Ordinance Company in Plattsburgh.

For Charlie, serving as a firefighter has been a family tradition. After obtaining his license, Charlie often drove his dad—who served with the department for thirty-eight years—to fire calls, and soon followed in his father's footsteps and became a firefighter himself. During his impressive fifty-five-year career with the Department, Charlie served as Fire Commissioner, Assistant Fire Chief, Fire Police Captain, and EMS Captain.

Having devoted over half a century of their lives to fire protection, Jim and Charlie are exemplary members of the community. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to join the Keeseville Volunteer Fire Department in honoring Jim King and Charlie Cobb and thanking them for their many years of public service.

RECOGNIZING FORMER MAYOR SCOTT EISENHAUER

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scott Eisenhauer, who recently retired as Mayor of Danville after 16 years of service.

Like many other cities, Danville has faced its share of challenges. Yet, through it all, Mayor Eisenhauer was a beacon of hope and resiliency as a tireless advocate for his home town and a superb manager of its affairs. Over the past few years, I have come to know Scott and I have seen firsthand the many positive results his hard work has brought.

Today, Danville is a far better place to live, work, and raise a family than it was when Scott won his first election in 2003. Numerous large-scale economic development projects have been realized and more are in the works. Public housing programs will be accomplished in early 2019. Additionally, a long list of infrastructure and quality of life projects were completed under Scott's stewardship.

His list of accomplishments are many, but perhaps the most remarkable aspect of Scott's tenure as mayor was how successfully he was able to gain a consensus with the many stakeholders he engaged. His working relationship with city aldermen, the business community, civic and community leaders, and the state and federal government officials was exemplary and a major key to his success.

Madam Speaker, ''Eisenhauer will be missed'' was the title of a recent editorial in Danville's newspaper. It is a good way to sum up how the city feels about their former mayor. Indeed, Scott's boundless energy and endless enthusiasm will be missed by all, and I wish him the very best as he begins a new chapter in his professional life.

HONORING THE CAREER OF DOUGLAS VERVERS

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Douglas Ververs, who retired in 2018 after a 30-year career with the Cornell Cooperative Extension (CCE). Mr. Ververs has served the CCE in various capacities throughout the years and has remained steadfast in his commitment to support economic development and the agriculture in Upstate New York.

Mr. Ververs graduated from SUNY Oswego with a degree in Industrial Arts & Technology Education in 1979. He spent his first eight years after college working in sales for the Black Clawson Company in Fulton, but changed his career trajectory in January 1988 when he started working for CCE. He first served as a Small Business and Tourism Educator for CCE Oswego County, where he taught businesses how to utilize local attractions for their customers. In 2006, Mr. Ververs became Executive Director of CCE Cayuga County after 17 years working for CCE Oswego.

Mr. Ververs oversaw all of CCE's operations in Cayuga County during his tenure as Executive Director. This included conducting outreach programs for Cayuga County residents in the fields of agriculture, environmental education, and small business and nutrition. Additionally, Mr. Ververs implemented a 4–H youth development program through CCE Cayuga. He was also responsible for many administrative responsibilities at CCE Cayuga.

Outside of his CCE Cayuga activities, Mr. Ververs was a team member with the New York Sea Grant Program in Costal Business Development from 1988 to 2002. He also shared his knowledge of recreation and the environment by teaching classes at the SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry from 2003 to 2005. Mr. Ververs has been honored many times throughout his career for his work in Central New York, including his receipt of the Community and Rural Development Innovator Award in 2001, the Cornell Cooperative Extension Distinguished Service Career Award in 2014, and induction into the Oswego County Tourism Ambassador Hall-of-Fame in 2005.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in honoring the distinguished career of Douglas Ververs. He has improved the lives of many Central New Yorkers, as well as the environment, through his diligent service to his community. His investment in the success of his local community is exemplary of a model citizen and is a standard from which we can all learn.

HONORING DR. BHAGWATI MISTRY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a member of the community who this year will serve as a delegate to the 15th Pravasi Bharatiya Divas celebration, which will be held in Varanasi, India from January 21 to 23.

