



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2019

No. 26

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable G. K. BUTTERFIELD 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.

HONORING SWEDISH COMMUNITY OF LINDSBORG, KANSAS

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 150th anniversary of a town in my district, Lindsborg, Kansas, also known as Little Sweden.

The town was originally settled in 1869 by hardworking Swedish farmers who, like my great-grandfather, had left Sweden because of the potato famine.

These farmers were new to America and new to the landscape and climate

of Kansas. Their goal was to establish a home and community rich in Swedish culture, religion, and business.

Today, Lindsborg is a bright, vibrant community where retailers feature unique traditional Swedish treats and artwork; where visitors can walk up and down the streets and Main Street and find more than 15 wild Dala horses painted to represent a unique piece of Lindsborg's culture. My own family often has one of these Dala horses in their entryway as folks enter their house.

It is a community that is proud of its heritage and comes together to carry on a variety of Swedish festivals and traditions honoring its original settlers.

I, myself, am one-quarter Swedish and very proud of this fact. Growing up, we kept many Swedish traditions in our family. We celebrated them whenever we had the occasion. Still today, our Christmas Eve dinners always feature various Swedish dishes, including pickled herring, anchovies, hardtack crackers, Swedish candies, and desserts. My mom, brother, and wife to this day enjoy their annual pilgrimage to Lindsborg to pick out their very special Swedish Christmas gifts.

In 2010, I was able to take my mother back to Sweden, along with my oldest son and daughter, and view the home that my grandfather had built; the farm where they farmed; the fences they had built out of stone; the barns they had built out of stone, still functional and standing today; and the water well my great-grandfather had dug. All of those parts of the farm were still functioning.

I was able to see the church where my great-grandfather and great-grandmother were married and see the cemetery where many of our relatives are buried to this day. It is a trip I will never forget.

I am very proud of my Swedish roots, and I am honored to represent Bethany

College and the town of Lindsborg. This town will always have a very special place in my heart, and it is my honor to sponsor the resolution that celebrates this milestone for Lindsborg. I can't wait until this year's Messiah Festival, when we will get to watch them live there in Lindsborg.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to represent this Swedish community, something that will always represent so much to my family.

CONGRATULATING DIANA SMITH

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Beatrice Municipal Airport manager, Diana Smith, on her induction into the Nebraska Aviation Hall of Fame.

Diana has worked at the airport, located in southeastern Nebraska, for 47 years, with the past 18 years as its manager. During her tenure, Diana has presided over a number of improvements to the Beatrice Municipal Airport, including a new administration building and the repaving of both its runways.

She went on to chair the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission in 2015, where she worked to support Nebraska's airports statewide.

Please join me in thanking and congratulating Diana for her service to her local community and to the entire State of Nebraska.

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 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1495

□ 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: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times, with only a few days before the next funding deadline to keep all of the government open. Bless those Members of the conference committee working to bring resolution to all differences.

At the same time, this is a week in which the House notes the loss of an historic Member, John Dingell, who served in the people's House for over one-quarter of its existence. Bless his family in their mourning, as well as all Members who possess special memories of his presence and contributions to the greatness of the House of Representatives.

We remember as well WALTER JONES, whose quiet but steady presence in the House reminded us all of the value of integrity in government service. May his moral strength be a helpful encouragement to all who wish to serve.

Bless us, O God, and be with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the whole number of the House is 432.

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. BUTTERFIELD) 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 votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY DONATION REFORM ACT OF 2019

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1063) to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1063

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 "Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2112 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY FUNDRAISING ORGANIZATION REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 15 days after the end of a calendar quarter and until the end of the requirement period described in paragraph (2), each Presidential library fundraising organization shall submit to the Archivist information for that quarter in an electronic searchable and sortable format with respect to every contributor who gave the organization a contribution or contributions (whether monetary or in-kind) totaling \$200 or more for the quarterly period.

“(2) DURATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The requirement to submit information under paragraph (1) shall continue until the later of the following occurs:

“(A) The Archivist has accepted, taken title to, or entered into an agreement to use any land or facility for the Presidential archival depository for the President for whom the Presidential library fundraising organization was established.

“(B) The President whose archives are contained in the deposit no longer holds the Office of President.

“(3) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PUBLISHED.—The Archivist shall publish on the website of the National Archives and Records Administration, within 30 days after each quarterly filing, any information that is submitted under paragraph (1), without a

fee or other access charge in a downloadable database.

“(4) SUBMISSION OF FALSE MATERIAL INFORMATION PROHIBITED.—

“(A) INDIVIDUAL.—

“(i) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person who makes a contribution described in paragraph (1) to knowingly and willfully submit false material information or omit material information with respect to the contribution to an organization described in such paragraph.

“(ii) PENALTY.—The penalties described in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply with respect to a violation of clause (i) in the same manner as a violation described in such section.

“(B) ORGANIZATION.—

“(i) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any Presidential library fundraising organization to knowingly and willfully submit false material information or omit material information under paragraph (1).

“(ii) PENALTY.—The penalties described in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply with respect to a violation of clause (i) in the same manner as a violation described in such section.

“(5) PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a person to knowingly and willfully—

“(i) make a contribution described in paragraph (1) in the name of another person;

“(ii) permit his or her name to be used to effect a contribution described in paragraph (1); or

“(iii) accept a contribution described in paragraph (1) that is made by one person in the name of another person.

“(B) PENALTY.—The penalties set forth in section 309(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) shall apply to a violation of subparagraph (A) in the same manner as if such violation were a violation of section 316(b)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(3)).

“(6) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Archivist shall promulgate regulations for the purpose of carrying out this subsection.

“(7) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) INFORMATION.—The term ‘information’ means the following:

“(i) The amount or value of each contribution made by a contributor referred to in paragraph (1) in the quarter covered by the submission.

“(ii) The source of each such contribution, and the address of the entity or individual that is the source of the contribution.

“(iii) If the source of such a contribution is an individual, the occupation of the individual.

“(iv) The date of each such contribution.

“(B) PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY FUNDRAISING ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘Presidential library fundraising organization’ means an organization that is established for the purpose of raising funds for creating, maintaining, expanding, or conducting activities at—

“(i) a Presidential archival depository; or

“(ii) any facilities relating to a Presidential archival depository.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2112(h) of title 44, United States Code (as added by subsection (a))—

(1) shall apply to an organization established for the purpose of raising funds for creating, maintaining, expanding, or conducting activities at a Presidential archival depository or any facilities relating to a Presidential archival depository before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall only apply with respect to contributions (whether monetary or in-kind) made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HILL 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CUMMINGS and Representative MEADOWS for sponsoring this legislation.

Former Representative JOHN DUNCAN from Tennessee first sponsored a bill to improve Presidential libraries 19 years ago. A bill identical to the one before us passed the House in the last Congress with bipartisan support. I hope we now can finally get this important reform enacted.

The Presidential Library Donation Reform Act would make the process for building Presidential libraries more transparent. Presidential libraries have become increasingly expensive as they have evolved into multipurpose centers.

The costs for building a Presidential library must come from private funding, and modern libraries cost millions—in some cases, hundreds of millions—of dollars to build.

The George W. Bush Presidential Center, for example, cost an estimated \$250 million to build, and President Bush raised approximately \$500 million for the building and an endowment for his library, museum, and institute.

Although President Obama has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for his Presidential library, he has voluntarily disclosed the names of those who have donated \$200 or more.

We should not, however, rely on such voluntary disclosures. Under current law, there is no requirement to disclose the identities of those who donate to a Presidential library, and a President, while still in office, is able to raise an

unlimited amount from private donations.

There is no limitation on who can donate to a sitting President for a Presidential library, or how much they can donate, and their identities remain secret.

This bill would require organizations that raise money to build Presidential libraries to disclose the identity of any individual who donates more than \$200. The National Archives and Records Administration would then be required to post the donation information online.

The bill would also create criminal penalties for individuals who report false information on donations and for fundraising organizations that omit donation information.

A group of 15 good government organizations, including Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington and the Sunlight Foundation, sent a letter last Congress urging the House to support this bill.

Here is what they wrote: "Under the current opaque system, Presidents raise funds privately to establish their Presidential libraries. These efforts, which often begin long before they leave office, are unregulated and undisclosed, creating opportunities for, and/or the appearance of, influence peddling. Improved transparency would help reduce the appearance of impropriety and help deter inappropriate behavior."

This bill had bipartisan support and passed the House last Congress without opposition.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1063. I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks as it relates to this particular bill. The bipartisan Presidential Library Donation Reform Act, which was introduced by the gentleman from Maryland, my good friend, Mr. CUMMINGS, is certainly one worthy of our support, Mr. Speaker.

Under current law, Presidents can fundraise for their Presidential libraries through private, unlimited donations while they are still in office. There are no current requirements for any Presidential library fundraising organization to disclose the source or size of the donation it receives. Donations can be from individuals, companies, associations, and foreign governments, with no transparency.

Presidential libraries have become more expensive throughout the years. President Clinton's library cost \$165 million. President Bush's cost \$250 million. President Obama's is projected to cost more than \$500 million.

This bill requires Presidential library fundraising organizations to disclose to the National Archives information about contributors who have donated \$200 or more in any quarter. The National Archives would then be tasked with making the data available on its website in a downloadable format.

H.R. 1063 also sunsets the disclosure requirement to when the management of the actual library is transferred to the National Archives.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It is a pro-transparency bill that has already passed the House, as my colleague mentioned, not once but three different times, with overwhelming support under both Democratic and Republican majorities.

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

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1063, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced the Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2019 to make the process of raising money to build presidential libraries more transparent. I thank Representative MARK MEADOWS for joining me in sponsoring this legislation.

Right now, a president—while still in office—can raise an unlimited amount of money for a presidential library from private donations, and the identities of all the donors can remain secret. It is time to enact this bipartisan legislation to require the disclosure of donor information.

Presidential libraries are built using private funds accepted through a private, non-profit organization. The costs of building modern presidential libraries can be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. The George W. Bush Presidential Center, for example, cost an estimated \$250 million to build, and President Bush raised several hundred million dollars to build the facility.

President Obama has also raised hundreds of millions of dollars for his presidential library. President Obama has voluntarily disclosed the names of donors who have given \$200 or more. While I applaud President Obama's efforts at transparency, we cannot rely on every president to voluntarily disclose donor information.

This bipartisan legislation would require the disclosure of information about every donor who gives \$200 or more for a presidential library and establish penalties for false reporting and non-compliance. This bill would make these vital changes to the law to deter inappropriate behavior.

Former Republican Representative John Duncan of Tennessee first sponsored a bill to improve the process for building presidential libraries 19 years ago. Representative Duncan also sponsored the same legislation we are considering today with me last Congress. The bill had bipartisan support and passed the House last Congress without opposition. It is past time for us to enact this bipartisan reform and shed light on an otherwise opaque system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1063, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL MEDIA USE IN CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS ACT OF 2019

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1065) to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1065

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 “Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. STUDY ON USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA IN SECURITY CLEARANCE INVESTIGATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on the examination of social media activity during security clearance investigations, including—

(1) the current use of publicly available social media in security clearance background investigations;

(2) any legal impediments to examining publicly available social media activity, and whether those impediments are statutory or regulatory in nature;

(3) the results of any pilot programs to incorporate social media checks in such investigations, including the effectiveness and cost of such programs;

(4) options for widespread implementation of the examination of social media activity during such investigations; and

(5) estimates on the cost for such options as part of—

(A) all Top Secret investigations; or

(B) all Secret and Top Secret investigations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HILL 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressmen LYNCH and HICE for their work on this bill. This bill would require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue a report to Congress on the use of social media checks in background investigations for security clearances.

In recent years, a number of agencies have begun pilot programs to help develop the best methods for incorporating social media into background checks. For example, the Army initiated a pilot program that found that, while checking social media is a valu-

able tool, it can be costly and may raise legal issues.

This bill would require that OMB conducts a comprehensive study on these issues and report back to Congress. This one-time report would describe the current uses of social media postings for investigative purposes and any legal concerns or impediments to their use.

In addition, the report would summarize the results of any pilot programs on the use of social media conducted to date and provide cost estimates for implementing their widespread use in the background investigation process.

This report would greatly assist Congress in determining whether further legislative action is needed when it comes to the Federal Government’s use of social media in background investigations. An identical measure was approved by the House last year without opposition.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1065, the Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act of 2019, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. Speaker, I was at one of these hearings where we were talking about this very issue and how it was just mind-boggling that we would not use current protocols, in terms of looking at national security clearances and the approval thereof.

It was Mr. LYNCH’s initiative here to actually address that in a legislative manner, and I support his good work there.

Millions of Americans use social media to interact with family members, friends, and followers. Public posts on social media websites occasionally provide a unique insight into a person’s character and interests.

In several high-profile cases, Federal contractors with valid security clearances who leaked classified information had posted highly suspicious entries on their social media accounts.

For example, Edward Snowden used various online aliases to post suspicious content on the comment boards of a tech magazine before he received his security clearance. A simple check—mind you, a simple check—would have let us know of these suspicious activities and certainly could have worked to mitigate some of the damages that we all know too well.

Private companies and private citizens can and often do search publicly available social media accounts to learn more about job applicants. However, our government does not regularly check the social media of individuals who have applied for security clearances.

On May 12, 2016, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence issued a new policy permitting the use of public social media information in security

clearance investigations. Despite that legal clearance, most security clearance investigations still do not involve a social media check.

Various Federal entities have studied the potential use of social media information in background investigations for at least a decade. The National Security Agency, the Army, OPM, and others have conducted pilot programs on the effectiveness of social media checks, and it is not clear what use has been made of this data for these programs or whether the programs can be expanded to cover more applicants.

Concerning online behavior should be one of many factors used to evaluate a person’s fitness to access classified information.

H.R. 1065, the Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act, is a step toward creating a more holistic security clearance review process. The bill requires OMB to evaluate pilot programs conducted to date and estimate the costs of wider implementation of publicly available social media checks.

This report is due within 6 months and will help guide subsequent legislation to require checks of publicly available data. We cannot wait any longer to modernize our security clearance process.

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

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1065, the Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act, bipartisan legislation that I introduced earlier this month. It had passed this House previously, last session, with no opposition.

I commend our full committee chairman, Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland, for his continued leadership on this issue of security clearance reform and for his work to advance H.R. 1065 to the floor today.

I also thank the new ranking member of our subcommittee, Mr. HICE of Georgia, for his support as well.

In order to enhance the Federal security clearance process, H.R. 1065 will require the Office of Management and Budget to examine the extent to which Federal agencies are reviewing publicly available social media profiles as they conduct background investigations for security clearance applicants.

This bill will also require OMB to submit recommendations to Congress on how we can implement this examination of social media activity in clearance investigations across the Federal Government while also safeguarding individual privacy rights.

Our bipartisan oversight of the security clearance process has already revealed that Federal agencies have too often missed red flags in determining an individual’s eligibility to access classified information and facilities.

We need only recall the tragic shooting at the Washington Navy Yard in 2013 to underscore the devastating impact of a failure to effectively vet security clearance holders such as Aaron Alexis, a defense contractor with a marked history of gun violence who was still issued a secret-level clearance.

□ 1615

Chief among the recommendations offered by the interagency council that President Obama convened to identify lapses in security clearance reviews was the need for agencies to have “access to relevant information from a variety of sources.”

As noted by William Evanina, the head of counterintelligence for the U.S. government since 2014, his quote is:

Social media has become an integral and very public part of the fabric of many Americans’ daily lives. And we cannot ignore this important open source in our effort to safeguard our national interests.

Moreover, a public social media profile adds to the “mosaic” of a person and may reveal to background investigators evidence suggesting a change in ideology, ill intent, vulnerability to blackmail, and allegiance to another country.

The integration of social media into security clearance background investigations falls in line with the unprecedented exploitation of Twitter, Facebook, WhatsApp, Telegram, and other networking services by terrorist organizations, including the Islamic State.

As reported by the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, the prolific use of social media by terrorist groups has not only facilitated the dissemination of propaganda, but also served as a primary global recruitment and financing tool.

Foreign governments are also increasingly relying on social media to advance their espionage efforts. According to open source reports, Chinese spy agencies have routinely resorted to using fake LinkedIn accounts to try to recruit Americans with access to government and commercial secrets.

“60 Minutes” recently reported that former CIA officer Kevin Mallory, who has been convicted on espionage charges, was first approached by his Chinese government handlers through the LinkedIn career networking site.

In advance of our 2016 subcommittee hearing on this issue, then-Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, directed Federal agencies to integrate public social media reviews into the security clearance process. While this directive was a step in the right direction, it has been incorporated quite unevenly and on a limited basis.

Our bill, H.R. 1065, will advance the full integration of this important reform to better ensure that our national security framework is adapting to evolving technologies much faster than the usual pace that is characteristic of the Federal Government.

I would note that, according to the annual job recruitment survey issued

by CareerBuilder, an online employment resource, seven out of 10 private sector employers have already incorporated social media reviews into their hiring process.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks in reference to this bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 1065.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank the gentleman, again, for his thoughtfulness on this particular piece of legislation. I know that he has worked with my previous colleague, now the Governor of Florida, Mr. DeSantis, and we have great bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the adoption and passing of H.R. 1065, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 1065, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1065.

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. HILL of California. 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.

ALLOWING WHISTLEBLOWERS TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION TO CERTAIN RECIPIENTS

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1064) to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1064

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

SECTION 1. RECIPIENTS OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES.

Section 2302(b)(8)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “or to the Inspector” and all that follows through “such disclosures” and inserting “the Inspector General of an agency, a supervisor in the employee’s direct chain of command up to and including the head of the employing agency, or to an employee designated by any of the aforementioned individuals for the purpose of receiving such disclosures”.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that

such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HILL 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 measure before us.

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

There was no objection.

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

I introduced this bill, along with the distinguished Congressman from North Carolina, Mr. MARK MEADOWS, to make it easier for whistleblowers to disclose wrongdoing. This bill would protect whistleblowers who report waste, fraud, or abuse, to their supervisors at a government agency.

Under current law, an employee would not be protected from retaliation for disclosing information to a supervisor, even if the employee reasonably believes it is necessary to expose a violation of a law, rule, or regulation. A whistleblower is currently only protected by law if they make their disclosures to the Office of Special Counsel, an Inspector General, Congress, the head of the whistleblower’s agency, or an employee designated by the head of the agency.

Under this bill, an employee who is covered by the Whistleblower Protection Act could report alleged misconduct to any supervisor in their direct chain of command. This sensible change in law would allow employees to provide evidence of wrongdoing to a supervisor instead of requiring employees to report all the way up to the head of an agency or an inspector general.

This change in the law would protect employees who use the proper channels at their agency to report waste, fraud, and abuse. Employees in the intelligence community already have these whistleblower protections as a result of a Presidential policy directive issued in 2012. This bill would ensure that all federal employees have the same protections as whistleblowers in the intelligence community.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1064, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on this effort. Any time that you support whistleblowers, it is a good day in Congress; and to do that a bipartisan way, with

the gentlewoman's leadership, is certainly a day that should be applauded. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Whistleblowers in the Federal Government should be able to tell their supervisor when something is going wrong. That is the truth, no matter what, especially in cases involving classified information which implies, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter of national security.

Under the current law, whistleblowers dealing with classified information in the intelligence community can make protected disclosures to their supervisors. However, whistleblowers dealing with classified information outside of the intelligence community do not have the same protection.

With fewer legally-protected options, employees outside of the intelligence community may be more likely to make an illegal disclosure to people or entities without the proper security clearance.

Federal employees dealing with classified information outside of the IC community must be reassured that they can report wrongdoing to the appropriate people, including their supervisors.

With that protection, whistleblowers will be less likely to disclose protected sensitive information on waste, fraud, and abuse to the media or other entities or individuals without the proper security clearance.

This bill would allow whistleblowers to make protected disclosures of classified information to individuals within their chain of command, as the gentlewoman has already suggested.

There are very few conceivable circumstances in which a whistleblower complaint to a supervisor would jeopardize national security, but such disclosures are not currently protected.

There is no reasonable basis for concern about whistleblowers throughout the Federal Government having the right to contact individuals within their chain of command about waste, fraud, or abuse of a classified nature. These additional whistleblower protections will make it easier for Federal employees to do the responsible thing when it comes to classified disclosures.

I urge my colleagues to support this. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1064, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1064, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT INFORMATION DATABASE ACT OF 2019

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 995) to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 995

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 "Settlement Agreement Information Database Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. INFORMATION REGARDING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—Chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 307. Information regarding settlement agreements

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'local government' has the meaning given that term in section 6501 of title 31.

"(2) ORDER TYPE.—The term 'order type' means the type of action or instrument used to settle a civil or criminal judicial action.

"(3) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term 'settlement agreement' means a settlement agreement (including a consent decree) that—

"(A) is entered into by an Executive agency; and

"(B) relates to an alleged violation of Federal civil or criminal law.

"(4) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, each territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

"(b) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT INFORMATION DATABASE.—

"(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY REQUIREMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the head of each Executive agency shall, in accordance with guidance issued pursuant to paragraph (2), submit the following information to the database established under paragraph (3):

"(i) A list of each settlement agreement, in a categorized and searchable format, entered into by the Executive agency, as a party to a lawsuit, which shall include, for each settlement agreement—

"(I) the order type of the settlement agreement;

"(II) the date on which the parties entered into the settlement agreement;

"(III) a list of specific violations that specify the basis for the action taken, with a description of the claims each party settled under the settlement agreement;

"(IV) the amount of attorneys' fees and other litigation costs awarded, if any, including a description of the statutory basis for such an award;

"(V) the amount each party settling a claim under the settlement agreement is obligated to pay under the settlement agreement;

"(VI) the total amount the settling parties are obligated to pay under the settlement agreement;

"(VII) the amount, if any, the settling party is obligated to pay that is expressly specified under the settlement agreement as a civil or criminal penalty or fine;

"(VIII) any payment made under the settlement agreement, including a description of any payment made to the Federal Government;

"(IX) the projected duration of the settlement agreement, if available;

"(X) a list of State or local governments that may be directly affected by the terms of the settlement agreement;

"(XI) a brief description of any economic data and methodology used to justify the terms of the settlement agreement;

"(XII) any modifications to the settlement agreement, when applicable;

"(XIII) notice and comments, when applicable; and

"(XIV) whether the settlement agreement is still under judicial enforcement and any period of time by which the parties agreed to have certain conditions met.

"(ii) A copy of each—

"(I) settlement agreement entered into by the Executive agency; and

"(II) statement issued under paragraph (4).

"(B) NONDISCLOSURE.—The requirement to submit information or a copy of a settlement agreement under subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the information or copy (or portion thereof)—

"(i) is subject to a confidentiality provision that prohibits disclosure of the information or copy (or portion thereof); and

"(ii) would not be disclosed under section 552, if the Executive agency provides a citation to the applicable exemption.

"(C) CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBLE AGENCY.—In a case in which an Executive agency is acting at the request or on behalf of another Executive agency (referred to as the originating agency), the originating agency is responsible for submitting information under subparagraph (A).

"(2) GUIDANCE.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance for Executive agencies to implement paragraph (1). Such guidance shall include the following:

"(A) Specific dates by which submissions must be made, not less than twice a year.

"(B) Data standards, including common data elements and a common, nonproprietary, searchable, machine-readable, platform independent format.

"(C) A requirement that the information and documents required under paragraph (1) are publicly available for a period starting on the date of the settlement through not less than 5 years after the termination of the settlement agreement.

"(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or the head of an Executive agency designated by the Director, shall establish and maintain a public, searchable, downloadable database for Executive agencies to directly upload and submit the information and documents required under paragraph (1) for immediate publication online.

"(4) STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY.—If the head of an Executive agency determines that a confidentiality provision in a settlement agreement, or the sealing of a settlement agreement, is required to protect the public interest of the United States, the head of the Executive agency may except the settlement agreement from the requirement in paragraph (1) and shall issue a written public statement stating why such action is required to protect the public interest of the United States, which shall explain—

"(A) what interests confidentiality protects; and

"(B) why the interests protected by confidentiality outweigh the public's interest in knowing about the conduct of the Federal Government and the expenditure of Federal resources."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“307. Information regarding settlement agreements.”.

(c) DEADLINE TO ESTABLISH DATABASE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance required by section 307(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and establish the settlement agreement information database required by section 307(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(d) DEADLINE FOR FIRST SUBMISSION.—Not later than 90 days after the Director issues guidance under section 307(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the head of each Executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code) shall begin submitting information to the database established under such section 307.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

Section 552(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) each settlement agreement (as defined in section 307) entered into by an Executive agency, with redactions for information that the agency may withhold under paragraph (8) and subsections (b) and (c) of this section;”.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to require the disclosure of information or records that any agency may properly withhold from public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Freedom of Information Act”).

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

This Act shall be effective 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply—

(1) with respect to any settlement agreement (as such term is defined in section 307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 2), entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) to the extent practicable, any such settlement agreement (as such term is defined in section 307 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 2) that remains in effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

I support this commonsense measure. The Settlement Agreement Information Database Act would create a database of settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies that relate to alleged violations of Federal, civil or criminal law.

The Office of Management and Budget would manage this database and set deadlines for submission. The heads of executive agencies would be required to submit details about the types of settlement agreements, the parties involved in the settlements, specific violations, and the dates on which the settlement agreements were agreed to.

The information about the settlement agreements would remain public until 5 years after the termination of the agreements. The information in the agreements would remain subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but if the head of the agency decided to keep an entire agreement confidential, he or she would be required to provide an explanation of that action.

This bill would improve the transparency surrounding settlement agreements which, in the past, have been difficult for the public to access.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 995. But before I do, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman on the passage, I believe, of her first bill here on the House floor; and go even further to say that, in keeping with this bipartisan support of H.R. 995, the Settlement Agreement Information Database Act of 2019 that was introduced, and is introduced, by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. Speaker, transparency and public participation are critical to maintaining the public trust in its government. However, Federal agencies have increasingly resolved litigation by entering into settlement agreements rather than going through a lengthy public trial.

Now settlement agreements are often negotiated behind closed doors. Those secret negotiations effectively prevent the public from participating in important policy sessions.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate this. When these settlements are done, when they are actually consummated, they set up future public policy, and to do that behind closed doors is certainly not something that a transparent government should be about.

State and local governments, industry stakeholders, and taxpayers are

often directly affected by these settlements, but unable to provide input.

For example, through the settlement agreement, the Environmental Protection Agency required the city of Fort Smith, Arkansas, to overhaul its sewer system in 12 years. Sewer utility bills increased by 167 percent in 3 years to fund the obligation of this agreement. At the same time, Fort Smith residents' income actually decreased by 11 percent.

The burden of a Federal settlement can be difficult to see and understand. Poor recordkeeping makes it impossible for Congress and the public to determine the full impact of the Federal settlement agreements.

Agencies release information about settlements at their discretion. Some agencies rely even on press releases to release the amount of information. So, as a result, the public only sees the facts through what the agency puts out and only in the most favorable light.

So, in many cases these closed-door negotiations, the terms of the settlement are deemed confidential. Without an explanation to the public, the process becomes even more opaque and seemingly arbitrary.

□ 1630

H.R. 995 will shine a light on Federal settlement agreements. This bill will require the establishment of electronic and publicly available databases for agencies' settlement agreements.

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

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), the sponsor of this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from North Carolina in congratulating the gentlewoman from California on passing her first bill. I now know what that broad smile was about when the “yeas” were announced.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's duty to serve the public interest relies on transparency and accountability to its citizens; however, since the 1970s, Federal agencies have increasingly chosen to avoid a public trial and settle litigation behind closed doors. The resulting consent decrees and settlement agreements can mandate terms beyond the scope of the original violation of Federal law and can lead to higher costs than a trial.

These agreements are nearly impossible to modify or vacate, and in many cases can remain in place for decades. In one instance in New York City, their special education program has been under a consent decree since 1972.

This process has influenced a range of public policies across governmental programs in States, counties, and cities, with elected officials inheriting the burden with little knowledge of the mandates or cost.

In Alabama, for instance, when former Member of Congress Governor Bob Riley was elected Governor of Alabama, he was going over the budget and saw the amount for legal fees and asked what it was for. He was informed of the number of consent decrees that the State was under and they were paying out these legal fees, and it was an enormous amount.

States, municipalities, industry, stakeholders, and taxpayers are often directly affected by the terms of the agreements but are prevented from participating in the negotiations. In some cases, the settlements are declared to be confidential and the contents sealed, without providing any explanation.

Unfortunately, there is no uniform standard for recordkeeping across Federal agencies. While some agencies have issued directives to streamline and publish this information, most of the public's access to Federal settlement agreement information is primarily issued, as my colleague from North Carolina pointed out, in the form of a press release. It is, therefore, impossible for the public to determine the comprehensive costs and outcomes of these settlement agreements.

This lack of transparency leaves elected officials, agency officials, and the public in the dark about the consent decrees that can impact them. Oftentimes, newly elected officials, as I said, from Governors to attorneys general to mayors are sworn in and inherit substantial legal obligations they were completely unaware of before they took office.

The Settlement Agreement Information Database Act will address this problem. The bill establishes a centralized and electronic database of settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies. Basic information about the settlement agreements already collected by Federal agencies, such as payments and dates, will be available to the public online through this database.

H.R. 995 provides long overdue transparency and accountability and standards to the Federal settlement agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL), for their support on this bill, and I urge my other colleagues to support this bill as well.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his leadership on this particular bill. I urge the adoption of it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentlemen from Alabama and from North Carolina for their congratulations and in sharing my excitement over the passage of my first bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 995, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 995, as amended.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CREATING ADVANCED STREAMLINED ELECTRONIC SERVICES FOR CONSTITUENTS ACT OF 2019

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1079) to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1079

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 "Creating Advanced Streamlined Electronic Services for Constituents Act of 2019" or the "CASES Act".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) congressional offices provide crucial services to constituents by acting as a liaison between the constituents and the respective agencies;

(2) this includes assisting constituents by making inquiries and working toward resolutions on behalf of the constituent with the respective agencies; and

(3) this process should be simplified through the creation of electronic forms that may be submitted under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act), thus modernizing the process for constituents and improving access and efficiency of Government services and agencies in order to expedite the resolution of the problem for which constituents sought help.

SEC. 3. OMB GUIDANCE ON ELECTRONIC CONSENT AND ACCESS FORMS.

(a) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue guidance that does the following:

(1) Requires each agency to accept electronic identity proofing and authentication processes for the purposes of allowing an individual to provide prior written consent for the disclosure of the individual's records under section 552a(b) of title 5, United States Code, or for individual access to records under section 552a(d) of such title.

(2) Creates a template for electronic consent and access forms and requires each agency to post the template on the agency website and to accept the forms from any individual properly identity proofed and au-

thenticated in accordance with paragraph (1) for the purpose of authorizing disclosure of the individual's records under section 552a(b) of title 5, United States Code, or for individual access to records under section 552a(d) of such title.

(3) Requires each agency to accept the electronic consent and access forms described in paragraph (2) from any individual properly identity proofed and authenticated in accordance with paragraph (1) for the purpose of authorizing disclosure of the individual's records to another entity, including a congressional office, in accordance with section 552a(b) of title 5, United States Code, or for individual access to records under section 552a(d).

(b) AGENCY COMPLIANCE.—Each agency shall comply with the guidance issued pursuant to subsection (a) not later than 1 year after the date on which such guidance is issued.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY; INDIVIDUAL; RECORD.—The terms "agency", "individual", and "record" have the meanings given those terms in section 552a(a) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HILL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HILL 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, the CASES for Constituents Act, introduced by Representatives GARRET GRAVES and JOE KENNEDY. This bill would modernize the way Federal agencies process Privacy Act waivers and make it easier for Members of Congress to help constituents get assistance from Federal agencies.

Our constituents are required to provide Federal agencies with written consent before our offices can obtain information from the agency on their behalf. Some agencies have outdated policies and still require these consent

forms to be mailed or faxed, which can be next to impossible in certain circumstances, such as after a major storm or other natural disaster.

Under this bill, the Office of Management and Budget would be required to create a template for electronic consent forms and issue guidance to agencies requiring them to accept such forms.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisan way in which this bill was developed, and I thank Representatives GRAVES and KENNEDY for their diligent efforts to address this problem.

This is a good bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1079, the CASES for Constituents Act, introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and, as was mentioned, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

I have some prepared remarks, Mr. Speaker, but let me just deviate from that for just a second.

Finally, two people have come together to get rid of the archaic way that we have to get disclosures, that only go to hurt our constituents whom we aim to serve. I mean, only in the government do we have this kind of way where we actually have to make sure that we run it over by a carrier pigeon to get something done.

All of us have been together where we are trying to serve our constituents. Sometimes it is very time sensitive, Mr. Speaker, and what do they want?

Well, you need to go get the privacy release form.

And if you go get the privacy release form: Well, no. That is not okay. You have got to get their actual signature.

And so we are sending people all over.

So it is with heartfelt gratitude, Mr. Speaker, that I want to thank these two gentlemen for doing something that is not only common sense but much needed.

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

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I will just note for the record that I believe faxes may or may not have ended their usefulness before I was born.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for her support and for her observation about the utility of fax machines; the gentleman from North Carolina as well for his comments of support; and my colleague, Mr. GRAVES, for his leadership, his advocacy on this piece of legislation, and for his determination in getting this done. It was a long, long slog to try to navigate our way through the morass to get there, but we did, and Mr. GRAVES' office deserves a lot of credit for that.

We were able to clear the House unanimously last year, Mr. Speaker, and I am excited for our prospects this year.

Importantly, as well, Mr. Speaker, today is the first time that identical texts have been introduced in the United States Senate. Senators CARPER and PORTMAN are taking the lead, and I look forward to our offices working together to get this bill across the finish line.

For all the attention that is placed on Members of Congress when we are in Washington, there is no more important responsibility of this job than helping our constituents back home. Whether assisting a veteran seeking benefits or a retiree accessing Medicare, we can ease the burden off of our neighbors' shoulders by getting them the help that they have earned.

When one of our constituents calls our office, whether it is in Newton, Massachusetts, or in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, they don't ask us about our political parties or policy positions; they just ask for a little bit of help.

Usually, those neighbors only reach our office when they have fought every other battle possible first; but too often, archaic rules, as outlined by Mr. MEADOWS, build obstacles in our efforts to provide that help. With the CASES for Constituents Act, we can modernize our government, streamline that process, and more directly assist them when they need it.

Let's bring the casework process a step closer to the 21st century and provide electronic access to privacy release forms.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) in support of this particular piece of legislation that he and the gentleman who just spoke have led so eloquently and diligently on.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, years ago, they created something called the internet. If you are not familiar with it, I would urge you to go to your local library, go to the card catalog system to get the right Dewey decimal number, go find a book, and read up on it, because apparently many in our Federal Government haven't realized that this has been created.

As was noted a little while ago, in 1974, there was an act called the Privacy Act that was passed—1974. Since that time, we have had companies like Apple and Amazon and Microsoft and many others that have proliferated and are now worth billions and billions of dollars, some of the largest companies in the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is similar to us having to mail in a form to get an ambulance to come to our house.

As was noted by some of the previous speakers, in many cases, people con-

tact us because of emergency situations. We have had family members contact us when their loved ones were stuck overseas in emergency situations. We have had people contact us because there was water filling up their home and they needed emergency services at the time. Under the Privacy Act of 1974 that was written 45 years ago, we were unable to help them, as Mr. MEADOWS noted, unless they sent us a signed privacy release form.

I remember distinctly, in August of 2016, when we had a record flood in my home State of Louisiana, talking to constituents who were on their cellphones saying that their homes had 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 feet of water and asking for help with FEMA, the Small Business Administration, and other government services, and myself or other folks on our team having to tell them: You bet, we want to help you. All you need to do is go to your computer, go to this website, click the link, print it out.

You can imagine the response from people: I would love to be able to go to my computer right now. I would love to be able to find it, if it wasn't under 4 feet of water right now.

Incredibly frustrating.

Mr. Speaker, the government today has a customer service approval rating of 70 percent—70 percent is the customer service approval rating. While that was sufficient to get me through high school, that is not okay for the Federal Government. It is entirely inappropriate.

This bill simply updates the Federal Government to put it online with how we file our taxes, how we handle our banking, insurance, and virtually everything else we do, ensuring that when people contact us, we can use those same technologies to protect privacy, that we can ensure the right people are asking for the right approvals, and we can quickly, within minutes, begin providing them services through their own Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for persevering and continuing to work with us on this. I want to thank my friends, Mr. MEADOWS from North Carolina and Ms. HILL from California. Thank you all very much for doing this.

This is bipartisan. This is common sense. It should have been done decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Jennifer Bollinger, Eric Fins, all the OGR staff and others who helped get this bill done, and I am looking forward to passage.

I urge full support.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to go ahead and close, if we can, at this particular point, but before I do so, I want to thank all of our staff.

It is so easy at times for us to get up here, and yet the legislation that gets introduced oftentimes is not just due to our personal staff in our offices, but the committee staff, and so I want to make sure that I emphasize that today.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this final comment.

NAYS—3

Biggs	Gaetz	Gohmert
-------	-------	---------

NOT VOTING—51

Abraham	Crow	Meeks
Allred	Dingell	Meng
Babin	Duffy	Olson
Bishop (UT)	Escobar	Quigley
Bost	Gabbard	Ratcliffe
Boyle, Brendan F.	Graves (MO)	Richmond
Brooks (AL)	Hayes	Rush
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Ryan
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Shimkus
Carter (GA)	Kaptur	Simpson
Carter (TX)	Kind	Vargas
Clay	Kinzinger	Wagner
Cloud	Lawrence	Walorski
Collins (GA)	Lipinski	Watson Coleman
Collins (NY)	Loeb sack	Weber (TX)
Costa	Lofgren	Wilson (FL)
Cox (CA)	Loudermilk	
	Marchant	

□ 1857

Ms. ADAMS, Messrs. ARRINGTON, and GOSAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 76.

CREATING ADVANCED STREAM-LINED ELECTRONIC SERVICES FOR CONSTITUENTS 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. 1079) to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, and for other purposes, as amended, 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 California (Ms. HILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 0, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—379

Adams	Beyer	Calvert
Aderholt	Biggs	Carbajal
Aguilar	Bilirakis	Cárdenas
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)
Amash	Blumenauer	Carter (GA)
Amodei	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Armstrong	Bonamici	Case
Arrington	Brady	Casten (IL)
Axne	Brindisi	Castor (FL)
Bacon	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Baird	Brownley (CA)	Chabot
Balderson	Buchanan	Cheney
Banks	Buck	Chu, Judy
Barr	Bucshon	Cicilline
Barragán	Budd	Cisneros
Bass	Burchett	Clark (MA)
Beatty	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bera	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bergman	Byrne	Cline

Clyburn	Hollingsworth	Omar
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Palazzo
Cole	Horsford	Pallone
Comer	Houlahan	Palmer
Conaway	Hoyer	Panetta
Connolly	Hudson	Pappas
Cook	Huffman	Pascrell
Cooper	Hunter	Payne
Correa	Hurd (TX)	Pence
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Craig	Jayapal	Perry
Crawford	Jeffries	Peters
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Peterson
Crist	Johnson (SD)	Phillips
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	Pingree
Cummings	Jordan	Pocan
Cunningham	Joyce (OH)	Porter
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Posey
Davids (KS)	Katko	Pressley
Davidson (OH)	Keating	Raskin
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Reed
Davis, Danny K.	Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Rice (NY)
Dean	Kennedy	Rice (SC)
DeFazio	Khanna	Riggleman
DeGette	Kildee	Roby
DeLauro	Kilmer	Rodgers (WA)
DelBene	Kim	Roe, David P.
Delgado	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Demings	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick	Rooney (FL)
DesJarlais	Krishnamoorthi	Rose (NY)
Deutch	Kuster (NH)	Rose, John W.
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Rouda
Doggett	LaHood	Rouzer
Doyle, Michael F.	LaMalfa	Roy
Duncan	Lamb	Roybal-Allard
Dunn	Lamborn	Ruiz
Emmer	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Rutherford
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
Españillat	Latta	Sarbanes
Estes	Lawson (FL)	Scalise
Evans	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
Ferguson	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky
Finkenauer	Lesko	Schiff
Fitzpatrick	Levin (CA)	Schneider
Fleischmann	Levin (MI)	Schrader
Fletcher	Lewis	Schrier
Flores	Lieu, Ted	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Long	Scott (VA)
Foster	Lowenthal	Scott, Austin
Foxx (NC)	Lowe y	Scott, David
Frankel	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Serrano
Fulcher	Luján	Sewell (AL)
Gaetz	Luria	Shalala
Gallagher	Lynch	Sherman
Gallego	Malinowski	Sherrill
Garamendi	Maloney,	Sires
García (IL)	Carolyn B.	Slotkin
García (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Smith (MO)
Gianforte	Marshall	Smith (NE)
Gibbs	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	Mast	Smith (WA)
Golden	Matsui	Smucker
Gomez	McAdams	Soto
Gonzalez (OH)	McBath	Spanberger
Gonzalez (TX)	McCarthy	Spano
Gooden	McCaul	Speier
Gosar	McClintock	Stanton
Gothelmer	McCollum	Stauber
Granger	McEachin	Stefanik
Graves (GA)	McGovern	Steil
Graves (LA)	McHenry	Steube
Green (TN)	McKinley	Stevens
Green (TX)	McNerney	Stewart
Griffith	Meadows	Stivers
Grijalva	Meuser	Suozzi
Grothman	Miller	Swalwell (CA)
Guest	Mitchell	Takano
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Taylor
Haaland	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (CA)
Hagedorn	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Harder (CA)	Morrelle	Thompson (PA)
Harris	Moulton	Thornberry
Hartzer	Mucarsel-Powell	Timmons
Hastings	Mullin	Tipton
Heck	Murphy	Titus
Hern, Kevin	Nader	Tlaib
Herrera Beutler	Napolitano	Tonko
Hice (GA)	Neal	Torres (CA)
Higgins (LA)	Neguse	Torres Small
Higgins (NY)	Newhouse	(NM)
Hill (AR)	Norcross	Trahan
Hill (CA)	Norman	Trone
Himes	Nunes	Turner
Holding	O'Halleran	Underwood
	Ocasio-Cortez	Upton

Van Drew	Wasserman	Williams
Veasey	Schultz	Wilson (SC)
Vela	Waters	Wittman
Velázquez	Watkins	Womack
Visclosky	Webster (FL)	Woodall
Walberg	Welch	Wright
Walden	Wenstrup	Yarmuth
Walker	Westerman	Yoho
Waltz	Wexton	Young
	Wild	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—52

Abraham	Dingell	Meeks
Allred	Duffy	Meng
Babin	Escobar	Olson
Bishop (UT)	Gabbard	Price (NC)
Bost	Graves (MO)	Quigley
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hayes	Ratcliffe
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Richmond
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Ryan
Carter (TX)	Kaptur	Shimkus
Clay	Kind	Simpson
Cloud	Kinzinger	Vargas
Collins (GA)	Lawrence	Wagner
Collins (NY)	Lipinski	Walorski
Costa	Loeb sack	Watson Coleman
Cox (CA)	Lofgren	Weber (TX)
Crow	Loudermilk	Wilson (FL)
	Marchant	

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, due to personal illness, I missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 76 and “Yea” on rollcall No. 77.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, as I am back home in Dallas, Texas, on paternity leave with my family, I submit the following vote explanation.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 76 and YEA on Roll Call No. 77.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 37, REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-8) on the resolution (H. Res. 122) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the

House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING THE LIFE, ACHIEVEMENTS, AND DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE OF JOHN DAVID DINGELL, JR., AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO HIS FAMILY ON HIS PASSING

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 120, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House; and further, I ask unanimous consent that it be read in full.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 120

Whereas the death of former chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Representative John David Dingell, Jr., on February 8, 2019, brought not only a sense of deep personal loss to his family, including his wife Representative Debbie Dingell of Michigan's 12th Congressional District and his children and grandchildren, to his many former colleagues and friends, but also to the institution of the House of Representatives and to the Nation;

Whereas John Dingell represented the people of southeastern Michigan with distinction in the House for 59 years, from December 13, 1955, to January 3, 2015, making him the longest serving Member of either chamber of Congress in its history to date;

Whereas John Dingell's father, the late John David Dingell, Sr., preceded him in service as a Member of the House from March 4, 1933, to September 19, 1955, and his wife Debbie Dingell succeeded him on January 3, 2015, and continues to serve, and Michiganders have entrusted John Sr., John Jr., and Debbie Dingell together to serve as their voice in the Congress for the past 86 years;

Whereas John Dingell was raised from the age of six in southeast Michigan, his parents' home State, and where his father was elected to serve in the Seventy Third Congress;

Whereas John Dingell was fiercely proud of his Polish-American roots and throughout his life shared the joys of his heritage with others, including delivering paczki pastries to colleagues, House staff, and visitors to the Capitol;

Whereas John Dingell's first taste of public service and participation in government was as a page for the House of Representatives;

Whereas John Dingell, while serving as a House page, was in the Hall of the House on December 8, 1941, to witness President Franklin Roosevelt deliver his iconic address asking for a declaration of war against Japan following the bombing of Pearl Harbor;

Whereas John Dingell was drafted into the United States Army at the age of 18 and served honorably;

Whereas John Dingell received both his B.S. and J.D. degrees from Georgetown University and then served in private law practice, as a park ranger with the National Park Service, and as an assistant prosecutor before his election to the House;

Whereas John Dingell was elected to the House following the death of his father in 1955 and was reelected 29 times;

Whereas John Dingell took up the mantle of advocating for affordable health insurance coverage for the Nation's seniors, as championed by his father, and worked to secure the enactment of Medicare in 1965, presided over its passage in the House, and was on hand to witness its signing into law by President Lyndon Johnson;

Whereas John Dingell was a crusader for the environment, helping to author and shepherd to passage the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act;

Whereas John Dingell fought to make civil rights a part of Democrats' platform in 1960, standing up to those who believed it would alienate certain voters and declaring that it was the right thing to do;

Whereas John Dingell was a strong supporter in the House of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Civil Rights Act of 1960, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas John Dingell served as chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce from January 3, 1981, to January 3, 1995, and again from January 3, 2007, to January 3, 2009, and served as its ranking minority member during the years in between, making him the senior Democratic member on that Committee for 26 years;

Whereas during every Congress in which he served, John Dingell introduced legislation to provide universal access to health care, and he invited Speaker Nancy Pelosi to use the gavel with which he presided over passage of Medicare in 1965 to preside over the Affordable Care Act's passage in the House in 2010;

Whereas John Dingell, over the course of his tenure, served with eleven Presidents (Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, Bush, and Obama);

Whereas John Dingell served as Dean of the House from January 3, 1995, until January 3, 2015;

Whereas John Dingell retired from the House in 2015 and was succeeded by his beloved wife, whom he referred to as his "lovely Deborah", who carries on his legacy and now serves as co-chair of the Democratic Policy and Communications Committee in the Democratic Caucus;

Whereas, in 2014, President Barack Obama awarded John Dingell the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor;

Whereas John Dingell, both before and after his retirement, gathered a large following on Twitter, where he demonstrated his wit, wisdom, and clever commentary on the Nation's politics, while promoting greater civility, patriotism, tolerance, justice, and inclusion; and

Whereas John Dingell was held in the highest esteem by Members of the House from both parties, not only because of his record tenure in office but because of his sharp intellect, good humor, congeniality, and belief in working together to achieve consensus through trust and camaraderie: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the life, achievements, and distinguished public service of John David Dingell, Jr.; and

(2) expresses condolences to his family on his passing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, and recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the born-alive bill so we can stand up and protect the sanctity of human life, and I would ask all others to join that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

□ 1915

NATIONAL CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus to recognize February as National CTE Month. Today, my good friend and caucus co-chair, Representative THOMPSON, and I introduced a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of CTE Month.

This resolution is particularly important because many Americans still hold an outdated view of CTE as a plan B. In fact, today it is quite the opposite. The CTE programs are academic pathways that allow students to explore careers in high demand, high-paying industries that are relevant in today's society from healthcare to advanced manufacturing to IT.

CTE Month is a time not only to celebrate the achievements of CTE students, like the bright and motivated SkillsUSA students from Rhode Island who visit my office each year, but to spread awareness of today's CTE and its potential to help students and businesses succeed.

Mr. Speaker, society needs workers with these skills that are in demand today, and I want to thank Representative THOMPSON for his partnership and urge my colleagues to join us in supporting CTE programs across the country.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, after the conclusion of the last shutdown, I was hopeful that we would work together in good faith to find a commonsense approach to secure our border. However, it appears that the Democrats are more concerned with releasing illegal aliens than addressing border security.