Dr. Mistry was born in India but emigrated to the United States in 1978. She has served the community as a pediatric dentist, delivering high quality treatment and care to young children and teenagers in New York for the past 38 years.

The Pravasi Bharatiya Divas event occurs every two years, and is an opportunity for the Government of India to recognize the contributions made by the overseas Indian community. This year, the Pravasi Bharatiya Divas is associated with two other major events for India, the Kumbh Mela and India's 70th Republic Day. By including Dr. Mistry among the delegates for the Pravasi Bharatiya Divas, the celebration is further enriched because of her tremendous contributions to the Tarrytown community.

Congratulations to Dr. Mistry on receiving this wonderful and well-deserved recognition.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BEAUTIFUL: THE CAROLE KING MUSICAL AND ALL THE AMAZING CONTRIBUTIONS THAT CAROLE KING HAS MADE TO NEW YORK AND OUR COUNTRY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my dear friend Carole King, arguably the most prodigious singer-songwriter of our century, for the fifth anniversary of Beautiful: The Carole King Musical which is based on her life and career.

Beautiful: the Carole King Musical opened on Broadway on January 12, 2014. After its first season the show won a GRAMMY for Best Musical Theater Album as well as two Tony awards. In 2015, it opened on London's West End, garnering 2 Olivier Awards. The show is now entering its sixth year.

Carole King launched her extraordinary musical career as a hit songwriter at the young age of seventeen with the song ''Will You Love Me Tomorrow,'' co-written with her then-husband Gerry Goffin. With Goffin and others, she went on to write dozens of chart-topping songs throughout the 1960's. King made her breakthrough as a musical artist in her own right when she released her era-defining album Tapestry in 1971, which stayed on the charts for over six consecutive years and was inducted into the Grammy Hall of Fame in 1998.

To date, King has composed more than 100 hit singles and amassed numerous prestigious musical awards, including four Grammy Awards. She was the first woman to receive the Library of Congress Gershwin Prize for Popular Song, which she was honored with in 2013. She has also been inducted into the Songwriters Hall of Fame as well as the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and was a Kennedy Center Honoree in 2015.

In addition to her prolific musical career, King has also dedicated her exceptional abilities towards environmental activism and ensuring the conservation of American wildlife, parks, and wild places. King is a long-time resident of Idaho and began working with the Alliance for the Wild Rockies in 1990, testifying on Capitol Hill against legislation that would harm Idahoan natural spaces. She has also been a stalwart and outspoken advocate of the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act (NREPA), a bill I have introduced in every Congress since the 103rd Congress. King testified in favor of NREPA in 2009 before the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the extraordinary contributions of Carole King, whose environmentalism and musical talents have bettered New York and our nation and inspired a Broadway musical.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE OF MAYOR LARRY PAUL LANGFORD

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of the late Mayor Larry Paul Langford. Mayor Langford was a beloved member of the Birmingham, Fairfield and Jefferson County communities, who had bold dreams for the communities he loved and served He promoted economic development and made significant investments in the children and schools of Fairfield and Birmingham. Mayor Langford will be remembered as a larger than life personality who broke boundaries as the first black reporter for the region at WBRC; the first black Mayor of Fairfield, AL; the first black President of the Jefferson County Commission; and as a former Mayor of Birmingham. A Vietnam veteran, Mayor Langford served in public office in multiple capacities for nearly 23 years and will be greatly missed.

On March 17, 1946, Larry Langford was born to John Langford and Lillian Nance Langford, as the oldest of six children. He grew up understanding the importance of a good education and having a strong foundation of faith to guide him. His mother often stressed that a quality education was the key to improving one's lot in life and encouraged all of her children to strive for academic success. A proud graduate of A. H. Parker High School in Birmingham, Langford took his mother's advice to heart, but placed his dreams of attaining a college degree on hold when he chose to enlist into the United States Air Force shortly after finishing high school.