Recently, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have suggested that we reduce the adult detention beds for illegal detainees in exchange for border security. This is unacceptable. As we in this body are all aware, adult detention beds are an essential aspect of enforcing our immigration laws. Reducing the amount of beds would further exacerbate our problems with interior enforcement, thus relying on an ineffective catch and release policy. Only 4 percent of those released ever show up for their court date. That means that they have a 96 percent chance of staying in this country.

Our primary role of government is security. Border security is national security, and our national security should not be a bargaining chip for the Democrats' political games. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to take this issue seriously.

Please stop playing political games with our Nation's security and the brave men and women of our Coast Guard, TSA, CBP, and ICE agents. We must work together as Americans and fix our broken immigration system which starts with a secure border.

CONGRESSIONAL CHILDREN'S CAUCUS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the clarity that I would like to offer is that none of us should tolerate any shutdown of the government or ever holding our Federal workers hostage to policy debates, and that is for my colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle and for this administration.

But I think in all fairness, the clarity on the question of detention beds is to make sure that the criminals are detained and to make sure that women and children, like little 9-month-old Roger, have alternative housing. That is the debate. But that debate can go on and go on beyond holding the government hostage and our workers hostage.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce the fact that I am establishing the Congressional Children's Caucus, as we have done every year since I have been here. Our focus is for better quality of life for children, not only in this Nation but around the world. One of the priorities will be hunger amongst children here in the United States and around the world.

It is noteworthy that children do go to bed hungry here in the United States, and it is important that we support the food nutrition programs and the lunch, breakfast, and dinner programs in our public schools.

We must ensure that this Nation protects its children.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because every American should know that we are now at the point where the Democrats are demanding that ICE release dangerous criminals onto the streets of the United States.

First, they demanded that we not build a wall. Their leader said that would be immoral. Now they are demanding that we release dangerous criminals we have already apprehended.

Mr. Speaker, they are threatening to shut the government down, they are so committed to this position. Most Americans know their government's most sacred obligation is the defense of the Nation. The Democrats want to abolish one of the very agencies tasked with this responsibility. This is a backdoor effort to do so.

Under this latest proposal, ICE has said they could be required to release as many as 15,000 criminals on to our streets. The far left radical positions of today's Democrats are threatening the security of our Nation.

It is time to build the wall, secure our borders, support our law enforcement, and keep dangerous criminals off our streets.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday marks 1 year since the horrific shooting in Parkland, Florida, that took 17 precious lives. My community faced our own tragedy just 9 months later when 12 of our friends and neighbors were stolen from us at the Borderline Bar and Grill.

As our communities continue to mourn these devastating tragedies, we must also honor the memories of those we lost with action. There is no single answer that will stop every incident of gun violence, but to do nothing with the argument that it will not fix everything is unconscionable.

One of the first steps we need to take is passing H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act, which is being considered by the House Judiciary Committee this week.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill, a critical first step to keeping deadly weapons out of the wrong hands.

CAPPING ICE'S DETENTION CAPACITY

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the dangerous proposal that is being put forth by leadership on the other side of the aisle, the Democratic proposal to place an artificial and arbitrary cap on ICE's detention capacity.

ICE is outstanding at arresting gang members, felons, drug dealers, and human traffickers, but now Speaker PELOSI and Minority Leader SCHUMER want to limit how many they catch. This represents a breakdown in law and order and will only make our broken border less secure.

It does not make sense to tell a State trooper that he can only pull over 10 people and then must stop, or a city cop saying: once you catch your second thief, she must stop.

Does the next person committing an illegal act get a free pass because we have hit some magic number?

Our country embraces the rule of law. We do not get to pick and choose, especially when it pertains to our national security.

I urge the Democratic leadership to withdraw this ludicrous proposal and come to the negotiating table. It is about time we work together, but we will not and cannot undermine our national security and the safety of our communities.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AND A BORDER WALL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our broken immigration system and our need to overcome partisan politics to find a solution. The most glaring example of this broken system and the one most endangering to American citizens is our porous southern border. Tens of thousands of illegal immigrants bypass checkpoints and avoid our immigration laws by using that border to gain access to America.

But my colleagues across the aisle refuse to see the issue. They ignore all the evidence to push their political agenda and discredit the President at the expense of Americans' security. They now have found a new excuse—the number of ICE's adult detention beds.

Let's be clear what this stunt is: a backdoor attempt to defund ICE, prevent them from doing their critical mission, and attempt to appease those demanding open borders.

I sincerely urge my colleagues across the aisle to come to the table to negotiate in good faith for the safety and security of all Americans. We need border security along our southern border

which includes a wall structure, and we need ICE to achieve its public safety mission.

To the Democrats: Stop these last-minute games and let's do our job for the American people.

SUPPORTING OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of American tradition and heritage, American law enforcement, and the sovereignty of our Nation.

I stand here in the Chamber of the people's House, a 57-year-old American man who has never witnessed such division and insanity as I have observed here in D.C., where right is wrong, where American traditions are rejected, where Christian principles are ridiculed, where many of my colleagues across the aisle envision an America with no sovereign borders, no fossil fuels, and no Second Amendment, a land where no airplanes fly, where police cannot arrest, and where jails do not exist.

I remind my colleagues that we are here to serve the best interests and security of the American people. We were not elected by citizens of foreign soil, nor should we allow our bicameral, bipartisan Congress to become infected with anti-American sentiment.

GOLD JOURNEY TO EXCELLENCE AWARD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the eighth consecutive year, the Juniata Valley Council, Boy Scouts of America, achieved the Gold Journey to Excellence Award.

It was an honor to celebrate this outstanding achievement yesterday with the council as well as volunteers at the unit, district, and council levels, as well as the Scouts and parents in Centre, Huntingdon, Juniata, and Mifflin Counties in central Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the Journey to Excellence Award measures a council's performance in a range of areas; including fiscal management, membership growth and retention, and program excellence; including camping, advancement, and community service, among other areas.

These key performance areas are directly related to producing successful, growing, and sustainable Scouting programs. I am incredibly proud of the Juniata Valley Boy Scout Council, which I have been a member of for four decades. The annual recognition dinner is a time to celebrate achievements, and I was pleased to see Jonathan Long of my hometown recognized as the Howard Cub Pack Leader of the Year.

Scouting makes a difference in the lives of so many youth. I congratulate the Juniata Council on this outstanding achievement.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to address the dangerous proposal being put forth by Democrats in the ongoing negotiations to secure our border and fund the government.

Talks on this issue are now stalled because Democrats are demanding a cap in the number of beds allocated to detain illegal criminals. But this new initiative blatantly contradicts what our leaders on the ground are asking us to do on this issue.

Just this weekend, the National Sheriffs' Association and the Major County Sheriffs of America both stated: "Any legislation that reduces ICE's detention capacity would hinder its ability to perform its national security and public safety missions. . . . In order to meet the cap being tentatively proposed by Congress, ICE would be compelled to release thousands of aliens from custody."

The sheriffs went on to say that if the Democrats' plans were approved, then 9,000 illegal immigrants would have to be released by the end of the fiscal year. That is 9,000 criminals.

We need to focus on securing our border, funding the wall, and making our country safer, not protecting criminals and sending them back onto the streets to endanger our citizens.

We need to listen to these recommendations.

□ 1930

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to finally come to the table for a meaningful discussion around securing our Nation's borders.

The Democrats' leadership would have the entire country believe that our President and the Republicans are the ones holding up negotiations to avoid another unnecessary government shutdown, but it is the President and

the House Republicans who have come to the bargaining table in good faith.

Just this week, there were rumors that a deal was near with less border funding than the President and my party wanted. That is what happens in negotiations: We give, and they take.

Now that we are close to a deal being cut, the Democrats are moving the goalpost, Mr. Speaker. This brand-new cap on ICE detention beds came out of thin air and is proof that the Democrats are willing to do anything to keep from making a deal with the President and the Republicans.

What is worse, the move by the Democrats would make our country less secure. It is just a backdoor attempt to get rid of ICE entirely.

The citizens of this country deserve better, Mr. Speaker. They deserve a government that works. Let's do the job our constituents sent us here to do.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, sheriffs from across the country are in D.C. this week, and they have a simple message for Congress: Secure the border.

These sheriffs know that border security will help stem the flow of illegal drugs and human trafficking which affect communities all across the country.

The sheriffs warn that a new demand from my colleagues across the aisle could mean over 8,000 criminals would have to be released by authorities.

They wrote: "This dangerous Congressional proposal not only jeopardizes the risk of our national security, but hinders our law enforcement officers from effectively enforcing and upholding the law and protecting their communities."

In other words, this demand does not make our country safer.

We need to empower law enforcement to hold criminal aliens, when appropriate, to protect our communities. The last thing we should do is release dangerous criminals from custody.

I urge negotiators to come to an agreement to secure our border, build the wall—a barrier, a fence, a partition, a panel. I am less interested in semantics and more interested in supporting the law enforcement officers who are on the front lines every day protecting our communities.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, instead of working in good faith to secure our borders and reach a compromise to

avoid another shutdown, House Democrats have other ideas.

They argue that allowing ICE to increase adult detention beds from 40,000 to 52,000 is actually a bad idea—unbelievable.

Is there any solution the Democrats pose for securing our borders and our sovereign Nation?

They don't want the agency to have the capacity to detain more illegal immigrants who cross into the United States. Instead, just flow right in, increasing the risk to our citizens, as we see time and time again, especially in my home State of California.

Right now, there are 48,000 illegal immigrants detained thanks to the increased enforcement of our sovereign border laws under this administration.

Our county sheriffs are greatly concerned, however, that the new numbers that the Democrats are posing for us will release up to 10,000 illegal immigrants—criminals, even—onto our streets, into our country.

Instead of providing additional beds and allowing our Border Patrol agents to do their jobs, they have actually proposed to knock that number down to 35,000.

It appears my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather release illegal immigrants into the community, many of them traffickers, endangering our public.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, what do we think would happen in this country if we said we were only going to lock up 1,000 people, total, for murder? Well, probably, after the thousandth person was arrested and locked up, you would have a lot more murders, not less, because people would think they could get away with it.

The caravans that are forming in Central and South America and coming toward our southern border aren't shrinking; they are growing. That is why Democrats don't want us to be able to lock up all the people who commit the crime of unlawful entry into the country, because they want to induce that illegal immigration.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we want to stop it, and our negotiators are operating in good faith, but now Democrats are adding new issues.

Here is my challenge to Speaker PELOSI: If she has got a bill that can pass with Democratic votes to secure the border, put it on the floor, because we are tired of negotiating when the goalposts keep moving, when the terms keep changing, and when Democrats do not appear sincere about securing our border.

It is like we are negotiating against a ghost. We are tired of it, and the American people are tired of it.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Ms. SÁNCHEZ, California
Mr. LARSEN, Washington
Mrs. DAVIS, California
Mr. MEEKS, New York
Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE, Pennsylvania
Mr. COSTA, California

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend our deepest sympathies, prayers, and certainly our thoughts to the family of John Dingell and WALTER JONES.

I did not know Mr. Dingell and only came after and served with his lovely wife, DEBBIE DINGELL, but certainly wish all of their family our extended prayers.

And the same goes for one of our North Carolina delegation members, WALTER JONES, and his family, Joe Anne and Ashley, who served faithfully for North Carolinians for a quarter of a century.

Certainly, we will remember those, as we already have tonight, in our Prayer Caucus in praying for both families.

I don't really have any speeches written out tonight but do want to talk about a couple of areas that I believe are continuing to impact our country, maybe two of the foremost areas: border security, and then I want to talk a little bit about where our country stands in the pro-life movement.

Let me start with border security. This seems to be happening in real time. In fact, just last night, Mr. Speaker, I received a phone call from a local sheriff who is part of the 3,000 sheriff representatives in the National Sheriffs' Association. You see, they are becoming more and more concerned as we get less and less, as a body, concerned about border security.

They reached out to me last night and said: Fifty of us would like to de-

liver a letter to the Capitol to Members of Congress, specifically Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and Ranking Member KAY GRANGER. Our plans weren't to arrive until this afternoon, but we quickly made arrangements to be here this morning.

If these 50 sheriffs were going to travel all over the country, States from Massachusetts to Arizona to Washington to Texas, the least we could do would be to be here and to greet them, which we did.

On a very cold, rainy morning this morning, we met these 50 sheriffs on the Capitol steps, at which time they handed to me this letter, and I would like to read it this evening. It says:

Dear Chairwoman NITA LOWEY and Ranking Member KAY GRANGER:

On behalf of more than 3,000 sheriffs represented by both the National Sheriffs' Association and the Major County Sheriffs of America, we write in opposition to Congress' most recent deliberation to place an artificial cap on Immigration and Customs Enforcement's detention capacity.

Now, I am going to explain this in just a little bit and get into detail.

Capping the number of detention beds utilized by ICE not only jeopardizes the integrity of the immigration system, but would cripple ICE's ability to detain criminal aliens and other aliens who pose a risk to public safety or are a flight risk.

They continue:

Any legislation that reduces ICE's detention capacity would hinder its ability to perform its national security and public safety missions but, also, impact local law enforcement's ability to protect the communities they serve.

You know, we have heard a lot from some of our Democratic colleagues who say the people who should be making these decisions or the people who should be informing us of these decisions are the people with the most experience. Well, here is our National Sheriffs' Association, 3,000-strong, sitting representatives here.

They go on to say:

In order to meet the cap being tentatively proposed by Congress, ICE would be compelled to release thousands of aliens from custody.

Now, listen to this data point:

To achieve the 16,500 adult average detainee population—ADP—caps for the remaining 7 months of the fiscal year, a net reduction of 9,264 adults by the end of this fiscal year would be required.

Now, what does that mean? It means, if you are not meeting the caps, these folks, these criminal aliens, are going to get released.

You say, well, are these criminal aliens? Here is the number:

Approximately 72 percent of ICE's current detention population is subject to mandatory detention due to the alien having certain convictions or having committed certain acts.

So, of that number, 72 percent we know of, we are just going to say, or the Democrats want us to say, Mr. Speaker, that we just need to release these because we want to put a cap, just pick a number out of the air because we don't think we should have

more than that, no matter what kind of crimes they committed.

This is ludicrous.

They conclude by saying:

Placing a cap on ICE detention beds would undermine the efficacy of the immigration system and reduce the number of aliens who are removed from the United States.

They use these words:

This dangerous congressional proposal not only jeopardizes the risk of our national security, but hinders our law enforcement officers from effectively enforcing and upholding the law and protecting their communities.

There you have it. They are saying the reduction of these detention beds, which is just a backhanded way of defunding Immigration and Customs Enforcement, would hinder them from doing their job.

So tonight I am reminding my Democratic colleagues that, by pushing for the reduction of detention beds, these sheriffs, who serve for little pay and serve in dangerous situations in many places, in many remote areas, they are telling my colleagues: Don't do this. This puts us in a dangerous situation. This puts our communities in a more dangerous situation when we allow thousands of criminal aliens to be put back in the different communities on the streets.

This is preposterous.

The National Sheriffs' Association and the Major County Sheriffs of America oppose the current budget proposal and urge Congress to consider the dangerous ramifications that passing this depreciated budget could have on the citizens of America.

Mr. Speaker, these aren't my words. Mr. Speaker, these aren't the words of our minority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, or our whip, STEVE SCALISE, or our chair, LIZ CHENEY. These are the words of our local county sheriffs, urging and pleading: Do not continue to push for this.

It is a real shame that these sheriffs have to come to Washington, D.C.—33 degrees outside, in the rain—to plead with a Member of Congress to try and stop such a preposterous suggestion.

As they stood today—and I brought them inside the Capitol, gave them a quick tour, even took them over into the Rayburn Room, and we talked a little bit. We talked about how structures work, how steel slats work. We talked about the places of San Diego and El Paso, where there has been a drastic reduction in crime.

You see, these sheriffs get it. These sheriffs are elected officials themselves and have a duty to uphold the law, much like the same oath that Members of Congress take to protect and serve the American people.

Structures work.

Now the Democrats, at the last minute, are trying another ploy by trying to come up with some crazy suggestion that we should reduce the amount of detention beds, putting a cap on it, automatically releasing criminal aliens. It is time for my Democratic

colleagues to put up or shut up when it comes to being genuine about border security.

One of the things that we have seen recently is not only a lackadaisical approach about border security, but we have also seen it in the protection and the sanctity of human life.

□ 1945

Many Members are very passionate and should be so. You see, this isn't about an argument over how much funding a certain project should receive. This isn't about a preference on a particular issue that comes out of committee. The reason this has brought so much passion over the last 50 years is because this has to do with human life.

I can tell you, as a former pastor and being in the hospital room when a loved one breathed their last breath, I have seen how families had yearned for just another hour, another day. It is a very sad and tragic situation. They would have given everything they had for another few precious minutes with that loved one: a son, a daughter, a dad, a brother, a sister, a mom.

Yet we have cheapened life to the place, in these Hallowed Halls, that it has simply become a political pawn, a bargaining chip. How did we get to this place?

The other night, the night before the National Prayer Breakfast, I was speaking with a wonderful representative, a lady from the country of Latvia, who was appalled at our abortion laws, who are so much further than anything we see in Europe.

When we have to begin to talk about only six other countries that have such extreme abortion laws as ours, is that not a wake-up call?

When the Governor of New York, Mr. Speaker, continues to advocate with such lack of respect for human life, is that not a wake-up call?

When Governor Ralph Northam begins to talk about infanticide, is that not a wake-up call?

What does it take for everyday Americans to say enough is enough when it comes to human life?

Right now, we are trying to bring to the floor a Born-Alive Abortion Protection Act. What does it say? Well, it is not overwhelming too much. It basically says, if a baby survives a botched abortion, then the providers would be required by law to sustain its life. Yet we can't get it to the floor.

The reason why is because, when it was introduced last time, last cycle, we had several brave, strong Democrats who had the courage to step forward and vote for a piece of legislation that would require providers to sustain life during these times.

I remember I was so moved by that kind of courage nearly a year or so ago that I went back to my office and wrote thank-you cards to those Democrats who were willing to stand up for the sanctity of human life.

What is it worth to us? Not only is the Born-Alive Protection Act some-

thing that is important; I would even add another bill that was passed out of the House, not taken up before the Senate, the Pain-Capable Child Protection Act, that would limit abortions after 20 weeks to only specific circumstances.

What is it going to take for our country to put the kind of concern and the favor that God's creation deserves?

Speaking of God's creation, Mr. Speaker, our Speaker of the House, just 3 days ago, sent this tweet out that I will read. She said: "We have a moral responsibility to protect God's creation for generations to come." That is why, today, she was naming a select committee not on the sanctity of human life, but on climate control.

We need to take a look at all the issues, but we need to stand as Members of Congress for those who cannot stand for themselves. We need to be a voice for those who have no voice.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to continue to remind us that God's creation isn't just what we see in nature. God's creations are also these unborn babies. May we come to the place that we protect.

So tonight, as I talk about border security and pro-life issues, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), a large animal veterinarian from the Gainesville, Florida, area, to share his thoughts on what we need to do secure our border.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and putting this together. It is such an important issue.

I just left another meeting, and we were talking about border security. There shouldn't even be a fight, because what we are talking about is what we are charged with in Congress, Republicans and Democrats, and the President. We have all taken that oath, and that oath talks about protecting our country and upholding our Constitution from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

When you look at border security, that should not be a partisan issue if you focus on border security and take politics out of it—not Donald Trump's fence, not a party's fence; this is security for the American people.

Just last week, there was a bust of drugs coming in from Mexico in a load of bell peppers that had over 1,000 pounds of methamphetamines. It was valued at \$1.2 billion, coming from our southern border. That came through a legal border checkpoint. That is border security that we are not doing that we should do that erodes the very social fabric of this Nation.

Two weeks before that, there was a bust of a legal truck coming in carrying cucumbers from the southern border through Mexico that had over 200 pounds of fentanyl. In fact, it had enough fentanyl to kill an estimated 55 million Americans—55 million Americans. Again, it came through a legal checkpoint.

So when we talk about border security, take the narrative and the argument off of Donald Trump's border wall

and put it on Americans' border security. If we as Republicans and Democrats come together as Americans, we will have border security.

It is not racist. It is not trying to keep anybody out who wants to come here legally, which there are ample places for people to come legally. This is about securing the people in our country, the men and women who get exposed to these drugs.

In addition to that—and I don't understand why the Mexican Government hasn't done more about this. They are growing over 22 hectares of poppy fields. Poppy is used for heroin production. There is not a medicinal use in that quantity that needs to come into this country. The only way that is coming in is illegally, through either illegal checkpoints or no checkpoints, or it is coming through legal checkpoints where we are not emphasizing border security with the new technologies we have.

So it pains me to think of this country going through another shutdown that it doesn't need to because people want to play party politics.

You think of the young men and women in DHS, with border security, our TSA employees, our Coast Guard, Customs and Border Patrol, and ICE agents. They show up for work, and we here in this body can't come to an agreement about America's border security. It is shameful for us. It is embarrassing.

But when you try to tell the people who are in those situations—I know people very well who are in the Coast Guard, and when you say, "Well, you just don't understand. They are holding up. They don't want Trump to have a wall," they say, "I don't care whose problem it is. Fix the problem." In fact, one of them said, "You know where you need to build a wall around first is around Washington, D.C. so you guys can't leave until you solve this problem."

It is just a shame that we, together, as Republicans and Democrats, can't solve this problem. But, unfortunately, politics gets put into this.

If I may talk about the other issue the gentleman was talking about, being a veterinarian, I have come to believe, and my Christian values say, that life begins at conception. There is no doubt in my mind. The good Lord put it there, and I am blessed that I have had the experiences I have had.

In fact, I have been able to do embryo transfers in the equine, in the horse world, and I can withdraw an embryo from a female horse between 5 and 7 days of pregnancy. Even at that size—when you look at it under a microscope, it looks like a golf ball—it is a baby horse developing.

I think it is ironic and it is sad that in this country we have laws on the books that will protect the unborn turtle in an egg or the eagle within an egg, in a nest, and we have laws that say that it is a Federal offense and you will go to prison for it, that we will

protect species, but yet when it comes to our own kind, the human species—that if you believe like you and I do and the majority of Americans that we are created in the image of God—I have seen an erosion of our society, and it pains me.

I know, every 100 years they say there is a breakdown of our society; but I can only think that this time around, when you are saying it is okay to kill a baby, full term, that is a breathing, living, creature of God, it is okay, that something is wrong in our society.

I think of that verse in the Bible—the gentleman will know the number and all that—that says:

If my people will turn away from their wicked ways and humble themselves and get down on their knees, I will forgive them.

And He says:

If they do that, then I will continue to bless them.

So, I appreciate the gentleman doing this. I have got some more facts and figures if he has time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. YOHO. I appreciate his wisdom and his experience in this area.

As we continue to talk about these two issues tonight, I think back to the border security issue and how this has become more of a campaign against the President of the United States, when just a few short years ago, the majority of Senators, who were Democrats at the time, voted for a structure at that time, voted for a wall. It wasn't politically incorrect at that point to call it a wall. But we see how quickly in Washington, D.C., things do become politically correct.

Why? It is because we see the numbers. We see the work of our border agents. We see the work of ICE, which, in 2017, was able to ascertain over 800,000 pounds of drugs. Think about that, 800,000 pounds of drugs. Enough fentanyl to kill every man, woman, and child not just in our country, but in all of North America was ascertained.

A week ago tomorrow night, sitting right up to my left in the second row there, was my sister-in-law. Her brother was an Army veteran, wonderful young man, played basketball in college with my youngest brother. Scott Aaron was his name.

One day, he injured his knee, and he had to have an operation. From that operation, he was given painkillers. Painkillers went to opioids; opioids obviously included heroin, to the place where he became a full-fledged addict.

He tried multiple times to overcome that addiction to heroin but, in the end, failed and realized that, in his mind, he did not have hope, which brought him to the place of committing suicide.

Now, Scott is not by himself, to the tune of 300 families per week that are having the funeral of a loved one due to some kind of tragic overdose, mostly heroin. Now heroin is laced with fentanyl, and we are seeing more and more epidemic proportions.

We are doing everything we can in Congress to provide the funding to combat the heroin crisis, but why wouldn't it make sense that we also put up some structures, specifically in hot spots along the border, to help reduce and maybe even, in some cases, eliminate?

On this floor, I have talked with more than a dozen of my Democratic friends and colleagues who have told me time after time after time: We have no doubt that a structure works.

So why not move forward? Why not come to an agreement—a compromise, if you will—to be able to begin to lay out the places where a structure, a fence, a wall could work?

How many lives would need to be saved to make it worth it?

How many families could be reunited without an empty chair this Thanksgiving or this Christmas?

How many would it take for it to be worth it? How many would it take for us to get past the political jargon of being able to use this as some kind of pawn to argue back and forth?

I would say just one. The case could be made for thousands.

□ 2000

Border security: It is time we come together. We don't even need to be talking about another shutdown or CR. We need to be able to resolve this. This is a commonsense solution to be able to resolve this.

Republicans aren't talking about a border from San Diego to McAllen, Texas. We understand there are places where drones, where technology, where surveillance may be the better way.

We don't believe in eminent domain and blocking people's views of the Rio Grande River with a wall, but there are things that we can do immediately. Yet I believe it has come to the place where we put personalities and politics over the people themselves.

Border security: It is time we do something.

Mr. Speaker, I yield again to my friend, Dr. YOHO, to have a few more data points on border security. Then I will close out in just a few minutes.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as I was talking earlier about the drugs coming in, the methamphetamine and the fentanyl that is coming in, these aren't coming in by the honest farmer or ranch hand or farmworker in Mexico. These are orchestrated by drug cartels.

Keep in mind, the methamphetamine and the fentanyl coming into this country primarily comes via China, so you have nation-states that are sending products into this country. China is trying to re-create the Opium Wars of the 1800s with our youth in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. WALKER brought up the deaths, and I feel really bad for his family to have his brother-in-law go through that. I can't imagine the pain and the horror.

There are 300 opioid deaths a week in this country alone, but that is just the tip of the iceberg.

A good friend of mine, he is a heart surgeon in Gainesville, Florida. He said: TED, that is just the tip of it. I have a young lady in, and it is her fourth heart valve replacement. At 25 years of age, the fourth heart valve replacement, because as they use the drugs, they don't use sterile techniques. They get infected. Their immune system goes down, and the bacteria will grow on the heart valve. Her fourth one.

I said: Tom, what is the cost of that?

He said: The average heart valve is close to \$100,000.

\$400,000, and if she dies, she doesn't die from a drug overdose. In the records, it is from heart failure.

So the 300 a week who we know are dying from drug overdoses, that is just the tip of the iceberg.

We talk about the cost. You can put a monetary cost on the deaths and the EMTs and all the emergency support staff and the ERs that we as taxpayers are funding, because, as he said, guess who paid for that? I said the hospital. He said: Absolutely. No insurance.

We can put a price on that, a monetary price, but you can't put a price on the disruption and the loss of a family member, as Mr. WALKER's family went through. The price of that goes on forever.

If we look at just numbers, from a typical number standpoint, we get 2,000 inadmissible migrants arriving at our southern border daily. That means, since January 2, when the Democrats took over, 41 days approximately, that means there were 82,000 inadmissible migrants who came into this country or were trying to.

Of the family units—that is a spouse, a husband and wife, or just a mother and father with their children—in the last 41 days, that equates to 36,395 family units.

If you look at the illegal aliens arrested for homicide charges just in the last 41 days, it is more than 228 arrests.

Let's take politics out of this argument, and let's do what is right by the American people: fund our government, fund DHS, secure our borders with any means from above.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his passion about this.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. YOHO for his comments tonight. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple more thoughts on border security as we move forward.

America was built on immigration. Nearly everyone within the sound of my voice, even though the halls have emptied out tonight, can go back and trace, from some ancestry point, the impact that immigrants had on this country, but it is legal immigration.

Now, somebody might ask, how are we doing in that area? Thank you for asking.

America has the most generous immigration laws in the world. In 2017 alone, we took over 1.1 million immigrants who raised their right hand, who took an oath to pledge allegiance to this great country of America. We are doing pretty good there, and the President has even made proposals to increase that amount.

It is the illegal immigration. We don't want our hearts to get lost in this, as Republicans, and specifically speaking for myself, having worked in refugee camps, having worked internationally to understand the plight and the struggle that goes on, to be able to expand America as fast as we can, to legally allow people to be part of the greatest country in the history of the world.

Yet, as Members of Congress, when we raise that right hand to do our best to protect, we need to take that seriously.

The crazy calls to abolish our law enforcement, agencies like ICE, which in 2017 rescued 904 children who were being exploited, how many children would it take for it to be worth it, for Immigration and Customs Enforcement? How many of those children would we measure any success by this?

To go as far as calling for abolishment, that is not America. That is crazy political speech.

Speaking of crazy political speech, the recent absurd language that has become acceptable to talk about third trimesters and to talk about infanticide, what are we coming to in this country?

Listen, we don't pass judgment on the young woman who is making sometimes a life decision. Working with our own Greensboro Pregnancy Care Center, sometimes these young ladies don't even realize they have another option. We don't pass judgment. Do not believe the lies that this is about hating or judging these mere innocent souls.

The problem that I have tonight is the political leaders who are providing the pathway to cheapen the sanctity of our human lives. That is where the focus needs to be. It needs to be that colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, are willing to stand up for those who simply don't have any rights.

Who advocates for the baby? Who speaks out on behalf of the baby? It is all about reproductive rights. It is all about choice. It is all about what is now called women's healthcare. Who voices or who stands up for the baby?

As we talked about a little earlier tonight in our bipartisan prayer caucus where a dozen or so Members were gathered, I brought up the point it wasn't too long ago that I remember sitting in a prestigious place with my wife, being the honored guests. To add to that, I think back over the last 4 years I have served with the United States Congress. I have sat down with Prime Ministers and royalty all across this world to have opportunities to talk policy. But I am well aware that,

in our life, the remembrance of a Congressman lasts about 15 minutes, maybe 20 minutes, once you are gone from these hallowed halls.

We are judged, in some ways, by our policy. But ultimately, what we do for God, to me, matters the most, when it comes to eternal values. One day, when we all stand before God, we will be judged not by just whatever button we pushed on the back of these chairs but, ultimately, what we did, I believe, with life.

That is why it is important to me. It is why it is important to millions and millions of Americans.

Let's get back to the place where we are willing to stand up, where we are willing to raise our voices for a child who cannot raise its own.

Tonight, let's get back to a place where we have a respect for the Almighty, for God, who, as I read in a tweet earlier, is the giver and the creator of life.

I think of David's writing in the Old Testament. I think of Psalm 139, where David captured quite poetically the words how we are "fearfully and wonderfully made," how that even when we were formed, the beginning of our substance, God knew us. Not only did he know us, it is that he had a purpose and a plan for every life born and unborn.

May we never grow weary, and may we never tire of doing all that we can in the United States Congress to protect, stand for, and defend the sanctity of human life.

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina. We in Florida all express our condolences for the loss of Congressman WALTER JONES. I thank the gentleman for bringing that up.

Mr. Speaker, we had the longest shutdown in history caused by the President of the United States claiming the mantel that government needed to be shut down for his border wall. Then, finally, government was reopened as every party came to their senses.

As we speak, Mr. Speaker, we have Senate Members and House Members diligently negotiating a bipartisan border deal, four Republicans in the Senate led by Senator SHELBY and three Democrats led by Senator LEAHY. In the House, we have Chairwoman NITA LOWEY, subcommittee Chairwoman ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ranking Member GRANGER, and Ranking Member FLEISCHMANN.

I believe a deal is imminent, where both sides will deliver concessions and

have to compromise. Yet, tonight, I heard dozens of speeches by my friends across the aisle on the one hand pleading for a bipartisan deal and on the other hand condemning Democrats with every other breath.

Were they not aware that there is a bipartisan negotiation happening as we speak that their colleagues are involved in? Devoid of reality, perhaps, or maybe it was just political scare tactics.

Mr. Speaker, when bipartisan plans come up before this body this week, and we show that we will keep the government open and protect our Nation, I know one other thing is for sure: My colleagues across the aisle are going to need a new script, because these scare tactics aren't going to work anymore.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Anna M. Pinellas, Anna M. Pinellas and her husband, Louis C. Pinellas, moved to Kissimmee, Florida, in 1981, after having worked in local government in Washington, Maryland, and Virginia.

Having knowledge in securing funds for various projects, she was hired by the city of Kissimmee and was able to secure grants for the infrastructure around Osceola Square Mall, the paving of Hill Street, and John Young Parkway, the first of those grants being \$750,000.

□ 2015

She was also hired by Osceola County government to secure Federal funds for projects, which include bringing Head Start back to Osceola County, refurbishing the old courthouse, and the establishment of a salary plan for Osceola County employees.

One of her primary goals was to pursue the establishment of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday in the city of Kissimmee, city of St. Cloud, Osceola County, and the school board. Thirty-four years ago, Pinellas founded Osceola Visionaries, Inc., a nonprofit corporation devoted to honoring and celebrating Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. before the holiday was observed.

Today, Pinellas continues to honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. by hosting their annual banquet and holding programs for the central Florida community.

And for that, Mrs. Pinellas, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING BEVERLYE COLSON NEAL

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Beverlye Colson Neal.

Beverlye Colson Neal is the president of the Orange County branch of the NAACP and the former executive director for the Florida State Conference of the NAACP. She has spent most of her life fighting for civil rights, beginning in her early childhood, as a member of the Jacksonville Youth Council of the NAACP.

She has a wealth of experience in the field of civil rights, community, and

political organizing. Her involvement has been centered around safeguarding the Black community.

She coordinated the 1984 GOTV efforts for the Congressional District 3 for Reverend Jesse Jackson for President of the United States, getting the only elected Jesse Jackson delegate from Florida from that congressional district. In 2009, she was asked by Dr. C. Delores Tucker to start a chapter of the National Congress of Black Women, Inc. in Florida. She has since organized five other chapters in the State. She has been instrumental in ensuring the programs under the NCBW-Orlando reflect the needs of Black women and their families in Orlando.

She is the mother of three adult sons—James, Odell, and Kenneth Neal—and the proud grandmother of five grandchildren. She has a committed passion for the work that she does in the State, and is always working for those who are ignored or overlooked. She feels that this is God's purpose for her life on Earth.

And for that, Mrs. Beverlye Colson Neal, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING JOHNNIE WALKER

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Johnnie Walker.

Johnnie Walker was born in Ethiopia in 1961, where his father was a technical advisor for the U.S. Department of State. He is now employed as a national representative for the American Federation of Government Employees, working for and with Federal employees performing the full range of employee and labor relations duties for Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

For 32 years, he has been a labor activist, advocate, and trainer, with extensive experience representing unionized bargaining unit employee members, and others. His advocacy has obtained over \$500,000 in back pay for D.C. government bargaining unit employees.

Walker received his undergraduate degrees in political science and liberal arts from the College of Central Florida and Howard University. He worked as the constituent liaison for the late Florida Congressman Bill Chappell, Jr. from 1983 to 1986. He has received numerous recognitions from the D.C. Committee on Political Education, D.C. Central Labor Council, and the AFGE.

Walker represents Federal Government employees and provides community support and outreach to thousands of union members he represents, the most recent example being the ongoing support for furloughed employees by holding collections and distribution drives, town halls, and roundtable discussions to discuss the effects and seek solutions.

And for that, Mr. Johnnie Walker, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING CYNTHIA DOWNING

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Cynthia Downing.

Cynthia Downing is a native of Florida; mother of one daughter, Cyntoria; and a recent grandmother of grandson, JaMarcus. She is a graduate of Haines City Senior High. She received her Bachelor's degree in Management of Human Resources and a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of Phoenix.

Ms. Downing is a lifetime member of the Haines City NAACP, where she serves as president. Her love of advocating for people and seeking justice has afforded her the opportunity to serve on social and economic panels. She is most proud of instituting the Black History Program, Black History Essay Contest, quarterly mission projects, a scholarship program, and the Drum Major for Justice Award. Serving in this capacity allows her to bring awareness and new initiatives to her community.

She always had a passion for helping others reach their fullest potential, and her management skills allowed her to start her own business as a trainer and coach. She also assists with vocational rehabilitation with job placement.

Ms. Downing is also active in many ministries of her church, New Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church in Haines City. She serves as a Sunday school teacher, newsletter editor, website administrator, and president of the Shepherd's Care Ministry.

She lives by the quote her dad often repeated: "To whom much is given, much is required."

And for that, Ms. Cynthia Downing, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING ANTHONY GORDON

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Anthony Gordon.

Anthony Gordon was born and raised in Avon Park, Florida. After graduating from Avon Park High School, he attended Polk State College on a baseball scholarship, and soon began his professional baseball career with the Seattle Mariners, Kansas City Royals, Chicago White Sox, and Milwaukee Brewers.

After retiring from professional baseball in 1996, he began working with Bill and Brian Jarrett to purchase and operate the Jarrett-Gordon Ford dealerships in central Florida.

Anthony serves as a board member for the Ford Motor Minority Dealers Association, as a Rotarian since 2002, and also served as a Haines City Chamber Board member, on the Board of Directors for Heart of Florida hospital, and was recognized as the Haines City Chamber of Commerce 2014 Citizen of the Year. He volunteers for the Great American Teach-In at Ridge High School, Bethune Academy and Horizon Elementary in recognition of Black History Month.

Mr. Anthony Gordon is a dedicated husband and father, as well as a longtime active member of New Zion Temple Holiness Church Association, where he currently serves as an ordained minister. He is a firm believer that his

life's accomplishments are directly ordered by the mercy and grace of God.

And for that, Mr. Anthony Gordon, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING WAYNE GANDY

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Wayne Gandy.

In 1989, as a senior at Haines City High School, Wayne Gandy was recruited by Auburn University to play football. He was then drafted as a first-round pick to the Los Angeles Rams, where he played his first 5 years. Since then, he has played for the Pittsburgh Steelers, New Orleans Saints, and the Atlanta Falcons, having never missed a game.

After the NFL, Gandy focused on his foundation, The Wayne Gandy Foundation, organized exclusively to support and promote the power of sports in developing the qualities of leadership, social responsibility, and excellence through the sponsorship of sports camps, team building events, and programs that build healthy spirits, bodies, and minds of at-risk teens.

In addition to this, he also hosts a daily 3-hour syndicated radio show, the Sports Joc Show with Wayne Gandy, and serves as a color analyst for ESPN. Gandy still returns to his hometown, Haines City, Florida, and offers help wherever it may be needed. For the past 3 years, he has sponsored the Wayne Gandy Christmas Tournament, a semi-final high school basketball tournament in Haines City.

In 2017, Haines City High School dedicated the Wayne Gandy field to Mr. Gandy, thus showing how much his name is synonymous to the meaning of truly being a "hometown hero."

And for that, Mr. Wayne Gandy, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING LEMUEL GEATHERS

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Lemuel Geathers.

Mr. Lemuel Geathers, from the historic Pughsville neighborhood of Winter Haven, Florida, served as the city's first African American Commissioner and Mayor. He was also the special assistant to Congressman Andy Ireland. He is a World War II veteran, and served as an electrician in the Navy.

In 1954, he went on to receive a Bachelor of Science degree in industrial arts and education from Florida A&M University. He spent 28 years as a teacher in Polk County, and one of his greatest accomplishments was serving on the committee to establish a junior college in Winter Haven, Florida, now known as Polk State College, because he knew the importance of receiving a good education.

He has served on the Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Winter Haven Hospital Board, Polk County Industrial Bonding Board, Polk County Master Planning Committee, and was chairman of the city's Human Relations Committee. Mr. Geathers was also the first African American chairman of the Democratic Executive Com-

mittee in Polk County. He has been affiliated with the National Education Association, American Legion, NAACP, Boys and Girls Club, and Optimist Club.

His wife, Juanita Geathers, is a retired educator and former secretary of the Florida Democratic Party. They have six children and nine grandchildren, all college educated.

And for that, Mr. Lemuel Geathers, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING GEORGE BROOKS

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize George Brooks.

Staff Sergeant George Brooks enlisted in the U.S. Air Force in 1954; 7 years after the USAF had integrated its forces. He was stationed in Biloxi, less than 1 year before Emmett Till was murdered in Money, Mississippi. He was also one of the first African Americans to attend electronics school.

While stationed in Spokane, Washington, he worked on the B-36 aircraft, becoming one of the first Black bomb navigation technicians to fly the craft, flying three missions. He left Spokane in 1956 for Westover Air Force Base, in Springfield, Massachusetts, where he first started working on the B-52 bomber, also joining the first ranks of Black navigators on that plane.

He flew 47 missions in the B-52, and was awarded the Air Medal with two clusters. Over the course of his 20-year career, he flew over 100 missions, until retiring from the USAF in 1974.

Mr. Brooks went to work for the Department of Defense for 13 years after that as an electronics consultant, until his retirement in 1987. He traveled the world extensively, with stops in seven continents, including Antarctica, finally ending up in Nalcrest, just outside Lake Wales.

Staff Sergeant George Brooks, for that, we honor you.

RECOGNIZING ORRETT DAVIS

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I recognize Orrett Davis.

Orrett Davis is a growth marketer, startup advocate, and technology enthusiast. While continuing to support Orlando's tech community, Mr. Davis currently serves as Director of Marketing at SightPlan, an Orlando-based technology company providing cutting-edge solutions for the Nation's growing multifamily industry.

Mr. Davis is a proud graduate of the University of Florida, and received a master's degree in business administration from Rollins College. Prior to SightPlan, Mr. Davis was head of growth for Abe AI, a financial technology company, recently acquired by Envestnet Yodlee, where he launched the largest virtual summit on artificial intelligence and banking.

Mr. Davis was the first executive director for the Orlando Tech Association, OTA, which helped cultivate the explosive growth of Orlando's startup and technology ecosystem.

□ 2030

As head of OTA, Mr. Davis was invited to the inaugural Tech Meet Up at the White House by the Obama administration, where he presented on the growth of Orlando's startup community.

Mr. Davis has made a tremendous impact on the central Florida community, and in addition to his work in Orlando, he has helped foster entrepreneurial communities throughout the country.

For that, Mr. Orrett Davis, we honor you.

IN RECOGNITION OF DELORIS MCMILLON

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Deloris McMillon.

Ms. Deloris McMillon is a retired educator and administrator whose career spanned from 1965 to 2003. Her commitment to educating children and community service are among her greatest gifts and strengths.

Ms. McMillon moved to Kissimmee in 1966 after marrying her college sweetheart, the late Samuel Lawrence McMillon, Jr.

During a time when schools were still segregated, she helped pave the way for the integration of Black educators into the Osceola County School System.

After receiving her master's in administration and supervision in 1989, she was promoted to assistant principal at Osceola High School, and then principal of Parkway Middle School.

Ms. McMillon has received numerous awards for her outstanding contributions and leadership in education and community service. She is a recipient of the NAACP Lifetime Achievement Award, the Rosa Parks Memorial Award, the OCTA Human and Civil Rights Award, and more.

Her involvements include Valencia Community College Board of Trustees; Osceola County Fire and Rescue Advisory Board; Osceola Visionaries, Inc.; and a member of the Kissimmee/Osceola County Chamber of Commerce Leadership.

Deloris McMillon is currently the President of the Osceola County branch of the NAACP. She continues to advocate for equal rights and education. She encourages young people to seek higher educational opportunities by providing tutoring and financial assistance to college-bound students. She is a true role model for all women, not just women of color.

And for that, Ms. Deloris McMillon, we honor you.

IN RECOGNITION OF GAIL PASCHALL-BROWN

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Black History Month, I want to recognize Gail Paschall-Brown. Gail Paschall-Brown started her life in Brooklyn, New York, but was raised by her grandparents in rural North Carolina.

Now a Floridian, Paschall-Brown is celebrating 21 years at WESH-2 News, where she has served as an anchor and is a general assignment reporter.

Starting in television while in high school, working in her hometown, Paschall-Brown did everything from shooting video for the city to doing commercials for advertisers.

Gail received a bachelor of arts in drama and speech, with a minor in broadcasting, from East Carolina University. While at ECU, she received the Broadcaster of the Year Award from her peers and worked at WITN-TV 7 in North Carolina. She served on ECU's first practicum program for journalists.

Paschall-Brown learned the business from all angles. Beginning as a tape jockey, she moved to reporter, then to anchor, and even did weather before Doppler radar was implemented.

In Florida, she has covered countless stories, including related to Trayvon Martin and Casey Anthony, and Polk County's Alejandra Juarez's deportation story to Mexico, that I am currently working on legislation for.

Some of Gail's most memorable stories include the first Gulf War, the Grenada Invasion, and Susan Smith, who drowned her two sons, tragically. She has interviewed notables, including Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, author Alex Haley, sportscaster Jayne Kennedy, and did stories ranging from Bob Hope, Phylicia Rashad, to Pope Air Force Base.

Gail has received numerous community awards, including: being inducted into the Central Florida Association of Black Journalists Hall of Fame; Orange County Mayor Teresa Jacobs proclaimed Gail Paschall-Brown Day on April 30, 2015, for being a committed and engaged reporter who has shown integrity and compassion for the community; and that same year, she also received the Spirit of Journalism Oprah Winfrey Journalism Award.

She is most proud of her two children: Jasmine, a senior at North Carolina A&T; and Joshua, a sophomore at Florida Gulf Coast University.

After nearly four decades as a journalist, Gail says she loves this business still and hopes to continue serving the central Florida community.

And for that, Ms. Gail Paschall-Brown, we honor you.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. QUIGLEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

Mrs. SUSAN BROOKS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of district business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 121, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 12, 2019, at 9 a.m., as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable WALTER B. JONES.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 995, the Settlement Agreement Information Database Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that H.R. 1063, the Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1064, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1079, the Creating Advanced Streamlined Electronic Services for Constituents Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

116. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Retroactive Stop Loss Special Pay Compensation [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0071] (RIN: 0790-AK39) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

117. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's

final rule — Compensation of Certain Former Operatives Incarcerated by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0050] (RIN: 0790-AK38) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

118. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Unsatisfactory Performance of Ready Reserve Obligation [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0069] (RIN: 0790-AK28) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

119. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Participation in Reserve Training Programs [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0070] (RIN: 0790-AK29) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

120. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's notice — Supplement NOT Supplant Under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, As Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

121. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tracking of Workplace Injuries and Illnesses [Docket No.: OSHA-2013-0023] (RIN: 1218-AD17) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

122. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Formic Acid [Docket No.: FDA-2017-F-2130] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

123. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

124. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 2018 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

125. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation [Docket ID: ED-2019-OGC-0004] (RIN: 1801-AA18) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

126. A letter from the Assistant Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veteran Affairs, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Amendments (RIN: 2900-AQ55) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

127. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Casper, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0223; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

128. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bethel, ME [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0883; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ANE-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

129. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mesquite, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0007; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-18] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

130. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1066; Product Identifier 2018-NM-176-AD; Amendment 39-19540; AD 2019-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

131. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31228; Amdt. No.: 543] received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

132. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pago Pago, American Samoa [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0082; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWP-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

133. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace, and Removal of Class E Airspace; Lompoc, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1146; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

134. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Leitchfield, KY [Docket No.: FAA-

2018-0485; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

135. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Aspen, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0016; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

136. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Class E Airspace; Mercury, NV [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1148; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-30] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

137. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Appleton, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0006; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AGL-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

138. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hardinsburg, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0486; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

139. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Moses Lake, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1033; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

140. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Maurice, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0671; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ACE-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

141. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Jackson, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1187; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

142. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Glen Ullin, ND [Docket No.: FAA-

2018-0312; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AGL-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

143. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-170 and V-219 in the Vicinity of Fairmont, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0280; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-27] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

144. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Engelhard, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0626; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

145. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace and Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Olympia, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1012; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

146. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Alaska Towns; Nuiqsut, AK; Perryville, AK; Pilot Point, AK; and Point Lay, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0348; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AAL-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

147. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Atkasuk, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0577; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AAL-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 8, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 122. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 116-8). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BERA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SOTO, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 1137. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to repeal the authority relating to reprogramming during national emergencies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 1138. A bill to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. QUILLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. TONKO, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SIREN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1139. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of public transportation operations safety risk reduction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 1140. A bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who provide screening of all passengers and property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 1141. A bill to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Claims Fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KIM, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROUDA, Mr.

ENGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SUOZZI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MENG, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 1142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the dollar limitation on the deduction for State and local taxes and restore the 39.6 percent individual income tax rate bracket; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1143. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require a health insurance issuer offering short-term limited duration insurance to include a standardized disclosure and certain information with respect to coverage exclusions and premium variations in marketing, application, and enrollment materials distributed in connection with such insurance and prohibiting the sale of such insurance during certain periods; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1144. A bill to prohibit the use of funds during a lapse in appropriations to support congressional delegations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 1145. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former Members and elected officers of Congress from lobbying Congress at any time after leaving office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CROW, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUILLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms.

VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 1146. A bill to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. MILLER, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 1147. A bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1148. A bill to provide for disaster tax relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN DREW (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 1149. A bill to prohibit the Department of the Interior from issuing certain geological and geophysical exploration permits under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the provision of a basic standard of humanitarian care to all individuals in U.S. Customs and Border Protection custody; 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 Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COMER, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HECK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATTI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 119. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 120. A resolution honoring the life, achievements, and distinguished public service of John David Dingell, Jr., and expressing

condolences to his family on his passing; to the Committee on House Administration. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H. Res. 121. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Walter B. Jones; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H. Res. 123. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 12, 2019, as "Darwin Day" and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PORTER, Mr. ESPALLAT, Ms. WILD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DEAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. CRIST, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MENG, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SIREN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CROW, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 124. A resolution expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas introduced a bill (H.R. 1150) for the relief of Enrique Soriano and Areli Soriano; which was referred 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. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 1138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 1139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Articles 1, 3, and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 1141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to make appropriations as set forth in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution; and to make all rules and regulations respecting the Territories and possessions as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The legislation places limitations on how Treasury can expend funds during a lapse in regular appropriations. Congress has the authority to enact this under Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 1145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 1148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 1149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 1150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 64: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 93: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 94: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 117: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 125: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 141: Mr. SABLÁN and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 155: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 218: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 219: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 220: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 273: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 275: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 276: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 299: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. DEAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 305: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 309: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 310: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 365: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 369: Mr. MAST, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 394: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 402: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 510: Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER of

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

- Texas, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 530: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 540: Mr. COHEN and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 550: Mr. SIRES, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 553: Mrs. MILLER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 555: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 582: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 587: Mr. NUNES, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 594: Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 596: Mr. HECK and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 597: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 598: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 613: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 621: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 638: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. ROY.
H.R. 647: Mr. KEATING and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 668: Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 678: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 703: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 708: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 713: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 724: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 726: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 727: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 734: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 737: Mr. BACON, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 738: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 748: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 763: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 764: Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 781: Mr. GOTTHELMER.
H.R. 793: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 803: Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 807: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 810: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 830: Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 832: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 833: Mr. MAST and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 845: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 849: Mr. HIMES, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 850: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 864: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 865: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. FRANKEL, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 868: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 873: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 881: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 885: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 891: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 892: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 899: Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 911: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 919: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 920: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 928: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 929: Mr. COHEN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 935: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 946: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 949: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 956: Mr. BUDD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 962: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. COLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 965: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 969: Mr. STEEL.
H.R. 995: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1002: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1004: Ms. BASS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BEYER, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1005: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1008: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 1011: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1015: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1016: Ms. TITUS and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1019: Mr. NUNES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. VELA, Mr. STEWART, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 1041: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1042: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1043: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1044: Mr. STAUBER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1046: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 1055: Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1058: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 1060: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1062: Mr. ROY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1063: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1064: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1065: Mr. HICE of Georgia and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1066: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1069: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1073: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1074: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 1079: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1098: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 1104: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1105: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1117: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CIBILLINE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. HAALAND.
H. Res. 33: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H. Res. 39: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H. Res. 54: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H. Res. 60: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H. Res. 72: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BRADY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BOST, Mr. PERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H. Res. 75: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 88: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H. Res. 93: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FLORES, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 95: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H. Res. 100: Ms. TITUS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 101: Mr. WATKINS.
H. Res. 110: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 116: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2019

No. 26

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:

Let us pray.

O God, our Redeemer, thank You for Your abundant mercy and grace. You continue to do for us more than we can ask or imagine.

Guide the steps of our Senators. May they look to You to bring them to Your desired destination, as You surround them with the shield of Your divine favor.

Eternal King, help us all to never forget how Your sustaining grace has kept us in the past. May the memories of Your loving providence in our history infuse us with the spirit of optimism for all of our tomorrows.

We pray in Your merciful 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, as recently as a few days ago, our government funding discussions seemed to be in a pretty good place. Bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on finishing out the year's appropriations process seemed to be right on track. We ap-

peared headed toward a compromise result that would have provided much needed investments in border security and completed our remaining appropriations bill to fully fund the government.

Last week, the Democratic leader seemed confident that "we worked out a plan to refund the government, deal with border security in a way that would be acceptable to all sides. That's working pretty well." Just this past Friday, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator LEAHY, suggested that "we're 95 to 98 percent done."

But then over the weekend, we heard that the talks had suddenly hit a snag. The bipartisan momentum had stalled. What went wrong? Here is what happened. The House Democrats decided to add a poison pill demand into the conversations at the eleventh hour. It is a new demand. It is really extreme—a hard, statutory cap on the number of illegal immigrants who could be detained by the Federal Government. This would result in the release of thousands of criminal aliens and our inability to detain thousands more criminal aliens whom our Federal and State law enforcement authorities will apprehend.

This is a poison pill that no administration—not this one, not the previous one—would or should ever accept. Imagine the absurdity of this. House Democrats want to set a limit on how many criminal aliens our government can detain. This is a limit that is not based on any aspect of reality, such as how many criminal aliens there actually are or what crimes they have committed; it is just an arbitrary number a couple of lawmakers have pulled out of thin air. The consequence of such an arbitrary limit is obvious: Thousands of criminal aliens would simply be released into the interior of our country, both immediately and then on a rolling basis into the future.

The National Sheriffs' Association explained this in a letter to Chairman

SHELBY and Senator LEAHY. Here is what the sheriffs had to say:

Capping the number of detention beds . . . not only jeopardizes the integrity of the immigration system, but would cripple ICE's ability to detain criminal aliens and other aliens who pose a risk to public safety or are a flight risk. . . . In order to meet the cap tentatively proposed by Congress, ICE would be compelled to release thousands of aliens from custody.

That is what the National Sheriffs' Association had to say about it—released, just like that, right out into the United States of America. It is hard to believe this is where some Democrats are—a get-out-of-jail-free card for criminals because the radical left doesn't like U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement. Let me say that again. It is a get-out-of-jail-free card for criminals because the radical left doesn't like U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement.

It is hard to believe the "Abolish ICE" fringe among House Democrats actually thinks enforcing our laws is wrong. It is hard to believe a group of House Democrats see kneecapping American law enforcement as a higher priority than keeping the government open. But it would be even harder to believe that leading Democrats would be open to this craziness and would let this last-minute poison pill scuttle the entire appropriations process.

Just last year, when the Democratic leader was highlighting productive, bipartisan work on this appropriations process, he said: "Both sides have worked to avoid poison pill riders. That has meant steady progress." Ranking Member LEAHY celebrated that through last year's committee process, "We avoided new poison pill riders." So I hope my Democratic colleagues are able to talk some sense into their side.

Some House Democrats are risking a second partial government shutdown by calling for this absurd, last-minute poison pill. No administration of any party would sign a bill that forced them to release criminal aliens into

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1151

the interior of the United States. No administration would accept this poison pill forcing the release of criminals now and on a rolling basis going forward.

I understand that the four leaders on Appropriations in both Chambers will be meeting in just a few minutes. I would implore my friends across the aisle: Untangle yourselves from the most extreme far-left voices out on the fringe. Do not let this radical fringe and its absurd demand prevent you from taking yes for an answer. Don't let them torpedo all of this bipartisan work.

This provision would, rightly, be a total nonstarter with the White House—with any White House, not just this one. It would erase our progress and kick us back to square one. It is a total poison pill, pure and simple.

The American people are not clamoring for more aliens with criminal backgrounds to be roaming at large in their communities. I never heard anybody ask for that. And they certainly are not so eager for that outcome that they want another partial shutdown in order to achieve it.

My Democratic colleagues in this Chamber need to see this stunt for what it is, bring their side back to the table, and finish our work for the American people.

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.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 47, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 47) to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Murkowski/Manchin modified amendment No. 111, in the nature of a substitute.

Murkowski amendment No. 112 (to amendment No. 111), to modify the authorization period for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 6, H.J. Res. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 6, H.J. Res. 1, a bill making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for no more than 10 minutes.

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

S. 47

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, Chairman MURKOWSKI and I have been working with the majority leader and minority leader to resolve the few remaining issues on our bill, which is the land management bill we have before us.

I would like to thank all Senators for their cooperation and for the work they have put in to get this to this point. I believe we are making good progress.

We will vote on the motion to invoke cloture at 5:30. I will be joining Chairman MURKOWSKI in voting yes on cloture, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I understand that Senator LEE, my dear friend from Utah, may want a vote on his amendment to exempt Utah from the Antiquities Act. I have talked to Senator LEE many times about his concerns with national monuments in his State. While I respect his views, I will oppose any amendment that threatens the success of this lands bill. At this point, any amendment would threaten the success of the bill.

This bill is truly a great piece of legislation for our country. This package includes numerous important provisions that will enhance conservation, recreation, and hunting, fishing, and shooting opportunities for sportsmen on Federal lands.

In my view, one of the most important provisions in the bill is the permanent—I repeat, the permanent—reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I have long supported the permanent reauthorization of the LWCF, which has played a crucial role in making my State all the more wild and wonderful. In fact, since 1965, \$243 million of LWCF funds have been spent to enhance recreation and conservation in West Virginia alone.

LWCF funds have been used to provide public access and protect many of West Virginia's most popular recreation sites, including the Dolly Sods Wilderness in the Monongahela National Forest, as well as every access point on the Lower Gauley River in the Gauley River National Recreation Area. As you can see on this chart, LWCF funds have protected 57,000 acres in the Gauley River and the New River Gorge.

While LWCF funds are used to protect important Federal conservation and recreation lands, the program also

provides essential funding to States to enhance State and local park and outdoor recreational opportunities. These are not free giveaways to States but, rather, they are matching grants that result in increased recreational opportunities at the State and local levels.

This is Ritter Park in Huntington, WV. Ritter Park offers miles of walking trails along an area called Fourpole Creek. Ritter Park also has numerous tennis courts, playground facilities, and an amphitheater that is used by the community for small events, such as concerts and plays. The rose garden, which you can see here, is a wonderful place to spend some time, and in 2012, Ritter Park was named as one of the "Great Public Spaces" by the American Planning Association. Over the years, more than \$625,000 in State Land and Water Conservation funds has been spent on improvements at Ritter Park.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also provides other important financial assistance to States, including funding for the Forest Legacy Program, which helps to protect working forests on private lands; the American Battlefield Protection Program, which helps to protect Civil War and Revolutionary War battlefield sites on State and private lands; and grants to protect endangered species' habitats on non-Federal lands.

On the Federal side, LWCF funds have been used to safeguard some of our Nation's iconic public lands. Here you can see just a few examples of areas where LWCF funds have been used to ensure that we can set aside these areas for future generations and help our land management Agencies follow their conservation missions as directed by Congress.

LWCF funds help to complete the protection of and provide important public access to areas set aside by Congress in recognition of their national significance, including lands managed by the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service.

In West Virginia, we have the Canaan Valley National Wildlife Refuge, which is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Canaan was established in 1994 and was the 500th wildlife refuge to be established. Since 1994, every single acre of the 16,613-acre area was acquired using LWCF funds. As one can see here, the Canaan Valley National Wildlife Refuge is a truly beautiful place that would not have been possible had we not had the LWCF. Permanent reauthorization of the LWCF will ensure States and Federal land management Agencies will continue to protect and conserve nationally significant lands for future generations—all without relying on taxpayer dollars. It is past time for Congress to permanently reauthorize the LWCF.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is one of the many pieces of legislation in this package. It is another reason we need to pass this bill without

amendments and send it over to the House and then to the President for his signature. I am pleased that we are making good progress, and I hope we will be able to move to its final passage without additional delays.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are here this Monday afternoon to continue debate on S. 47, which is our Natural Resources Management Act, which we introduced just last month with Senator CANTWELL. We have been working on this bill with not only Senator CANTWELL and Senator MANCHIN but with the chairman and ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee. We did that last fall when the composition of that committee on the House side was a little bit different and now in this new year. We have been working forward with the commitment from our respective leaderships to bring this measure to the floor early in this Congress, and here we are.

I am very thankful and appreciative to Leader MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER for keeping their word to allow us a few days of debate on this very important natural resources and lands package. We have a great partnership going on in working with my new ranking member on the committee, Senator MANCHIN, in working with his team in conjunction with ours, and, again, in building on the great, great work that we have had with my friend and colleague from the State of Washington, Senator CANTWELL, and her team. There have been so many who have really come together in a very collaborative way and in a very dedicated way to help make this happen.

I make mention of the contributions of a few Members on our side and a few Members on the Democratic side who have really been engaged with us throughout this process—Senator GARDNER, Senator DAINES, Senator WYDEN, Senator HEINRICH—and of the dozens of Members who are on this measure as cosponsors. We truly appreciate it.

We made some good progress last week. We reached agreement to enter into debate on our bill. We considered two amendments. Both of those amendments were tabled in order to preserve what we would refer to as the spirit of the bicameral-bipartisan agreement. We anticipate one more amendment to process today before we move to a cloture vote. I am pleased that we are at this point as we near the end of the floor debate on this measure, and I would like to spend just a few moments

this afternoon, if I may, speaking to the really extensive process that has gone into this bill.

It is a substantive bill. There is no doubt about it. It is substantive because of the many, many different, discrete, small provisions that have been incorporated into it. Reaching this point has been no small task. I mentioned last week the way that we handle many of these lands matters before the U.S. Senate. It is an imperfect process—that is certainly for sure—but so many of these issues are so parochial that they just do not command the floor time that is available here. Invariably, what we effort to do is to put together a package of these measures. We really haven't seen a lands package before the Congress that has been ready to move out or, actually, be signed into law—that is, I guess, the best way to say it—since 2014. So that is 5 years of really pent-up demand, if you will, to address these matters.

So over the course of several years and multiple Congresses, both the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the House Natural Resources Committee have held dozens of hearings and business meetings to prepare the more than 100 bills we have now incorporated into S. 47. So when you think about, again, the process that goes into it—this is endless hours, countless hours of Member time, of staff time that go into these meetings as we work on very local priorities and then drafting the legislative text and refining it to make it right and refining it yet again to make it right.

We have also worked for months on a bipartisan, bicameral basis to truly negotiate every word in this bill, literally down to one-tenth of a mile for a certain designation on a specific conveyance there, so really taking a very sharp eye and a sharp pencil to all of the provisions that are in here.

We have really worked to try to incorporate as many local, State, and Member priorities as possible. The process these matters went through in order to get where we are today—the regular order process in the House, in the Senate, and in many cases, in both—is really quite impressive. I mentioned some of the Member priorities last week. Members have come to the floor. I indicated that we have included provisions sponsored by at least 50 different Senators within this bill. That number rises to about 90 Senators when we count the cosponsorship of various Members. So, again, it was very collaborative in terms of how we reached out to everyone to ensure their priorities are heard.

We have heard a lot on the floor about the contributions contained within the sportsmen's provision—something I have worked on with Members over the course of years, with different partners on the other side, whether it was Senator TESTER or Senator HEINRICH. It has been three Congresses running that we have tried to advance a bipartisan sportsmen's bill.

So there are so many who are looking with great interest into finally passing these sportsmen's provisions.

There is a provision in here that helps the folks in Tennessee. One of Senator ALEXANDER's priority projects is a special resource study for the James K. Polk Presidential home in Columbia, TN. It was built in 1916. It is the only surviving private residence of our 11th President. What we do within this bill is we take that first step to make a determination, to ask the question of whether this special place should be designated as a national park unit at some point in the future. So pretty parochial, pretty small, but it is important to those in Columbia, TN.

I mentioned some of the Arizona provisions. Udall Park in Tucson, AZ, is a priority for the Arizona delegation. This is one of those issues where they have a pretty popular local community park in the city, and there are all kinds of activities one would anticipate taking place in a small park—baseball, swimming, farmers market. Up until just a couple years ago, the city of Tucson was actually unaware that the Federal Government even owned this local park. So what we do in this bill is we clean up the ownership issue, which allows the city to move forward with the day-to-day activities without facing these Federal bureaucratic hurdles that happen back here. So when they want to do something that would be good for that community, such as expanding a farmers market or improving cell service on the softball fields, they don't have to come to us to ask for permission—pretty common sense.

I mentioned some of the priorities coming out of the State of Louisiana and a measure that Senator CASSIDY has been working on, the Lake Bistineau Land Title Stability Act. I shared the story of some homeowners who had been on a parcel for 13 years, built their home, wanted to sell, and then they found out they couldn't because they didn't have clear title to their land due to an issue with the BLM management survey. So we worked with BLM and the State of Louisiana—all this bipartisan work—to clear up the title. Again, this is something that you wouldn't think you would need an act of Congress to do, but we do that.

Up in the State of Minnesota, we worked with their delegation to modify the boundaries of the Voyageurs National Park.

In Georgia, we are expanding the Ocmulgee National Monument—this is a prehistoric American Indian site—and we are doing this at the request of the local communities and the Tribes. It has strong support from the Creek Indian Tribe and the local community. It is a designation that will help preserve the historic and cultural values of the area as well provide economic benefit by giving greater opportunities for visitors.

So these are some of the various priorities we have included in this very

comprehensive package. These are not things that are going to make the front page of the Washington Post or the New York Times. These are very local. But I can pretty much guarantee that they will be on the front page of the Ocmulgee—I still don't know if I am pronouncing that correctly—within the Creek Indian Tribe. They are going to make sure people know that this is something we have been working on for a long period of time and that it has finally been addressed in Congress.

Working over the years to help address these priorities is very, very important. We have received the support of not only so many colleagues in the Senate and in the House, Republicans and Democrats, but we have heard it from organizations and communities around the country. Some of these names are pretty well known to us: Ducks Unlimited, the Boone and Crockett Club, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the National Wildlife Federation, the U.S. Travel Association, the Nature Conservancy.

That is just a few of the many that have weighed in. I want to give a couple more examples of groups that have written in to share their support.

The Southeast Tourism Society wrote that "S. 47 has earned the enthusiastic support of the travel and tourism industry."

I mentioned last week that so many of the provisions contained in this bill really help these little local economies or the broader economies within the region, so you can see where the travel and tourism industry would be appreciative.

The Outdoor Recreation Roundtable—this is a consortium made up of a number of recreation associations—wrote that our bill should be passed to "guarantee American's great outdoors receive the attention and resources they so richly deserve and to ensure the outdoor recreation economy continues to grow."

We are also hearing from communities that have been waiting for congressional action to resolve longstanding Federal land management issues. I mentioned the one in Louisiana. I also mentioned the situation in Tucson, AZ. We did receive a letter from the mayor of Tucson in support of our package because of the provision we have included that he says "will bring closure to a historic agreement made between the city of Tucson and Bureau of Land Management at a popular urban park in Tucson's northeast business and residential areas." That mayor knows this is going to allow the local community to do some of the more simple tasks, such as operating a farmers market, without going through these bureaucratic hoops and hurdles.

Another provision in the bill will convey a parcel of land on the shores of Lake Fannin to Fannin County in Texas. The county commissioner shared that with the conveyance of this land, they will be able to "continue the process to restore, preserve,

and protect the historical significance and beauty this lake has to offer for years to come."

So, again, there is the encouragement we are getting from the communities and from the organizations. I have certainly heard from a lot of Alaskans who are very pleased about where we are with this lands package.

We heard from Sheri Buretta. Sheri is the chair of Chugach Alaska Corporation, and she wrote that "Section 1113 of S. 47, while long overdue from our perspective, provides a welcome and extremely helpful mechanism for addressing serious inequities relative to our land settlement."

Again, the land settlement in Alaska is decades old, and we are still attempting to address some of those inequities, and this legislation allows us to do that.

David Fee, who is the coordinating scientist at the Alaska Volcano Observatory, noted that "current volcano monitoring capacity in the United States is deficient, and we are unable to accurately forecast and detect eruptions at an adequate level. . . . Passing and funding [this measure will provide] for a safer and more resilient United States."

The benefits we provide for so many around the country—these are just a few of the examples of the many communities and organizations that support the passage of the bill. We have a full list of our supporters that is available on the committee's website—it runs almost 7 pages long—that I am going to be submitting for the record—not only that consolidated list but also the many, many letters of support we have received. These folks—these individuals, these groups, these communities—are writing in to make their support known because there is good policy in this package. It is policy that fosters economic development in rural America. It is policy that ensures that incredible landscapes are conserved for future generations to enjoy. It is policy that ensures access for sports men and women. It also allows for greater access for some of our off-highway vehicles. It is policy that enhances our volcano-monitoring systems. It empowers local water managers to make decisions on how to conserve water and endangered species.

I want to just kind of segue off of that because there hasn't been a lot of discussion about the water provisions within this bill. I keep referring to S. 47 as the lands package, but the truth is, it is not just about land; it is about water as well, and it includes a number of important western water provisions.

We improve water management by taking important steps to provide greater local control over water resources and promote management that balances the needs of water users with fish and wildlife protection. As an example of this, we create a new Bureau of Reclamation title transfer program. This is going to facilitate conveyance of water facilities to the local agencies

that have been managing them for decades and in some cases longer than decades—almost over a century—and that have fully repaid the government for the cost. So effectively what we are talking about here is we are simplifying the process for local utilities, States, and Tribes to pursue title transfers for reclamation projects, not by requiring an act of Congress to do it. So it is simplification. It is common sense. It is making things work. It is a straightforward change in the law that will make a huge difference for the entities in 17 of our Western States that manage water projects, canals, and other water infrastructure that irrigate more than 11 million acres of land—land that provides fresh fruits and vegetables for millions of Americans every day.

In the bill, we also authorize individual title transfers to California and Oklahoma. These provisions will greatly improve water management and incentivize capital investment in water infrastructure while conserving water resources and protecting public safety.

The reauthorization of the Upper Colorado and the San Juan River fish recovery program and phase 3 of the Yakima Basin Water Enhancement Project are both included in this bill. I think both of these are great examples of how a collaborative approach to water challenges, rather than litigation and conflict, results in solutions that benefit water users and the environment. We have certainly heard from Senator CANTWELL on this as it relates to the Yakima Basin project and the very collaborative effort that was involved with that. The Colorado River project involves bringing four species of endangered fish back from the brink of extinction while water development projects move forward.

There are other important water provisions that didn't make it into the bill for various reasons. I think many of us were disappointed, it is fair to say. It is clear to me that there is a lot more that we have to do to address these major challenges with western management of water and drought resilience. We have some issues to work through on that, certainly not the least of which is the Colorado River drought contingency plan. This involves an interstate agreement to keep Lake Mead from dropping to critical levels. It has taken years of negotiation with cities, Tribes, farmers, and elected officials.

I clearly understand that this is a time-sensitive issue. I had hoped we might be able to finalize it for this package, but I am looking forward to working with both Senator MCSALLY, who is the new chairman of the Water and Power Subcommittee of the Energy Committee, and Senator CORTEZ MASTO, who is the ranking member, so we can get this over the finish line as quickly as we can.

We also need to complete our work to reauthorize the Bureau of Reclamation's infrastructure funding programs

to better utilize Federal lands and water facilities for aquifer recharge and eliminate duplication in the permitting of reclamation pump storage projects.

We are making good strides on the water side with this measure as well. I think it is important to remind folks that it is a lands package; it addresses many of the issues related to water; it is a sportsmen's package; and it is truly a conservation package as we look to what we have included and incorporated as the permanent authorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This is a good bill we have in front of us. We have been able to make it even a little better through our substitute amendment. I do know that we have many colleagues who, if we had more time, would say that they have more amendments they would like to offer for the package. We are not going to have the time or the ability to come to an agreement to add them here, but it is not without a great deal of work that we have gotten to this place. Again, the fact that we have been working for years—literally, years—to put this together is demonstration of our good faith to try to incorporate as much as we possibly can.

I do want to repeat, and I know Senator MANCHIN has, as well, that this is not going to be our last chance to pass natural resources legislation in this Congress. As soon as we get done here—hopefully, no later than early tomorrow—we are going to be right back at work. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee is going back to work, holding hearings, moving lands legislation. This is our effort, what we are dealing with right now, to clear the deck, and then move on to some new issues. We will be back again to move many of the provisions that perhaps weren't quite ready for this particular package.