After serving for five years in the Air Force during the Vietnam Era, Langford returned home with a renewed sense of service to his community and quickly completed his college education at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). Langford attained a Bachelor of Arts degree in Social and Behavioral Sciences and began working for a local news station. Langford became the first African American male to become a news reporter for WBRC 6 News in its region The importance of this role was never lost on Langford. He knew that after the tumultuous decade before, to have an African American man reporting the news in this area was just one of several signs that the City of Birmingham was changing. Langford did well as a reporter, using his charisma and outgoing personality, he was able to speak with the people of Birmingham every day and record their stories.

After several years working as a reporter, Langford decided to run for his first political office. He was elected to the Birmingham City Council in 1977 where he quickly became known as the ''liveliest and most outspoken'' of the council members, as well as the most media-savvy. He would frequently brief reporters before meetings and would then provide the most memorable or controversial quotes packaged in sound bites for television coverage. During his time on the Birmingham Council, he also worked as a radio news director and contributed to the Birmingham Times. After an unsuccessful run for Mayor of the City of Birmingham against fellow councilman Richard Arrington, Jr. in 1979, Langford temporarily retreated from public service.

By 1982, Langford had moved to Fairfield, AL and married the love of his life, Melva Ferguson A few years later, Langford decided to return to public service and help the City of Fairfield respond to the complaints of the community. Langford ran for Mayor and won handily, defeating a crowded field of several candidates. Langford became the first African American Mayor of the City of Fairfield in 1988, another first for the charismatic public servant. After his election, he began an aggressive campaign to revitalize the city that included a massive project that would fix the streets and sidewalks of Fairfield. After a successful lobbying attempt to the Alabama State Legislature, Langford was granted more power in his role as Mayor over the Fairfield City Council, that allowed him to increase the city's sales tax to save Fairfield City Schools which were facing bankruptcy and the possible threat of having to close all of the public schools in the City. It was there that Langford became an outspoken advocate for students and began to find ways to make sure students who attended Fairfield City Schools would be ready for the technological advancements they would be facing in the near future.

While the Mayor of Fairfield, Langford also distinguished himself by pushing for regional cooperation in economic development and he became the driving force behind an agreement of 11 Jefferson County municipalities to join forces in 1998 to finance the construction of Visionland Amusement Park in Bessemer, a $90 million project.

During his fourth term as Fairfield Mayor, Langford set his eye on the Jefferson County Commission where he hoped his connections in Jefferson County would allow for stronger regional partnership amongst the cities of Jefferson County. Langford was elected to the Jefferson County Commission in 2002, defeating incumbent Jeff Germany. After being elected to the Commission, he was then elected President of the Jefferson County Commission; becoming the first African American to do so. A strong believer in helping students succeed, he proposed a 1 percent sales tax that helped build 30 new schools and generated over $1 billion in revenue. These new resources were immediately put to use by the nearly 36,000 students who were a part of the Jefferson County School System at that time. This was one of Langford's most successful projects and the effects of these schools are still felt throughout the county today.

In 2006, Langford attempted a second run for Mayor of Birmingham This time, he was successful and won enough votes to avoid a run-off election. Mayor Langford was sworn in on November 13, 2007. Just like he had done in Fairfield and on the Jefferson County Commission, as Birmingham Mayor, he put students first. Langford wanted to make sure that these students were getting every opportunity possible. Mayor Langford struck an agreement with a foundation that provided computers to children from developing countries, and got them to expand their reach to Birmingham City School. Nearly 17,000 elementary and middle school students received laptops that year.

While Mayor Langford's 23-year political career resulted in many successful public projects, his service was not without its controversy. Mayor Langford's tenure as Birmingham mayor was cut short when a jury

found him guilty of public corruption on October 28, 2009 and was sentenced to 15 years in federal prison. After serving eight and half years, on December 28, 2018, due to his failing health, Mayor Langford's sentence was commuted by a federal judge giving compassion release. The next day, Mayor Langford was transferred from a federal prison hospital in Lexington, Kentucky to Birmingham by ambulance where he was admitted to a Birmingham hospital and remained until his death on January 8, 2019.