Later this afternoon, we are going to vote on motions to end debate on S. 47. I strongly, strongly encourage all Members to support that motion and to allow us to take final steps to move this important package with good, strong, robust bipartisan support, and send it over to the House of Representatives so that we can finally get this enacted into law.

I see my friend from Nebraska is here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

LEAD PROGRAM STUDENTS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I offer my thanks and appreciation to the chairman of the committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, and the ranking member, Senator MANCHIN, for the work they have done on this lands package. They have tried their best to bring to the forefront a number of different viewpoints and, obviously, a wide variety of issues that are included in this package. They have worked hard to meet many demands on all sides, and I thank them for getting that done.

I am going to be installed this week as one of the chairmen of the sportsmen's caucus, and we are thrilled to be able to have the sportsmen's bill included in this package so that we can continue to see this great American tradition of families and friends enjoying the outdoors, hunting, fishing, and recreating in this beautiful land that we have here in the United States of America.

I am very fortunate today to welcome a number of conservationists from Nebraska to Washington, DC. This is a group of bright, young people who are taking part in Nebraska's Leadership Education/Action Development Program, true conservationists who are ag producers, ag business people, and are here visiting us. This is known as the LEAD Program. They are individuals from various backgrounds who participate in this premier agriculture leadership program.

Over the course of 2 years, Nebraska LEAD fellows engage in monthly seminars all across the State; they visit our Nation's Capital; and they even have the opportunity to study agriculture systems overseas. The goal of the LEAD Program is to develop the next generation of innovative thinkers, problem solvers, and decision makers who will work to provide food and fuel to our world.

As a proud LEAD alum myself, I can tell you that it has helped to shape who I am today. This program continues to be near and dear to my heart. Through the LEAD Program, I learned valuable leadership skills that I have carried with me in serving my community in the Nebraska Legislature and right here in the U.S. Senate.

Many may not know this statistic, but by the year 2050, there will be an additional 2 billion people to feed in this world. It is important that the future generations of agricultural leaders are motivated and prepared to deal with unforeseen challenges on the road ahead. The LEAD Program is an extraordinary opportunity for Nebraskans to learn more about international trade, about foreign policy, and the unique agricultural systems that we have in our State, in our country, and in our world. Participants in the program will gain firsthand experience in what it means to be an agricultural leader here at home.

Agriculture is the beating heart of my State's economy. The hard work of our farmers and ranchers in Nebraska produces abundant bounties every year. We feed the world. We are privileged to do this and proud of this responsibility, and we pass it on to the next generation.

We also know that putting food on family dinner tables around the world does not come easy. It is the result of calloused hands and long days. It is chopping ice in the tank for thirsty cattle when it is 20 below, and moving irrigation pipes for thirsty crops when it is 110. It is the product of bright innovations, new technology, critical

thinking, and fresh solutions in addressing some of our world's most pressing challenges. Now it is in the hands of the next generation of leaders.

Nebraska's LEAD Class 38 understands this. They know that our future is filled with promise. So I am expecting great things from each and every one of them, and I look forward to meeting with them this afternoon after I leave the floor.

LEAD Class 38, we are grateful for the work that you are doing now and the good work that you will do to help build a stronger Nebraska and a stronger world. I want to again extend a formal, warm welcome to all members of LEAD 38, and I hope you will enjoy your time in our Nation's Capital.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 pending motion to proceed to Calendar No. 6, H.J. Res. 1, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes.

Pat Roberts, Susan M. Collins, Michael B. Enzi, Roger F. Wicker, Lisa Murkowski, Marco Rubio, James M. Inhofe, Deb Fischer, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Richard C. Shelby, John Thune, Joni Ernst, Mitch McConnell

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I withdraw the motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The motion is withdrawn.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 433 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, the second bill that I have introduced is the Home Health Care Planning Improvement Act. I have introduced this bill with my friend and colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN. Our legislation will improve the access that Medicare beneficiaries have to home healthcare by allowing physician assistants, nurse practitioners, clinical nurse specialists, and certified nurse midwives to order home health services. All of these healthcare professionals are playing increasingly important roles in the delivery of healthcare, particularly in rural and underserved areas of our Nation, like those represented by the Presiding Officer and the State of Maine.

I have learned of far too many cases of seniors experiencing unnecessary delays in accessing home healthcare because a physician was not available to order the care promptly. To avoid these needless delays, it is common sense that other medical professionals who are familiar with a patient's case should be able to order these services. Under current law, however, only physicians are allowed to certify or initiate home healthcare for Medicare patients, even though they may not be as familiar with the patient's case as the nonphysician provider. In some cases, the certifying physician may not even have a relationship with the patient and must rely on the recommendation of the nurse practitioner, physician assistant, clinical nurse specialist, or certified nurse midwife to order the medically necessary home healthcare. That makes no sense whatsoever. In too many cases, these requirements create obstacles, delays, and unnecessary paperwork before home healthcare can be provided. The result can be an unnecessary hospital readmission or other setback for the patient that would not have occurred had the home healthcare been provided promptly.

The Home Health Care Planning Improvement Act removes the needless delays in getting Medicare patients the home healthcare they need simply because a physician is not available to sign the form required by law. Again, I would make the point that this physician may not even have a relationship with the senior or other patient who needs the home healthcare. That primary care relationship may be between the patient and a nurse practitioner or a physician assistant, and yet that qualified healthcare professional is unable to order the home care that the patient needs.

These two bills will help to ensure the viability and accessibility of home health services now and in the future. By helping patients to avoid much more costly hospital stays and nursing homes, we know that home healthcare saves Medicare, Medicaid, and private insurers' programs millions of dollars each year. At a time when healthcare costs are among our most pressing policy challenges, we should embrace cost-effective solutions like home healthcare.

Thank you, Madam President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, imagine going into a U.S. prison and announcing that a substantial number of the prisoners had to be released immediately—no exceptions, even if the prisoners in question had participated in serious crimes or committed violent offenses. That is an unthinkable scenario, and no one would seriously suggest going into our Nation's prisons and immediately releasing thousands of prisoners, including violent offenders onto the streets. Yet that is exactly what Democrats are proposing as part of a border security agreement.

Over the weekend, Democrats proposed capping the number of illegal immigrants who could be detained by Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Incredibly, they are refusing to allow an exception to the cap for violent criminals. Under Democrats' proposal, if Immigration and Customs Enforcement needed to detain more than 16,500 violent criminals in the interior of our country, they simply wouldn't be able to do it. Instead, immigration enforcement officers would have to choose which violent criminals to release back into our communities. Think about that.

Obviously, everyone who has come here illegally has broken our laws, but in a lot of cases in question, we are talking about people who have violated other laws, like laws against assault, rape, murder, theft, drug trafficking, and more. We are talking about limiting law enforcement's ability to make sure that those individuals are detained.

It isn't just about future detentions either. If the Democrats' enforcement cap went into effect, Immigration and Customs Enforcement would be forced to release criminals already in detention onto our Nation's streets.

Additionally, there are an estimated 180,000 criminal illegal aliens in the United States who currently are not in custody.

So, under the Democrats' proposal, not only would Immigration and Customs Enforcement be forced to release violent criminals, for all practical purposes, it would also be prohibited from trying to take additional dangerous criminals off of our streets.

Let's be very clear about what we are talking about here. We are talking about limiting the ability of a law enforcement agency to enforce criminal laws. No administration of either party would accept an arbitrary limit on the number of criminals it would be able to detain. No administration would or

should sign off on a law that would force law enforcement agencies to leave violent criminals on our Nation's streets.

As of a couple of days ago, the Republicans, I would say, were encouraged by the bipartisan nature of the negotiations to prevent another government shutdown. Then the Democrats came forward with this absurd proposal to limit law enforcement's ability to detain even dangerous criminals.

Are Democrats trying to derail negotiations with a poison pill at the eleventh hour and force another shutdown? The question has to be asked since no one could seriously think that any President of either party would sign a deal that would limit his administration's ability to enforce the law.

We still have a few days left. I hope the Democrats will abandon this preposterous proposal to release dangerous criminals onto our Nation's streets. We can achieve a deal to avert another shutdown, but we can't do it by jeopardizing law enforcement's ability to protect the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. 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. THUNE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 47

Mr. LEE. Madam President, a little over a month ago, I stood before this body to object to the massive public lands package that it was poised to pass. This bill, some 680 pages long, was released at 10 a.m. that morning—that very morning when they first wanted us to pass this. My staff and I had not seen it beforehand, and we had been given no time to read it. This is, of course, really bad process—terrible process. This is not the way legislation should be written. It is not the way legislation should be debated. It is, of course, never ever the way legislation should be passed. In addition to the bad process, I objected at the time because I suspected that it also contained bad policy—bad policy that would disproportionately and negatively affect my State of Utah.

Now we find ourselves today, more than a month later, at a moment at which we are considering the bill. During that time period, I have, of course, had time to read the bill. Unfortunately, those suspicions that I had

about the bill have since been confirmed. This bill perpetuates a terrible standard for Federal land policy in the West, particularly for the State of Utah.

To give one some background, the Federal Government owns more than 640 million acres of land. This is a staggering amount of real estate—an amount of land that in its totality is larger than the entireties of France, Spain, Germany, Poland, Italy, the United Kingdom, Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands combined—all of them. I don't mean the national parks of those lands combined. I don't mean the government lands owned by those respective nations. I mean the entirety of those countries combined. That is how much land the Federal Government owns just within the United States. That is a problem, especially because of the way it is distributed.

Do you see this? Federal public land is not distributed evenly across the entire country. It is distributed in such a way that the West bears a disproportionate burden. In fact, my home State of Utah is a place that itself bears a disproportionate burden, a disproportionate share of that land, with two-thirds of the land being owned by the Federal Government. You will see, on this map, we have Federal land marked in red, and land that is not owned by the Federal Government is marked in white. You will see there is a big difference, as you move from west to east, in the amount of Federal land that exists.

I remember when Eliza, my daughter, was about 8 years old. It was the first time I ever showed her this map. As best I could, I explained it to her, an 8-year-old.

At the time, she looked at the map and said:

Look, Daddy. They own Utah.

I said:

Yes, Eliza, you're right. They own Utah.

In every State east of Colorado, the Federal Government owns less than 15 percent of the land. In many of those States, it is in the low single digits as a percentage of the total land in a State that is owned by the Federal Government. In Colorado or in every State west of Colorado, the Federal Government owns at least 15 percent of the land, and in many of the States, like mine, it is a lot, lot more than that. This is, of course, an enormous amount of land. Make no mistake—it imposes an enormous burden on my State. In light of this, what are my objections to this bill? Well, there are a few.

First, this bill permanently reauthorizes something called the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or the LWCF, as it is sometimes abbreviated. Passed in 1964 by Congress, the LWCF was enacted to promote and preserve access to recreation opportunities on public land—to promote and preserve access to recreation opportunities. This is an admirable and worthy goal,

so the fund was set up to be the principal source of money for new Federal land acquisition and to assist the States in developing recreation opportunities.

As originally conceived and passed by Congress, it directed 60 percent of its funds to be appropriated for State purposes and 40 percent for Federal purposes. Unfortunately, the program has since drifted from its original intent and from its original wording, and it has been a program that has been rife with abuse. I understand that in some States, people like it, and I understand that in some States, this is a program that is well regarded. It is not the case in every State.

To be clear, in 1976, the law was amended, and it was amended to remove that 60-percent State provision, stating simply that not less than 40 percent must be used for Federal purposes. Then it was silent on whether a State would, in fact, receive a penny.

The result? Well, it has been used for more Federal land acquisition than to actually care for, access, and manage the land that we already have, and 61 percent of funds have historically been used for acquisition, compared to the 25 percent that has historically been allocated to State grants. So millions of acres of land have been added to the Federal Government's already vast estate solely through the LWCF program.

Not surprisingly, the Federal Government has not always been a good steward of this land, and that is putting it mildly. Look, the sheer magnitude of unfunded needs on Federal lands is itself staggering. Now, this shouldn't be surprising. The Federal Government is run by human beings, and the Federal Government owns an enormous amount of land—a staggering amount of land. So for any one entity to own and manage that much land is going to be a daunting task, and I am not just talking here about neglect of garden variety BLM lands—those managed by the Bureau of Land Management or one of the other land management agencies of the Federal Government. A lot of those lands that comprise what we might describe as the crown jewels, even of our National Park System—those parts of the Federal public lands that the American people know and enjoy the most and identify most closely with what they like about Federal land management—even many of those have been neglected.

Take, for example, Grand Canyon National Park. We have deferred maintenance costs there of over \$329 million. Yellowstone National Park has deferred maintenance of over \$515 million. That is an enormous amount of land that is not being properly maintained. So in Yellowstone, here you have a picture of a road going through the park, and that road is completely pockmarked and made dangerous—in some places almost unusable—by potholes that haven't been repaired.

No American would necessarily want to drive down a road that looks like

that. This is some of what happens when you continue to acquire more when you can't manage what you have.

Here in the Grand Canyon, we have a picture of a pipe that has sprung a leak and is leaking quite dangerously.

So what we have is a situation that, according to a 2017 CRS report, has resulted in a maintenance backlog of Federal lands totaling \$18.6 billion.

Wildfires have run rampant in parts of the country, especially in the West, which the government has failed to prevent, and it is not just that they have failed to prevent those wildfires. It is not just that the Federal Government is not always well equipped to either prevent them in the first place or to fight them because of the vast inventory of lands that it has. In many instances, poor land management processes have resulted in severe environmental degradation that has itself been the predictable cause of widespread environmental catastrophe within Federal public lands.

To cite one of many examples, there is an infestation of a certain type of bark beetle within a certain area of federally owned forest. Locals understand that it is coming and ask the Federal Government to abate the nuisance, to address the infestation. The Federal Government refuses. The State and local authorities come back and say: OK, will you at least let us deal with the nuisance, get rid of the bark beetle so it doesn't destroy the trees, because if it destroys the trees, it is going to create a local environmental and economic catastrophe for our people. The Federal Government says no. So the bark beetle does its damage and destroys hundreds of thousands of acres of wooded area. It kills the trees. The trees then die.

The local populations go back to the Federal Government and say: These trees are dead. Will you cut them down so that we don't have this massive tinderbox of forest fire waiting to happen?

The Federal Government says no.

The people come back, those who live around the area, and say: Can we cut them down because, otherwise, this is going to be a tinderbox. There is going to be a fire. People are going to get hurt, and it is going to wreak havoc on our local environment.

The Federal Government still says no.

Then, guess what happens. Those trees catch on fire. They burn down, creating environmental catastrophe, disrupting the watershed, and this, in turn, leads to floods.

All of these things connect back up to poor Federal land management processes, and those poor Federal land management processes are the result of the fact that we have too much Federal land in the inventory to begin with.

Meanwhile, we have ill-kept roads and trails that, in some cases, have actually kept people away from our national treasures rather than allowing them to access them.

Furthermore, none of the current LWCF funds—not any of them—are directed toward maintenance or upkeep

of these lands, including within our national parks.

But for years now, Congress has perpetuated the status quo of this broken, dangerous, and environmentally reckless program by reauthorizing it in giant omnibus spending bills or continuing resolutions without even the slightest incremental, modest reform. Worse still would be making reauthorization permanent. Indeed, it would deny us any regular opportunity as a Congress to actually reform and improve the program.

Second, the bill creates another 1.3 million acres of wilderness in the West—half of that being in Emery County, UT.

Now, at the outset, I want to say that wilderness designations might sound like a good thing, and sometimes they are. But this highly restrictive designation limits far more activities than is necessary in many, many instances to actually protect the land.

In fact, a wilderness designation prohibits almost all human activity. This land usually cannot be used for any commercial activity or any infrastructure. It cannot be developed for recreational purposes or traveled across by car, bus, automobile, or even a bicycle—even a bicycle made for that specific purpose—to say nothing of any type of agricultural development or timber harvesting. In a State like Utah, where the Federal Government owns more than two-thirds of the land, these designations have big consequences, especially for the poor and middle class in my State.

The amount of Federal land in Utah already sets out a great disadvantage to the people of Utah to begin with. While private landowners would pay property taxes on this land, and those taxes would go to the State and its political subdivisions, the Federal Government does not. It does not pay property taxes. So Utah is deprived of what should be and otherwise would be a huge source of revenue and of opportunity.

What does that mean? Well, as a result, our schools are underfunded, local governments are crippled, fire departments are, ironically, depleted and, therefore, unable to properly take care of the lands they are charged to protect in the first place, and many times strapped in their ability to provide basic services to those most in need.

With so much of this land in the grip of Federal bureaucrats, it is again limited in its use, in its opportunity, in its potential for use for development, for infrastructure, and for jobs that are essential to our State's economy—jobs that would be essential to any State's economy.

But with further wilderness designations by Congress, this is an even tighter grip. As the LWCF perpetuates the acquisition of even more Federal public land, communities like those throughout my State start to suffer even more. Citizens, you see, in this type of an environment have to go to

the Federal Government, cap in hand, to ask permission for the use of any of the land at all, for access to any of the land at all, whether that means to dig a well, to build a road, to bury a cable, or to do virtually anything on it at all.

So designating more than 660,000 acres of wilderness in Emery County is of no small consequence.

I understand that a lot of people here like the fact that we are doing that. Make no mistake. They are not the people who live in Emery County. They are not the people who live within hundreds or even thousands of miles of Emery County.

Finally, this bill does nothing to address the imminent threat that Utah faces from unilateral Executive land grabs through the Antiquities Act.

To be clear, anything and everything that is designated as red on this map may be designated as a national monument overnight, at any moment, solely at the discretion of the President. Anything here is fair game to any President, at any time, to say: I now make you a monument.

Now, the Antiquities Act, passed in 1906, was intended to give the President of the United States the power to declare land that is already owned or controlled by the Federal Government as a national monument and to do so by Executive fiat. This was done in order to protect specific historic and cultural objects in the case of an emergency where they couldn't otherwise be protected. But instead of reserving the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected, as the law itself requires and as the text of the Antiquities Act itself mandates, Presidents in more modern times have designated enormous, million-acre monuments far beyond the scope of the objects in need of immediate protection.

These monument designations—perhaps the most restrictive of all Federal land designations—often do more harm than good. They radically undermine a State's economy by prohibiting energy production, mining, fishing, ranching, recreation, and a myriad of other uses.

Furthermore, without allowing Congress or the State legislature any actionable input in a decision like this, they effectively silence and disenfranchise the voices of the people closest to and most affected by and connected to the lands in question, depriving them of any say in the process. This is not fair. It is wrong, and it is something that needs to be addressed.

Take, for example, the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, designated by President Clinton in 1996. The Clinton administration designated 1.7 million acres of land—or about 67 percent of Kane County, UT, for the monument, all the while claiming that grazing would remain at historical levels.

But this promise, of course, was not kept. Since then, the BLM has revoked permits and closed much needed range land. You see, the men and women of

the Bureau of Land Management, while well educated, well intentioned, and perhaps hard-working in many instances, are not from Utah. They don't respond to or stand accountable to anyone who is from Utah. They don't come from these parts of the country or from my State, where people's day-to-day livelihood and their ability to access their own land for their own purposes and to make a living—they don't have anything to do with this land. So why would they care? They don't.

Today, grazing is down almost one-third from what it had been more than two decades ago when the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument was proclaimed by President Clinton—proclaimed and designated as such, by the way, without any advance notice to the people of Utah, without the President even entering the State of Utah to do it.

Now, ranchers were hit hard. Many of them lost their ability to fence in water resources and maintain roads around them. In some cases, they could no longer bring water to their cattle, and many families were forced to reduce their herds, sometimes by half. This may not sound like much to someone who doesn't understand ranching or doesn't know anyone who makes their living off of ranching, but this means all the world to those people whose families for generations have supported themselves through ranching and ranching in that area where they are deeply connected to this land.

Of course, there was the designation of the Bears Ears National Monument by President Obama. The citizens of San Juan County, UT,—incidentally, Utah's poorest county—woke up on December 28, 2016, to find out that the Obama administration had unilaterally designated 1.35 million acres for that monument overnight, even though they had specifically pleaded against that.

Keep in mind that San Juan County has historically had some divisions—some of them along political lines, between Republicans and Democrats, and some of them along ethnic lines, between those who are Native American and those who are not.

This was an issue that united Democrats and Republicans alike in San Juan County. It united Native Americans in San Juan County and non-Native Americans in San Juan County like few issues ever have in San Juan County and few issues ever will in San Juan County. This brought them together because people from all walks of life opposed this if they lived in San Juan County.

President Obama, at the time he declared it, claimed this to have had the overwhelming support of Native American populations. What was often left out of that discussion is they were not the Native American populations in Utah. They were not the people who lived in San Juan County. They were people outside of this area, most of them out of State, who supported it.

Yes, it is easy to designate something as wilderness or a national monument when it is not in your land, when it is not in your community, when it doesn't affect your way of life. That is what happens when we abuse Federal public land ownership. That is what happens when you take one State and decide the Federal Government is going to own more than two-thirds of the land in that State.

Imagine if in your State—or in any other State—any other land owner, whether an individual, a for-profit corporation, a nonprofit foundation, or anything else, owned more than, let's say, 5 percent of the land. People would be understandably, justifiably concerned that that person or that entity or that nonprofit, or whatever it was, could have a disproportionate, outsized impact on that State's economy.

Imagine if that number were increased to include not just 5 percent of the land in your State, but 10, 15, 20, 25 percent of the land. As you rounded the corner of 30 percent, people would start to get freaked out. Imagine if that number then soared above that—35, 40, 45, 50 percent—until it got up to nearly 70 percent of the land in your State. Imagine further that, at that point, that landowner declared itself exempt from all forms of property taxation. That would create problems for your State.

This is what I beg and plead for my colleagues from around the country, particularly those who live east of Colorado, to understand. It is really easy to support these things when it is in somebody else's State. It is really for people on the northeastern seaboard to look at Utah and say: Well, it is just one of those square States. They have plenty of land out there. They have plenty of room. They don't need to worry about it.

Try living there. Try earning a living there for your family. It is not right. This goes against so much of what we believe in, in this country.

Federal land ownership is not the only unfair thing about this. Again, Federal land ownership makes possible the designation unilaterally, by one person, of a national monument, and if that one person happens to decide that a particular State ought to be the next victim, that person will make it so.

It just so happens that, just as Utah has a disproportionate share of Federal public land in its State, so, too, is it a disproportionate victim under the Antiquities Act. Since the passage of the Antiquities Act, Presidents have designated 77.85 million acres of land as national monuments, and 87 percent of that has been designated in the last 40 years. Of the land that has been designated as a monument over the last 25 years, 3.23 million acres, or 28 percent, are in Utah. All of the land in the United States designated as a monument in the last 25 years, that portion—nearly 30 percent—is in my State. Why is that fair? It is not, especially when you consider the harm

done to the economies, the disruption that takes place as a result of these designations, the widespread opposition from Democrats and Republicans alike, and in San Juan County the Native American population and the non-Native American population alike are overwhelmingly against this.

What was intended to be an act of cultural preservation has, sadly, deteriorated into a greedy, harmful Federal land grab. As it currently stands, there is always the threat of a decision coming down from on high that will utterly decimate the livelihoods of people in Utah. There is no good reason for this.

Already, two other States have felt the abuse of the Antiquities Act within their borders, and they have received relief. In the 1950s, Wyoming and Alaska successfully called on Congress to grant them Antiquities Act protections. Why? Because they had been disproportionately burdened by this law. As a result of their efforts, in Wyoming, any monument designation must be approved by Congress, and, in Alaska, any designation made by Presidential fiat that exceeds 5,000 acres must be approved by Congress.

To be clear, in both of these States, Congress still has the power to designate this. It is just that they are saying, for those States where it has been abused in the past, Congress as a whole—people's elected lawmakers as a whole in Congress—ought to be the ones designating, rather than putting it in the hands of one person.

There is no reason why the people of Utah, who have suffered more under the Antiquities Act than any other population in the entire country, should be treated any differently. There is no reason Utahns should live under this constant threat of abuse. That is why we have offered an amendment that would remedy this.

With permanent authorization of the LWCF, which will result only in a greater Federal land footprint, and with the roughly 660,000 acres of new wilderness designation in Utah, I fear my State is at even greater risk for yet another monument designation. Thus, at a bare minimum, Utah deserves the same protection Wyoming has received. Our amendment would add just two words: "or Utah." Without it, I simply cannot vote for this bill. With it, it gives us the protection we deserve and protection that other States like ours have already received.