Mayor Langford was an active member of St. Mary's Catholic Church in Fairfield, AL and frequently held bible studies to help promote the Word of God. He wanted to help the young men and women in his community to be guided by the strength and lessons of the Bible and to help heal the community through faith. Mayor Langford is survived by his beloved wife, Melva; son, Ronald Strothers; brother, Oliver Nance; niece, Lena Powe McDonald; sister-in-law, Casi Ferguson; two grandchildren, Ronald and Jared Strothers; and a host of other nieces, nephews, friends and supporters.

On a personal note, I am grateful for the kindness shown to me by Mayor and Mrs. Langford when I first moved to Birmingham. Mayor Langford was a man of big vision and a huge heart that has left our community better because of his many initiatives. It was out of respect for his many good deeds that I was honored to play a part in getting Mayor Langford's compassionate release due to his failing health so that he could spend his final days in Birmingham. Mayor Langford died as he lived—with dignity, distinction and as a free man with his family, friends and community who loved him deeply.

On behalf of Alabama's 7th Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life of Mayor Larry Paul Langford. May we celebrate the totality of his life today and honor his great works during his 23 years of service to Fairfield, Birmingham, and Jefferson County, Alabama.

RECOGNIZING JDRF ADVOCATE MAX SELMSER

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of Max Selmser, a constituent in my district living with type 1 diabetes. Now 13 years old, Max has lived with type 1 diabetes for over seven years and has become an advocate for the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation (JDRF). Max's efforts have engaged his family, friends, and community in finding a cure for type 1 diabetes.

Type 1 diabetes presents significant obstacles for those struggling with the illness. Afflicted individuals must constantly manage the disease through insulin shots to stabilize their blood sugar and are at long-term risk for various severe complications. However, the millions of people living with type 1 diabetes have bonded together to form a strong community working to discover a cure in the near future. Max is a perfect example of a member of this community.

Max participates in various awareness and fundraising events for type 1 diabetes. He has long served as a JDRF Youth Ambassador and Youth Advocacy leader since his diagnosis. In these roles, he informs his community about type 1 diabetes, how he lives with the illness, and offers his advice to newly diagnosed children. Additionally, he is active in the nationally popular JDRF One Walk and raised $35,000 to research a cure with his walk team.

For the 2019 JDRF Children's Congress, Max aspires to be a delegate from New York State in order to bring his advocacy efforts to Washington. He will have the opportunity to meet with lawmakers to discuss the funding needs of the Special Diabetes Program if selected. Max is an inspiring individual and is an excellent role model for children living through type 1 diabetes. He has my full support as he continues the application process.

We have a responsibility to invest in cures and assist researchers in their efforts to cure the diseases plaguing millions of Americans, and costing our nation billions of dollars. Type 1 diabetes is no exception and Congress must invest in the medical specialists searching for a solution to this ailment. Congress has taken positive steps forward with the 21st Century Cures Act, but these efforts must continue.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing Max Selmser. Living through any disease is no easy task but Max doesn't let his disease prevent him from reaching his full potential. I thank Max, as well as advocates across the country, for their efforts to find a cure for type 1 diabetes. I am optimistic one day soon a solution to this illness will be discovered thanks to the commitment of organizations such as the JDRF.

SUPPORTING H.R. 206, THE ENCOURAGING SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATORS ACT AND H.R. 246, THE STIMULATING INNOVATION THROUGH PROCUREMENT ACT OF 2019

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I want to state my support for H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovators Act and H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019. I thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, Congressman ROUDA, Congresswoman FINKENAUER and other colleagues on both committees for their work to advance these bills to the House Floor.