In a day and age when we have to deal with 680-page bills dropped on our desks at 10 a.m. on the day we are asked to pass it or a 2,232 page spending bill, as we faced last March for the omnibus spending package, a bill that is not two pages long, but just two words long, should be welcomed.

There is much that is wrong with our Federal land policy in the West, and, unfortunately, much of that is something that this bill fails to correct. Utahns, and Americans, deserve better than the stranglehold that the Federal Government is exercising over so much

of our country's lands. Yet Washington greedily continues to grab more, year after year, imposing tighter and tighter restrictions, all the while failing to maintain the lands that it already owns. These lands will not be national treasures for everyone if we can't take care of them in the first place. Indeed, they will be treasures for no one if we continue along this same pattern of willful neglect.

Let me be very clear. My opposition today is not about whether our national treasures or parks or monuments or lands should be protected. It is not about whether they should be, but how to do that and who is best equipped to do that and who is most knowledgeable to do it well.

What I am asking for is for Utah's elected leaders—its elected lawmakers in Congress—to at least be given a chance to weigh in on these matters before they become law, rather than to have those decisions being made from thousands of miles away by just one person. Indeed, the very best way to ensure that these national treasures are protected and recreation available is to empower our States and our local communities, which understand and appreciate their backyards best. They know which land to prioritize, and they know how to make that happen.

Just look at the State and local ballot initiatives in the last few decades to see the evidence. Since 1988, these State initiatives have approved over \$72 billion in combined expenditures for recreation and conservation. These things matter to States and local communities, and they have already raised huge funds and found ways to preserve and competently manage their public lands.

Protection of our lands will happen without the Federal Government's thumb on the scale, and it will happen in a way that actually makes these treasures more available for future generations. We will not be helping them preserve them, however, by denying access to the people who are in the best position themselves to preserve them; that is, the people who live and work and recreate on them, the people whose lives are interwoven with them and have been for generations. And we will not be helping the American people by depriving them of their livelihoods. That is why I have introduced amendments that would make reforms and improvements to the LWCF, the Emery County wilderness designation bill and other provisions in this package—amendments that would steer our lands policy in a better direction, at least as a starting point.

These are conversations worth having. They need to be had, and we ought to have them. But at a bare minimum, with the least shred of compromise, we could add just those two words—"or Utah"—to give Utahns justice, to give them a voice in managing and caring for their lands.

AMENDMENT NO. 187 TO AMENDMENT NO. 112

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 187 to amendment No. 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 187 to amendment No. 112.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Utah)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON THE EXTENSION OR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN THE STATE OF UTAH.

Section 320301(d) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “WYOMING” and inserting “THE STATE OF WYOMING OR UTAH”; and

(2) by striking “Wyoming” and inserting “the State of Wyoming or Utah”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, just to speak very, very briefly to the good Senator's amendment to amend the Antiquities Act to prohibit the President from designating national monuments in Utah.

He and I have had some opportunity to speak to this issue, and I certainly agree with him when it comes to the policy goals that he is seeking to assert here. I clearly understand the frustration he has.

With the previous administration, I believe we have seen a real abuse of authority—certainly an abuse of the spirit—of the Antiquities Act. We saw that in Utah when millions of acres were locked up through Executive designation. This was done despite some pretty robust local opposition and objection.

This is a scenario that I know pretty well because, in my State, we have a Federal landlord that owns about 63 percent of the State, 224 million acres. We have a provision in ANILCA that is a specific no-more clause, prohibiting the withdrawal of more than 5,000 acres absent congressional approval. The Obama administration circumvented that law. They placed hundreds of thousands of additional acres off limits to development.

What my colleague is seeking here, the ability to affirm or reject a monument designation by the State of Utah, is something that, again, I truly understand. I have supported legislation and introduction of legislation to do just as he has done—maybe not specific to one State but making sure that we truly do respect the spirit of the Antiquities Act and making sure, when monuments and monument designations move forward, that they are done with local support.

I am in a bit of a quandary here because what he is advocating for is something that, again, I have been there with him on. But our dilemma, if you will, is that we have a package before us of lands bills, of water bills, of sportsmen's provisions, of conservation provisions that we have been working to kind of—not kind of, but to build that level of consensus.

This measure is one that has been identified by those with whom we have been trying to work, not only here in this body but with the House as well. They have identified this as one of those measures that would bring down this effort. So we are in a position where, while I support the goals the Senator is seeking to achieve, I don't see a path forward for it in this Chamber at this time.

As I mentioned—as you have heard me say—we have some very important provisions that we have been working on for a period of years. I want to ensure those proceed. I don't want to see S. 47 fall. So I am going to move to table the Lee amendment, but I want to once again commit to the Senator from Utah that I will work with him, as the chairman of the Energy Committee, to address these monument designations.

Given the vehicle that we have in front of us, I will move to table and ask that colleagues join me in this tabling motion.

Mr. President, at this moment, I move to table the Lee amendment No. 187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have a cloture motion that has ripened. The motion to table is not in order unless you have unanimous consent.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we be allowed to proceed to table Lee amendment No. 187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I move to table Lee amendment No. 187.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

Further, if present and voting the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) would have voted “nay.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 20 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Graham	Reed
Baldwin	Harris	Roberts
Bennet	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rounds
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Jones	Shaheen
Capito	Kaine	Shelby
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Tillis
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gardner	Portman	Young

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Perdue
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Inhofe	Romney
Braun	Johnson	Rubio
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—7

Cornyn	Hoeven	Stabenow
Cruz	Klobuchar	
Gillibrand	Sasse	

The motion is agreed to.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN.

While I was pleased that we could reach agreement to include a designation of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area in the substitute amendment, I want to clarify what this designation does and, perhaps more importantly, what it does not do.

The purpose of this designation, as with congressionally designated National Heritage Areas in general, is to celebrate the region's history and cultural heritage by promoting education, tourism, recreation, and other historic values. It also creates the opportunity for Federal participation in promoting these regional attributes.

In no way does this designation implicate or interfere with any water facilities or operations associated with the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. We are not creating new regulatory authority or modifying existing regulatory authority, including those related to land or water use, at any level of government.

Further, S. 47 includes protections to ensure that private property will not be impacted by the designation, protections that apply to the ownership and use of water rights both inside and outside of the National Heritage Area's boundary.

I ask Senator FEINSTEIN, you have championed this National Heritage

Area designation for quite some time. In her view, have I properly characterized the intended effect of this designation?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank my colleague from Alaska and appreciate her help with this measure. Yes, her characterization of this provision is exactly right. There is no intent that this designation will have any impact on water rights or water-related management decisions. The general protections and limitations, along with the inclusion of language specific to Delta water operations, makes certain that the designation of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area will not affect or influence water operations of the Central Valley Project, State Water Project, or other water supply facilities within the Bay-Delta watershed, including a reduction in water exports from the Bay-Delta. I am pleased that we have included additional language to dispel any such concerns and make absolutely certain that no one reads anything into the legislation that is not there and was never intended.

I thank her for including this designation in S. 47 and for all of her work to move this historic public lands package forward. The public lands package includes a number of provisions that will benefit California, and I appreciate her leadership in building bipartisan agreement to steer it through the Senate.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN. As we have explained, the purpose of this designation is straightforward and intended to promote and celebrate the cultural heritage of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region, without any broader implications on water or land management.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, regarding S. 47, the Natural Resources Management Act, often referred to as the lands package, of which Chairman MURKOWSKI is the sponsor and which is currently under consideration by the full Senate. In particular, I am interested in clarifying the intent of title IV, regarding "Sportsmen's Access and Related Matters."

This title of the legislation deals with—among other issues—the amount of Federal lands open to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting. If I understand the bill correctly, nothing in S. 47 opens existing Federal lands to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting that are not currently open to those activities. Moreover, under this bill, those lands may be closed for reasons, including public safety and environmental protection, among other reasons.

Is that a correct reading of the bill? Ms. MURKOWSKI. Senator MURPHY's reading of the bill is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you. It is also my understanding that S. 47 makes uniform the process by which Federal

lands may be closed to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting. Moreover, it is my understanding that S. 47 does nothing to change the standards that the Federal Government uses to determine whether to close Federal lands to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting or to otherwise limit those activities.

Is that a correct reading of the bill? Ms. MURKOWSKI. Senator MURPHY's reading of the bill is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you.

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 Calendar No. 7, S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lisa Murkowski, Kevin Cramer, Mike Braun, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, Michael B. Enzi, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Richard Burr, Shelley Moore Capito, Rob Portman, Todd Young.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from TX (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from TX (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from ND (Mr. HOEVEN), and the Senator from NE (Mr. SASSE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from TX (Mr. CORNYN) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from ND (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "yea".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from MN (Mrs. KLOBUCHER) and the Senator from MI (Mrs. STAVENOW) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 21 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Boozman	Casey
Baldwin	Braun	Cassidy
Barrasso	Brown	Collins
Bennet	Burr	Coons
Blackburn	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Capito	Cotton
Blunt	Cardin	Cramer
Booker	Carper	Crapo

Daines	Leahy	Sanders
Duckworth	Manchin	Schatz
Durbin	Markey	Schumer
Enzi	McConnell	Scott (FL)
Ernst	McSally	Scott (SC)
Feinstein	Menendez	Shaheen
Fischer	Merkley	Shelby
Gardner	Moran	Sinema
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Smith
Graham	Murphy	Sullivan
Grassley	Murray	Tester
Harris	Perdue	Thune
Hassan	Peters	Tillis
Hawley	Portman	Udall
Heinrich	Reed	Van Hollen
Hirono	Risch	Warner
Hyde-Smith	Roberts	Warren
Isakson	Romney	Whitehouse
Jones	Rosen	Wicker
Kaine	Rounds	Wyden
King	Rubio	Young

NAYS—7

Inhofe	Lankford	Toomey
Johnson	Lee	
Kennedy	Paul	

NOT VOTING—6

Cornyn	Hoeven	Sasse
Cruz	Klobuchar	Stabenow

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 7.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 TO AMENDMENT NO. 112

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 182 to amendment No. 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. RUBIO] proposes an amendment numbered 182 to amendment No. 112.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To give effect to more accurate maps of units of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System that were produced by digital mapping)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 2402A. JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b) of the Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-358) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(36) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (1 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.”

“(37) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (2 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.”

(b) EFFECT.—Section 7003 shall have no force or effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Alaska.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 12, all postcloture time be considered expired on S. 47; that following the disposition of any pending amendments, the substitute amendment, as amended, if amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be

read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the body on the very substantive vote, and I look forward to tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, 2½ weeks ago, Democrats and Republicans—the House, the Senate, and the White House—agreed to reopen the government for 3 weeks to be able to continue negotiations on border security.

A very simple statement that was made by my Democratic colleagues was this: Reopen the government for 3 weeks. We will negotiate on border security and come to an agreement, but only if the government is open, and it would be limited to border security.

It was a pretty straightforward conversation.

President Trump said: We trust you on this.

We agreed to reopen the government for 3 weeks to focus on border security.

Now it appears that based on the negotiations that are happening right now in this building, this has become a Lucy-and-the-football-type negotiation because this doesn't seem to be about border security anymore.

My Democratic colleagues have said: Now we want to add one thing. We will vote for fencing at the border as long as you agree to defund a section of ICE.

The whole negotiation now is this: Yes, we will add border fencing, but you have to agree to defund ICE.

Here is the way that works. Their agreement is this: You will have to limit the number of people that ICE can detain.

Now, to our credit, this Congress has always allocated funding to say: Here is x amount of dollars for detention facilities and for bed space for ICE, knowing that if somebody is picked up at the border, when they are picked up at the border as they cross, the Border Patrol does not house them. They are not detained by Border Patrol. They are arrested by Border Patrol, and then they are turned over to ICE.

So the plan is not to allocate enough dollars for ICE detention but to create a new arbitrary cap for the number of people that ICE could actually detain, so that ICE could only hold x amount of people. That is what they want to get a negotiation—for the first time ever to have a maximum cap of the number of people that ICE could detain.

Why does that matter? One is to allow funding for it, and another one is to have a cap. A cap is very different, and my Democratic colleagues know it.

In real life, here is what it would look like. If ICE, at any point, already had the number they have in custody at that point and they arrest someone

else, they would have to choose to release someone currently in detention before they could arrest someone and put them in detention.

Let me give an example.

Coyotes now try for any adult who is coming to try to have them bring a child with them because they know if a child travels with the adult, they are going to get a special lane into the country, as if they are coming as a family. They get their own fast lane into being released into the country.

If you have this ICE detainer cap, coyotes will know: Bring people in mass migration because ICE can't release enough people at once. So if you come as a thousand across the border or 500 across the border, they have to be released into the country because ICE can't quickly release 500 people from detention to add the new 500 people who are coming through.

My Democratic colleagues also know that it currently takes about 41 days for someone who is in detention to go through the whole process to get a hearing and get finished. This would accelerate the process of getting those people out and released into the country, rather than getting them through the actual hearing.

The better solution on this is to add judges and actually get people to go through the process and get due process faster, instead of releasing people into the country. Once someone crosses our border illegally and they are released into the country, the vast majority of those individuals never get deported because they either don't show up for the hearing at all or, when they do show up for the hearing and they are told, no, you can't legally stay, they disappear.

This cap negotiation that is going on right now is exactly the wrong direction to go. It is not about border security. It is about releasing people into the country.

Several years ago, there was a young lady named Sarah Root. She was in Iowa. It was graduation night from college, and she was hit by a drunk driver and killed. Sarah Root's loss drew the Nation's attention for a moment to the issue of not only drunk driving but illegal immigration, because the person that hit Sarah was illegally present in the country and had a blood alcohol level three times above the legal limit.

Local law enforcement, at that time under the Obama administration, asked ICE to detain them. ICE said they didn't meet the minimum qualification that had been set by the administration to detain them. So they released this person on bond. Sarah later died from her injuries, and they have never been able to find that guy again. He is gone. He is somewhere in the United States, or maybe he is running internationally. We don't know, but he is on our most wanted list instead of being held.

That was a decision made by a previous administration just on priorities. My Democratic colleagues are trying

to force ICE to make those kinds of decisions every single day now—to determine who needs to be released and who needs to be kept based on an arbitrary cap that they want to put in on the maximum number of people that ICE can detain.

There is no State in the country that sets an arbitrary cap, other than the bed space that they have available. But this conversation is that we have enough bed space to hold someone, but you can't use that bed space because we want to limit the number of people that ICE can detain.

This is the current debate on border security. It is not about border security anymore. It is not about fencing anymore. It is now about giving ICE a maximum cap they can detain and, literally, forcing ICE to release people illegally present into the United States. That is not border security. That is the opposite of border security, and we should not go for a deal that puts a cap on ICE that is an arbitrary number.

I hope this administration rejects that. I hope we can finish negotiations. I hope the American people see this for what it is. This is no longer about border security. This is about trying to force this administration to release people into the country who are illegally present and prevent ICE from doing its job. Enough is enough on this. Let's allow the ICE folks to be able to do their job—they are Federal law enforcement—and not put a cap on them, saying: You can only enforce the law this far, and then after that, you cannot enforce the law anymore because we have an arbitrary cap. That needs to be rejected, and that is not a serious offer in negotiations.

The reason we don't already have a deal that is already done right now, with this body debating it, is that debate about capping ICE detentions got added into the conversation last week-end and blew up the whole negotiation.

This is not the White House blowing up negotiations. This is not Republicans blowing up negotiations. This is my Democratic colleagues saying they want a cap on ICE detentions and allowing coyotes to be able to rush large quantities at the border or forcing ICE to have to make difficult choices about which gang members they are going to release and which they are going to hold, literally getting a briefing every morning saying: We can't arrest anyone today because we don't have enough detention space, so today we have to look the other way.

That is an absurd proposal, and we should reject it.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. 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 ECONOMY

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss two economic issues this evening. The first is a reaction to a proposal that comes to us from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Let me preface this with the observation that I am pretty sure we are living through the strongest economy in the United States in my adult lifetime. It has been fantastic for the people I represent.

Our unemployment rate is pretty much at a 50-year low. African-American and Hispanic unemployment is the lowest that has ever been recorded. The youth unemployment rate is extremely low. It is at historically low levels. Our economy has accelerated, and wages are growing exactly as we said they would. It is very simple. The demand for workers has grown so much that employers are being forced to bid ever higher for the services of the workers.

Now we are in a tremendously enviable position of having more job openings in America than there are people looking for work in America. It is fantastic. This is exactly what we want to have happen.

Last week, the President was right when he said that our economy is the envy of the world. It is totally true.

So what do our colleagues on the other side of the aisle propose to do in light of the fact that we have this fantastic economy? Well, Senator SANDERS and Senator SCHUMER joined up and made a proposal that we adopt legislation that would severely restrict the ability of American companies to buy back their own stock. This is just the latest iteration of a socialist tendency that seems to be growing on the far left. This is a horrendous idea.

I suppose we shouldn't be surprised when we hear a Socialist-leaning idea coming from a self-described Democratic Socialist or a Socialist Democrat—whatever the description is—but I am surprised to hear this coming from the Senate minority leader.

Let's talk about this a little bit. First of all, what is a stock buyback? It is not that complicated. It is when the owners of a company take some or all of their money out of the company.

Let's think about it this way. A business is owned by its shareholders, and the shareholders hire a management team to take their money and invest it in a way that will generate a return for the investor, for the shareholder. That is the role of the management team.

So why would they buy back their own stock? The reason they would buy back their own stock is that sometimes it happens that the management team of a company is just not able to deploy any more capital in a way that would generate a better return than what is generally available in the marketplace. What sometimes happens is companies might make huge investments; they may be investing tremendous amounts—record amounts—in expanding their capabilities, expanding their production, more R&D, and expanding

their staff, but they can reach a limit as to how much they can expand and how much they productively invest at any given point. If they have more money—more cash—than they can productively deploy, they have an obligation to return that to the people who actually own it; that is, the shareholders, the investors. That is their obligation.

Shockingly, Senators SANDERS and SCHUMER are suggesting that companies be forbidden from being able to return some portion of their excess capital to their shareholders unless the company first complies with a list of political demands that Senators SCHUMER and SANDERS are advocating.

Let me tell you why this is such a bad idea. I will give you three reasons. No. 1, it is a disturbing and profound attack on freedom. No. 2, it would be terrible for the economy. And, No. 3, it would hurt the very people they presumably intend to help. Let me go through them in order.

First of all, as far as freedom goes, whose company is it? To whom does a given company in America belong? I have always thought they belonged to the shareholders of those companies—the people who saved up and invested in them, the people who have launched those companies, and the people whose capital made it possible. So, of course, it should be within the rights of the people who own a company to decide what to do with the profits after all expenses have been covered and taxes have been paid. That is what we are talking about here.

I have a question for my colleagues. The question is, What principle confers on politicians the right to control whether and when and under what circumstances an investor can withdraw his own money from a business in which he invested? I don't know what that principle is.

I will say, to me, it seems exactly equivalent to confiscating the property of somebody—in this case, their ownership in a business—and redistributing that confiscated asset to whomever they choose. That strikes me as pretty close to the definition of socialism. It clearly is an attack on the economic freedom that underpins our entire economy, an entire market economy.

My second point, and related, is this would be terrible for the economy. It would do great harm to an economy that is doing quite well right now. The main way it would be so damaging is it would scare away capital.

Just stop and think about it. Our economy thrives when people are willing to invest in existing businesses, in new businesses, and in startup businesses, but that investment is an absolutely essential part of a thriving economy. Well, people are much less likely to make an investment if Congress makes it harder to take that investment out. So what we would do is we would dry up sources of capital for companies that need that capital because investors would understandably

say: Well, we are heading down the road of putting all kinds of limits on my ability to ever get my money out. I think it may be good to just park it and not invest it.

That would be a very bad development.

The proponents of this idea of restricting companies this way say they want to “incentivize productive investment.” I have to laugh because I have a secret for our colleagues. You see, the free enterprise system already provides an incentive for productive investment. It is called the profit. That is the whole idea. So we don't need to punish people for making an investment as a way to incentivize productive investment. In fact, it will not work at all.

I think some of what they have argued displays a little bit of confusion about how this works. In their argument about why something has to be done, they say that 90 percent of profits go to buybacks and dividends. What else would you use it for? I mean, you first have to cover all of your expenses before you have a profit. So you could have record amounts of research and development, record amounts of expansion, records amounts of employment, and growth in employment, but after all of that is covered, only then do you have the profit. That is what is left over. And after you have covered all of those things, why wouldn't you have buybacks and a distribution to the investors?

That raises this question: Exactly what problem is it that our colleagues think they are solving here? We are running at record high levels of investment in our economy. Capital expenditures have gone through the roof in response partly—largely—due to the change in the tax law that we made. The buybacks that have been occurring have coincided with record levels of investment. What is the problem here?

By the way, as I pointed out earlier, wage growth has accelerated at the highest rate we have seen in many, many years. I really don't understand what problem they think we are solving.

By the way, there is an alternative to distributing excess capital to shareholders. The alternative is keeping the capital trapped in the company where it is not being put to its most productive use. You see, one of the great dynamics of a market economy is that by returning excess capital to shareholders, the shareholders get to decide what new idea deserves to be funded by recycling this capital. Whether it is in the form of dividends or stock buybacks, we encourage this capital to find a new home—a new startup, a new idea, or an expansion of an existing business. The capital is constantly being redirected to the best ideas, as long as you allow it to happen.

Finally, this idea would be very harmful to the people it is, presumably, meant to help. About 40 percent of all equities in the United States are

held in pension and retirement accounts. These are the accounts of teachers and cabdrivers and truckdrivers and folks who work at factories and do every other job that our economy depends on, who put a little money away. It may be in a 401(k) plan, in an IRA, or in an employer-sponsored pension plan; these folks own an awful lot of the stock in America. Well, buybacks are good for their investment because, in some cases, it returns cash that can then be redeployed. In other cases, it provides a bid; it provides upward pressure on the stock price, which is good for the value of their savings. Over time, if the stock gets retired, then the diminished supply gets that much greater a share of all of the future earnings. This is completely a win-win for savers and investors.

Let me just conclude by saying it is a very, very bad idea for America to take any steps down the road toward socialism. This is very much an idea of that ilk. In fact, it is a big step in the direction of a collectivist socialist economy, and we should reject this out of hand.

U.S. TRADE

Mr. President, I also want to touch on an unrelated topic, but it is an important one; that is, the ongoing discussion we are having in this Congress and across the country with respect to trade.

I think most of us in this Chamber agree that international trade is very good for the United States. I know it is very good for Pennsylvania.

I think we all understand that if we impose tariffs on imported goods, that is a tax that American consumers have to pay on a product or a service just because it originates somewhere else. If you add up the impact of the tariffs that this administration has already applied, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that is already going to take one-tenth of a percent off of our GDP, off of our economic growth. That is assuming no further tariffs occur, which is unknown at this point.

In particular, I want to address a category of tariffs that are known as section 232 tariffs because that is the part of the trade law which justifies these tariffs. This is an old law. It is a Cold War-era trade law that is designed to allow a President to impose tariffs when he believes there is a national security threat that requires these tariffs, these taxes on some foreign product for some reason that affects our national security.

In my view, the recent imposition of these 232 tariffs on aluminum and steel were not really about national security. They had other motives and other purposes, and, in my view, they have done much more harm than good.

If you look at tariffs on imported steel, you might believe that it is helpful to the people who are in the steel industry. We have about 140,000 Americans employed at steel mills. It is possible that the tariffs are helpful to those companies and those employees

at some level. The problem is, we have 6.5 million people in companies that use many, many multiples, and everybody who works in that sector of our economy across a wide range of industries is put at a competitive disadvantage when they have to pay that tax on imported steel and aluminum.

Some examples come to mind. Allegheny Technologies is a company in western Pennsylvania that last year had to pay \$16 million in taxes on the steel they imported. They had no choice but to import it because of the unique nature of that steel. It is threatening one of their production facilities.

American Keg is the only steel keg maker in the United States and makes beer kegs in Pennsylvania. They had to lay off one-third of their workers in March of last year because they are not as competitive as they need to be.

Colonial Metal Products is a small manufacturer. They use steel in fabrication. Their entire workforce is at risk.

The list goes on and on because fundamentally these taxes make many companies that use steel and aluminum less competitive.