Through competitive research and development grants and contracts, the SBIR and STTR programs provide opportunities for innovative small businesses to participate in the federal research and development enterprise. The Federal R&D enterprise supports innovation by funding the best and brightest at our great research institutions, our national labs, and small businesses across all sectors of our economy. The SBIR and STTR programs have proven to be an important part of that investment. Over the years, the Science Committee has supported strong funding as well as improvements in policy and oversight for the SBIR and STTR programs. Last Congress, several important pilot programs were extended and other updates were made in law that help make the programs more effective and efficient. These include supporting more early-state funding for small business innovators, providing funding for important agency outreach and program administration, and streamlining reporting requirements.

The Science Committee considered several of the provisions in H.R. 246 in the 115th Congress. As these two bills advance, the Committee looks forward to working with our colleagues on the Small Business Committee to review and adopt policy changes in the SBIR and STTR programs that continue to strengthen the partnership between innovative small business and our federal research agencies. Further, I hope we will continue working together to ensure that the agencies prioritize outreach and other activities to increase the participation of women and minority-owned innovative small businesses in the SBIR and STTR programs.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 206 and H.R. 246.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, on January 14, 2019, I regret I was unable to vote due to an important conflict in my congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 30, H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF HERB KELLEHER, CEO OF SOUTHWEST AIRLINES

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 14, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, as the representative of the 30th Congressional District of Texas, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Mr. Herb Kelleher, CEO of Southwest Airlines.

Herb Kelleher was one of a kind. He embodied the colorful spirit and joyful nature of the airline he cofounded. He exuded this bright personality whether he was on television, in a room full of people, or speaking to just one individual. Beyond instilling the value of fun in his company, he revolutionized air travel by making the low-cost, low-fare airline accessible for many Americans.

Born in New Jersey, he studied English and philosophy at Wesleyan University and then law at New York University. It was his wife, Joan, whom he met on a blind date, who persuaded him to set up a law firm in Texas. Southwest Airlines was born not on the back of a cocktail napkin as he later liked to boast, but when one of his legal clients, Rollin King, owner of a small commuter airline, and his banker, John Parker, came to his office. Both men found travelling between the cities of Houston, Dallas and San Antonio inconvenient and expensive and thought they could do it better. With Herb Kelleher's help, they succeeded.

Since it's conception as a public company in 1971, Southwest has succeeded by just about every measure. In more than 45 years, in an industry filled with bankruptcies and mergers, Southwest has never had a year where it lost money. Under Mr. Kelleher's leadership, Southwest broke through in an industry entrenched with big names to offer a new spin on commercial air travel. In addition, the company promoted a healthy work environment before the idea became a widely-embraced corporate concept.

To Mr. Kelleher, Southwest Airlines was more than just another company; to him, it was a cause. His goal was to keep fares low and fly to as many cities as possible. In his words, the focus was to ''democratize the skies'' by making it as easy, affordable, and flexible for everyday Americans to travel. Such a mission may seem quaint today, but it was a revolutionary aspiration back when he first began.

Madam Speaker, the life of Herb Kelleher that we celebrate today is a testament to the value of great character and honesty. Because of Mr. Kelleher, Southwest Airlines made an essential contribution to America's quality of life. And most importantly, for Dallas and Texans statewide, Mr. Kelleher made an essential and long-lasting economic contribution to our region. Today as we reflect on his life, it is safe to say that the late Mr. Kelleher made a very real contribution to our world, and we are all witnessing the benefit of those contributions today.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 15, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 16

9:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To continue hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SH–216

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine fighting elder fraud, focusing on progress made and work to be done.

SD–562

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules for the 116th Congress.

SD–106

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD–406

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine the future of nuclear power, focusing on advanced reactors.

SD–138

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S165–S186

Measures Introduced: Three bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 112–114, and S. Res. 17. **Page S181**

Measures Passed:

Congratulating the North Dakota State University Football Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 17, congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title. **Page S182**

Measures Considered:

Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people. **Pages S166–79**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 3), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S174**

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S174**

Appointments:

National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence: The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115–232, on behalf of the Democratic Leader of the Senate and the Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, appointed the following individual as a member of the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence: Christopher A. R. Darby of New Hampshire vice Senator Heinrich. **Page S182**

Messages from the House: **Page S180**

Measures Referred: **Page S180**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S180–81**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S181**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S181**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S181**

Additional Statements: **Page S180**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S181**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—3) **Page S174**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 7:50 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 15, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S182.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 116th Congress:

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies: Senators Hoeven (Chair), McConnell, Collins, Blunt, Moran, Hyde-Smith, Kennedy, Merkley, Feinstein, Tester, Udall, Leahy, and Baldwin.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies: Senators Moran (Chair), Alexander, Murkowski, Collins, Graham, Boozman, Capito, Kennedy, Rubio, Shaheen, Leahy, Feinstein, Reed, Coons, Schatz, Manchin, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Department of Defense: Senators Shelby (Chair), McConnell, Alexander, Collins, Murkowski, Graham, Blunt, Moran, Hoeven, Boozman, Durbin,

Leahy, Feinstein, Murray, Reed, Tester, Udall, Schatz, and Baldwin.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development: Senators Alexander (Chair), McConnell, Shelby, Collins, Murkowski, Graham, Hoeven, Kennedy, Hyde-Smith, Feinstein, Murray, Tester, Durbin, Udall, Shaheen, Merkley, and Coons.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government: Senators Kennedy (Chair), Moran, Boozman, Daines, Lankford, Coons, Durbin, Manchin, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security: Senators Capito (Chair), Shelby, Murkowski, Hoeven, Kennedy, Hyde-Smith, Lankford, Tester, Shaheen, Leahy, Murray, Baldwin, and Manchin.

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: Senators Murkowski (Chair), Alexander, Blunt, McConnell, Capito, Hyde-Smith, Daines, Rubio, Udall, Feinstein, Leahy, Reed, Tester, Merkley, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies: Senators Blunt (Chair), Shelby, Alexander, Graham, Moran, Capito, Kennedy, Hyde-Smith, Rubio, Lankford, Murray, Durbin, Reed, Shaheen, Merkley, Schatz, Baldwin, Murphy, and Manchin.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch: Senators Hyde-Smith (Chair), Shelby, Lankford, Murphy, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies: Senators Boozman (Chair), McConnell, Murkowski, Hoeven, Collins, Capito, Rubio, Daines, Schatz, Tester, Murray, Reed, Udall, Baldwin, and Murphy.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: Senators Graham (Chair), McConnell, Blunt, Boozman, Moran, Rubio, Lankford, Daines, Leahy, Durbin, Shaheen, Coons, Merkley, Murphy, and Van Hollen.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies: Senators Collins (Chair), Shelby, Alexander, Blunt, Boozman, Capito, Graham, Hoeven, Daines, Reed, Murray, Durbin, Feinstein, Coons, Schatz, Murphy, and Manchin.

Senators Shelby and Leahy are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 527–544; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 27–28; and H. Res. 40–41, were introduced.

Pages H543–44

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H545**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Brown (MD) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H521**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H522**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:02 p.m. and reconvened at 4 p.m. **Page H522**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Investing in Main Street Act of 2019: H.R. 116, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 403 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 30;

Pages H522–24, H534

Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019: H.R. 246, to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program;

Pages H524–26

Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act: H.R. 206, to amend the small business laws to create certain requirements with respect to the SBIR and STTR program; and **Pages H526–28**

TANF Extension Act of 2019: H.R. 430, to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through June 30, 2019. **Pages H531–34**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:10 p.m. and reconvened at 6:32 p.m. **Page H534**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019: H.R. 190, to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate the inclusion of option years in the award price for sole source contracts. **Pages H528–31**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Rush announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H536–37**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Ryan announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution in the form of H. Res. 40. **Page H537**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H528.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H534. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters; to be immediately followed by a closed hearing to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 268, the ''Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019'', 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, January 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, January 15

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E39
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E41, E41
Katko, John, N.Y., E39, E41
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E40
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E40, E41
Shimkus, John, Ill., E39
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E39

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.