That is not the only problem. As we all know, many American exporters are subject to retaliation by companies that experience these tariffs. So there are a lot of problems.

I have introduced legislation that is meant to address this. One aspect of this that I think is very important is that the Constitution unambiguously assigns to Congress the responsibility for managing our economic relations—our competing trade relations with other countries. In the Constitution, that explicitly includes the responsibility for deciding whether and to what extent we should impose tariffs on the products of other countries. Yet for years Congress has just let administration after administration take this responsibility that the Constitution gives to us.

So what my legislation does is pretty simple. It says, let's restore to Congress the responsibility that the Constitution gives to Congress. Let's make sure that national security-related tariffs are only imposed when Congress says they should be imposed.

The legislation has 11 original cosponsors, roughly even between Republicans and Democrats. Senator WARNER is the lead Democrat on this bill, and Senators SASSE and HASSAN are also original cosponsors. Four of the cosponsors are from the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over this issue. There is the House companion, which is also bipartisan. There are 61 organizations, business groups and others, that have endorsed this from the outside.

It is important to make the point that our legislation, while it is designed to restore to Congress this important responsibility, doesn't eliminate the ability of a President to invoke section 232 and impose tariffs if

there is a genuine threat to American security. What the President needs to do is explain the threat, make the case to the Congress, and under our legislation, there is a mechanism that requires expedited consideration of the President's request. It can't be filibustered. It doesn't take 60 votes. There is a strict timeline. So this can't languish on a shelf somewhere; Congress has to respond.

One other feature that is important in this bill is that the executive branch determination of whether there is a threat to national security would no longer be conducted by the Commerce Department, as it is now; it would move to the Department of Defense. My view on that is very simple. The Department of Defense is the entity within our executive branch that is best qualified to determine threats to our national security.

I am hopeful that we will grow our support and be able to get a vote on this legislation.

I should point out that there are other legislative approaches. There are other ideas on 232. There is one bill that, like mine, would shift the responsibility for evaluating the threat from the Commerce Department to the Defense Department, but the difference with some of these other pieces of legislation is they contemplate a disapproval resolution. They simply observe that Congress can pass a law to prevent or rescind a 232 designation, but these alternative bills would do nothing to restore that responsibility to Congress today. We could pass a law if we had the votes, and we could override a Presidential veto. We could pass a law to rescind any kind of tariff. The alternative legislation doesn't change that fact. What my legislation does is it would require the affirmative consent of Congress before the tariffs can go into place. That is a fundamental difference.

So I think, for the sake of expanding trade, but importantly, in my mind, for the sake of restoring the constitutional responsibility that is assigned to Congress, we ought to pass this legislation.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

NOMINATION HOLD

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, due to the actions of the Department of Justice, I have placed a hold on Donald Washington to be Director of the U.S. Marshals Service. This hold does not reflect any misgivings I may have

against Mr. Washington. I believe he is a man of great integrity, and his previous role as a U.S. Attorney has prepared him for the post he has been nominated to. Mr. Washington is an excellent candidate, and I look forward to supporting his nomination. However, I cannot allow his nomination to proceed at this time due to the actions of the Department of Justice.

On December 10, 2018, the Department of Justice agreed to provide my staff with a briefing on the Marshals' apparent misuse of the Assets Forfeiture Fund. Then on January 7, 2019, less than 24 hours before the briefing was set to take place, the Department cancelled on account that I was no longer the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

As I have explained several times, it is the constitutional duty of every Member of Congress to conduct oversight. Furthermore, at the time that the Department communicated their cancellation, I was still chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

I am placing this hold on Mr. Washington, a Department of Justice nominee, until the Department of Justice fulfills the promise to provide my staff with a briefing of the Assets Forfeiture Fund.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING CLAYTON JOEL TOWNSEND

● Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Officer Clayton Townsend, killed in the line of duty on January 8, 2019, at the age of 26. Officer Townsend was born in Glendale, AZ, on May 30, 1992. He was a dedicated, loyal, and highly skilled police officer at the Salt River Police Department. Our State will miss him dearly.

Officer Townsend served the Salt River Police Department for 5 years and was applauded by superiors on numerous occasions for excellent communication skills and performance on the job. He had always dreamed of becoming a police officer and truly embodied a genuine, caring, and compassionate commitment to protect and serve others.

Officer Townsend is survived by his wife Deanna, his 10-month-old son Brixton, and his mother Toni. He will be dearly missed by other family members, friends, and hundreds of bereaved members of the Salt River community. In the words of his older brother Cole, Clayton "brought a warmth with him wherever he went. He had a smile that everyone felt." Please join me in honoring his memory.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Sec-

retary of the Senate, on February 8, 2019, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 439. An act to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 450. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 494. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 507. An act to direct the Attorney General to study issues relating to human trafficking, and for other purposes.

H.R. 752. An act to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require the maintenance of databases on awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes.

H.R. 840. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care assistance to veterans receiving certain medical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY) announced that on today, February 11, 2019, he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 439. An act to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 450. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 494. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 507. An act to direct the Attorney General to study issues relating to human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 752. An act to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require the maintenance of databases on awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 840. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Vet-

erans Affairs to provide child care assistance to veterans receiving certain medical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUBIO, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. Res. 62. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. Res. 64. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 430. A bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 431. A bill to promote registered apprenticeships and on-the-job training for small and medium-sized businesses within in-demand industry sectors, through the establishment and support of eligible partnerships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 432. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PAUL, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 433. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 434. A bill to provide for a report on the maintenance of Federal land holdings under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 435. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 436. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of public transportation operations safety risk reduction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the dollar limitation on the deduction for State and local taxes and restore the 39.6 percent individual income tax rate bracket; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. Res. 62. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. Res. 63. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 12, 2019, as "Darwin Day" and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. Res. 64. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 65. A resolution congratulating the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of North Macedonia on ratification of the Prespa Agreement, which resolves a long-standing bilateral dispute and establishes a strategic partnership between the 2 countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 66. A resolution rejecting the use of Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 74

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes.

S. 162

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to provide back pay to low-wage contractor employees, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit, and for other purposes.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive certain penalties for affected Federal employees receiving a distribution from the Thrift Savings Plan during a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 213

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 213, a bill to amend the SOAR Act.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 274

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 274, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 319

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to provide for the administration of certain national monuments, to establish a National Monument Enhancement Fund, and to establish certain wilderness areas in the States of New Mexico and Nevada.

S. 368

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 368, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign non-governmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 378

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 378, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an excise tax on certain prescription drugs which have been subject to a price spike, and for other purposes.

S. 380

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 382, a bill to authorize a special resource study on the spread vectors of chronic wasting disease in Cervidae, and for other purposes.

S. 385

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 385, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide increased labor law protections for agricultural workers, and for other purposes.

S. 387

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 387, a bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes.

S. 408

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 408, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustments to be made automatically by law each year in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 409

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal in commemoration of Aretha Franklin.

AMENDMENT NO. 134

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 134 intended to be proposed to S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 157

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 157 intended to be proposed to S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PAUL, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 433. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support two bills that I have introduced that will help to preserve and to expand access to home healthcare.

I have been a strong supporter of home care since my very first home visit early in my Senate service. This experience gave me the opportunity to meet and to visit with home healthcare patients, where I saw firsthand what a difference highly skilled, caring visiting nurses and other healthcare professionals make in the lives of patients and their families. I have been a passionate advocate of home healthcare ever since.

The highly skilled and compassionate care that home health agencies provide in the State of Maine and across the country have enabled millions of our most frail and vulnerable individuals to avoid hospitals and nursing homes and to stay just where they want to be—in the comfort, privacy, and security of their own homes.

As we look to the future, home health services will continue to be in high demand. The Census projects that by the year 2030, the proportion of U.S. residents older than age 65 will have nearly doubled from 2010.

The Home Health Payment Innovation Act, which I have introduced with Senator STABENOW, Senator KENNEDY, Senator JONES, Senator CASSIDY, and Senator PAUL, preserves access to existing home health services under the Medicare Program, while also providing a pathway for innovative approaches to using these vital services. This bipartisan legislation is endorsed by the National Association of Home Care and Hospice, as well as by the Partnership for Quality Home Healthcare.

Our bill would make two key adjustments in home health payment reform

provisions that were passed last year. First, it would prevent unwarranted payment rate cuts by basing any behavioral adjustments on actual evidence. Second, it would limit the risk of disruption in care by providing a phase-in for any necessary rate increases or decreases. This phase-in is critical for home health providers, as CMS has already proposed cutting Medicare payment rates in 2020 by more than \$1 billion in the first year alone, based purely on assumptions of changes in behavior.

Our bill also provides the pathway to expanded use of home healthcare in the Medicare Program without increasing program spending.

It provides flexibility on waiving what is called the “homebound requirement” for home health services when a plan or innovative care delivery model, such as an accountable care organization, determines that providing care to the patient in the home would improve outcomes and reduce spending on patient care.

As plans and providers continue to experiment with innovative ways to deliver care and improve value in Medicare spending, allowing them the flexibility to waive this limitation—the homebound limitation—will help to advance the goals of ensuring that care is delivered at the right time, in the right place, and at the right cost.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 62—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. RUBIO submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 62

Resolved,

SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2019 through February 28, 2021, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. EXPENSES.

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 under this resolution

shall not exceed \$1,708,807, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(b) EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 PERIOD.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 under this resolution shall not exceed \$2,929,383, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

(c) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2021.—The expenses of the committee for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021 under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,220,576, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).

SEC. 3. EXPENSES AND AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(2) VOUCHERS NOT REQUIRED.—Vouchers shall not be required for—

(A) the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate;

(B) the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(C) the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery;

(D) payments to the Postmaster of the Senate;

(E) the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper;

(F) the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services; or

(G) the payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.

(b) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—There are authorized to be paid from the appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations” of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee—

(1) for the period March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019;

(2) for the period October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020; and

(3) for the period October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021.

SENATE RESOLUTION 63—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 12, 2019, AS “DARWIN DAY” AND RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE IN THE BETTERMENT OF HUMANITY

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

S. RES. 63

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

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

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

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

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

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

Whereas February 12, 2019, is the anniversary of the birth of Charles Darwin in 1809 and would be an appropriate date to designate as “Darwin Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of “Darwin Day”; and

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 64—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 64

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized from March 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019; October 1, 2019, through September 30, 2020; and October 1, 2020, through February 28, 2021, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the con-

tingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2(a). The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019, under this resolution shall not exceed \$5,451,418, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2019, through September 30, 2020, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$9,345,288, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2020, through February 28, 2021, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,893,870, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$75,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 2019, and February 28, 2020, respectively.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

SEC. 5. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the committee from March 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019, October 1, 2019, through September 30, 2020; and October 1, 2020, through February 28, 2021, to be paid from the Appropriations account for “Expenses of Inquiries and Investigations.”

SENATE RESOLUTION 65—CONGRATULATING THE HELLENIC REPUBLIC AND THE REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA ON RATIFICATION OF THE PRESPA AGREEMENT, WHICH RESOLVES A LONG-STANDING BILATERAL DISPUTE AND ESTABLISHES A STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE 2 COUNTRIES

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 65

Whereas, in 2017, Prime Minister of the Hellenic Republic Alexis Tsipras and Prime Minister of the Republic of Macedonia Zoran Zaev displayed great political courage and leadership by intensifying efforts to resolve a nearly 30-year dispute between the 2 countries;

Whereas, on June 17, 2018, the foreign ministers of the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Macedonia signed the Prespa Agreement, in which, subject to ratification by the parliament of each country, both parties agreed that the official name of the Republic of Macedonia would be changed to the Republic of North Macedonia;

Whereas, on September 30, 2018, the Republic of Macedonia held a consultative referendum on the proposed name change in which over 90 percent of those voting supported joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (referred to in this preamble as “NATO”) and the European Union (referred to in this preamble as the “EU”) by accepting the Prespa Agreement;

Whereas, on January 11, 2019, the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia, in accordance with the Prespa Agreement, approved constitutional amendments to change the name of the country to the Republic of North Macedonia;

Whereas, on January 25, 2019, the Hellenic Parliament ratified the Prespa Agreement, pledging not to object to the Republic of North Macedonia joining international organizations, including NATO and the EU;

Whereas the Hellenic Republic is an important ally of the United States, hosting United States Naval Support Activity Souda Bay on the island of Crete in the Mediterranean Sea;

Whereas the Hellenic Republic has been a NATO member since 1952, and has faithfully met the 2 percent of gross domestic product defense-spending goal established at the 2014 Wales NATO Summit;

Whereas the Republic of Macedonia made important contributions to the United States-led Operation Iraqi Freedom and to the International Security Assistance Force of NATO in Afghanistan;

Whereas the Republic of North Macedonia continues to provide soldiers to the Resolute Support Mission of NATO in Afghanistan;

Whereas the Republic of Macedonia joined NATO’s Partnership for Peace in 1995, commenced a NATO Membership Action Plan in 1999, fulfilled the terms necessary for accession to NATO by the 2008 Bucharest Summit, and was invited, in 2018, to begin NATO accession talks;

Whereas the Republic of Macedonia was the first western Balkan country to sign a Stabilization and Association Agreement with the EU, and became an official candidate to join the EU in 2005;

Whereas, in June 2018, the European Council set out the path toward opening EU accession negotiations with the Republic of Macedonia; and

Whereas the resolution of the naming dispute between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of North Macedonia paves the way for the Republic of North Macedonia to become a member of NATO and the EU: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of North Macedonia for resolving their nearly 30-year naming disagreement;

(2) commends the leadership and courage of Prime Minister of the Hellenic Republic Alexis Tsipras and Prime Minister of the Republic of North Macedonia Zoran Zaev;

(3) asserts that the agreement between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of North Macedonia advances stability, security, and prosperity in Southeast Europe;

(4) supports the integration of the Republic of North Macedonia into Euro-Atlantic institutions, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union; and

(5) encourages other countries in the region to follow the example of the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of North Macedonia in peacefully resolving long-standing disputes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 66—REJECTING THE USE OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

S. RES. 66

Whereas the Government shutdown that began on December 22, 2018 (referred to in this preamble as the “Government shutdown”), lasted 35 days before ending on January 25, 2019, becoming the longest shutdown in the history of the United States;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the Government shutdown caused an \$11,000,000,000 decline in the gross domestic product of the United States, \$3,000,000,000 of which will never be recovered;

Whereas the Government shutdown caused significant harm to the United States by disrupting important activities and services carried out by—

- (1) the Department of Agriculture;
- (2) the Department of Commerce;
- (3) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (4) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (5) the Department of the Interior;
- (6) the Department of Justice;
- (7) the Department of State;
- (8) the Department of Transportation;
- (9) the Department of the Treasury;
- (10) the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (11) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;
- (12) the National Science Foundation; and
- (13) other Federal agencies;

Whereas, according to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Government shutdown caused delays and uncertainty within the judicial branch of the Government, a branch co-equal with the legislative branch and the executive branch;

Whereas the Government shutdown created unnecessary chaos and, in many cases, financial hardship for the approximately 800,000 Federal workers who were forced to go without paychecks during the duration of the

Government shutdown and for the families of those Federal workers;

Whereas the Federal workers working without pay or furloughed as a result of the Government shutdown experienced preventable hardship due to no fault of their own, and Federal contractor employees affected by the Government shutdown may never recover the entirety of their lost wages;

Whereas private businesses working with Federal agencies affected by the Government shutdown saw a reduction in income and indirect consequences, including—

- (1) issues with obtaining Federal permits, loans, and grants; and
- (2) in the case of small businesses with federal contracts, not having enough work for the employees of those small businesses;

Whereas airports experienced delays during the Government shutdown, as Transportation Security Administration agents and air traffic controllers, who remained on the job, dedicated to the safety of every flight, were forced to work without pay in an already stressful profession;

Whereas the Government shutdown—

- (1) suspended the use of E-Verify technology by employers to verify the immigration status of their workers;
- (2) caused a 10-percent increase in the backlog of cases in the immigration court system; and
- (3) forced members of the Coast Guard, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to miss 2 paychecks and suffer severe financial hardship;

Whereas the Government shutdown threatened public health by hampering the operations of the Food and Drug Administration, limiting—

- (1) the ability to address critical medical drug shortages; and
- (2) Federal oversight of the food supply and medical products in the United States;

Whereas, according to the FBI Agents Association, the Government shutdown inhibited the Federal Bureau of Investigation from carrying out the full operations of the Bureau;

Whereas seniors at the Maritime Academies were unable to take licensing exams due to the Government shutdown, which will significantly delay the job searches of those seniors, and merchant mariners were unable to renew licenses;

Whereas thousands of low-income senior or disabled households were at risk of losing rental assistance during the Government shutdown;

Whereas small nonprofit groups across the United States that assist the homeless and victims of domestic violence were unable to access grants when employees were furloughed;

Whereas, in the wake of one of the deadliest and most destructive wildfires in the history of the United States, the Forest Service was forced to suspend wildfire prevention efforts due to the Government shutdown;

Whereas the Government shutdown harmed the National Parks and tourism that supports the National Parks, and resulted in—

- (1) iconic Joshua trees being damaged and chopped down;
- (2) historical artifacts being stolen;
- (3) animals being harassed; and
- (4) sensitive habitat being trampled;

Whereas the Government shutdown—

- (1) severely limited the ability of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (referred to in this preamble as “NOAA”) to fulfill critical regulatory and resource management responsibilities;
- (2) kept numerous fishermen off the water in New England and other coastal areas be-

cause those fishermen were unable to obtain required permits from NOAA; and

(3) created a significant backlog of work on many critical initiatives of NOAA; and

Whereas the Federal Government has experienced 21 shutdowns since 1976, ranging in duration from 1 day to 35 days: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that, no matter how long a Government shutdown lasts, a Government shutdown causes unnecessary pain—

- (A) to Federal workers; and
- (B) to the people of the United States;
- (2) rejects the future use of a Government shutdown as a negotiating tactic; and
- (3) believes that the Government should never resort to a shut down again.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 171. Mr. CRAMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 172. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 112 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 173. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 174. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 175. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 176. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 177. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 178. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 179. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 180. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 181. Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 182. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 112 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, supra.

SA 183. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the

bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 184. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. CASIDY, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 185. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 186. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 187. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. ROMNEY) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 112 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 171. Mr. CRAMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, insert the following:
SEC. 5 . . . CADASTRE OF FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CADASTRE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “cadastre” means an inventory of real property developed through collecting, storing, retrieving, or disseminating graphical or digital data depicting natural or man-made physical features, phenomena, or boundaries of the earth, and any information related to the data, including—

- (i) surveys;
- (ii) maps;
- (iii) charts;
- (iv) satellite and airborne remote sensing data;
- (v) images; and
- (vi) services, including services of an architectural or engineering nature performed by 1 or more professionals, such as—
 - (I) a surveyor;
 - (II) a photogrammetrist;
 - (III) a hydrographer;
 - (IV) a geodesist; and
 - (V) a cartographer.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “cadastre” includes—

- (i) a reference frame consisting of a current geodetic network;
- (ii) a series of current and accurate large-scale maps;
- (iii) an existing cadastral boundary overlay delineating all cadastral parcels;
- (iv) a system for indexing and identifying each cadastral parcel; and
- (v) a series of land data files, each including the parcel identifier, which can be used to retrieve information and cross-reference between and among other existing data files that may contain information about the use, assets, and infrastructure of each parcel.

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of the Interior.

(3) REAL PROPERTY.—The term “real property” means real estate consisting of—

- (A) land;
- (B) buildings, crops, forests, or other resources still attached to or within the land;

(C) improvements or fixtures permanently attached to the land;

(D) any structure on the land; or

(E) any interest, benefit, right, or privilege in the property described in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(b) CADASTRE OF FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and maintain a current and accurate multipurpose cadastre of Federal real property and any real property included under paragraph (2)(A) to support Federal land management activities on Federal real property, including—

- (A) resource development and conservation;
- (B) agricultural use;
- (C) active forest management;
- (D) environmental protection; and
- (E) other use of the real property.

(2) COST-SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into cost-sharing agreements with States to include any non-Federal land in a State in the cadastre under paragraph (1).

(B) COST SHARE.—The Federal share of any cost-sharing agreement described in subparagraph (A) shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost to a State for the development of the cadastre of non-Federal land in the State.

(3) CONSOLIDATION AND REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(A) the existing real property inventories or any components of any cadastre of Federal real property currently authorized by law or maintained by the Department, including—

(i) the statutory authorization for each existing real property inventory or component of a cadastre; and

(ii) the amount expended by the Federal Government for each existing real property inventory or component of a cadastre in fiscal year 2017;

(B) the existing real property inventories or any components of any cadastre of Federal real property currently authorized by law or maintained by the Department that will be eliminated or consolidated into the multipurpose cadastre under paragraph (1);

(C)(i) the existing real property inventories or any components of any cadastre of Federal real property currently authorized by law or maintained by the Department that will not be eliminated or consolidated into the multipurpose cadastre under paragraph (1); and

(ii) a justification for not eliminating or consolidating an existing real property inventory or component of a cadastre described in clause (i) into the multipurpose cadastre under paragraph (1);

(D) the use of existing real property inventories or any components of any cadastre currently maintained by any unit of State or local government that can be used to identify Federal real property within that unit of government;

(E) the cost-savings that will be achieved by eliminating or consolidating duplicative or unneeded real property inventories or any components of any cadastre of Federal real property currently authorized by law or maintained by the Department that will become part of the multipurpose cadastre under paragraph (1);

(F) a plan for the implementation of this section, including a cost estimate and an assessment of the feasibility of using revenue from any transactional activity authorized

by law to offset any costs of implementing this section;

(G) an assessment described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) with regard to each cadastre and inventory of Federal real property authorized, operated, or maintained by each other Federal agency, which shall be conducted in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and the Comptroller General of the United States; and

(H) recommendations for any legislation necessary to increase the cost-savings and enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of replacing, eliminating, or consolidating Federal real property inventories or any components of any cadastre of Federal real property currently authorized by law or maintained by the Department.

(4) COORDINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall—

(i) participate (in accordance with section 216 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note; Public Law 107-347)) in the establishment of such standards and common protocols as are necessary to ensure the interoperability of geospatial information pertaining to the cadastre under subsection (b)(1) for all users of the information;

(ii) coordinate with, seek assistance and cooperation of, and provide liaison to the Federal Geographic Data Committee pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-16 and Executive Order 12906 (43 U.S.C. 1457 note; relating to coordinating geographic data acquisition and access: the National Spatial Data Infrastructure) for the implementation of and compliance with such standards as may be applicable to the cadastre under subsection (b)(1);

(iii) integrate, or make the cadastre interoperable with, the Federal Real Property Profile established pursuant to Executive Order 13327 (40 U.S.C. 121 note; relating to Federal real property asset management);

(iv) to the maximum extent practicable, integrate with and leverage current cadastre activities of units of State and local government; and

(v) to the maximum extent practicable, use contracts with the private sector to provide such products and services as are necessary to develop the cadastre under subsection (b)(1).

(B) CONTRACTS CONSIDERED SURVEYING AND MAPPING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A contract entered into under subparagraph (A)(v) shall be considered to be a contract for services of surveying and mapping (within the meaning of chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code).

(ii) SELECTION PROCEDURES.—A contract under subparagraph (A)(v) shall be entered into in accordance with the selection procedures in chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.

(c) TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) make the cadastre under subsection (b)(1) publically available on the Internet in a graphically geo-enabled and searchable format;

(2) ensure that the inventory referred to in subsection (b) includes the identification of all land suitable for disposal in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(3) in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, prevent the disclosure of any parcel or parcels of land, any buildings or facilities on the land, or any information related to the land, buildings, or facilities if that disclosure would impair or jeopardize the national security or homeland defense of the United States.

(d) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) creates any substantive or procedural right or benefit; or

(2) requires or authorizes—

(A) any new surveying or mapping of Federal real property;

(B) the evaluation of any parcel of land or other real property for potential management by a non-Federal entity;

(C) the disposal of any Federal real property; or

(D) any new appraisal or assessment of—

(i) the value of any parcel of Federal land or other real property; or

(ii) the cultural and archaeological resources on any parcel of Federal land or other real property.

SA 172. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 112 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, after line 8, add the following:

SEC. 2402A. JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b) of the Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-358) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(36) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (1 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.”

“(37) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (2 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.”

(b) EFFECT.—Section 7003 shall have no force or effect.

SA 173. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

SA 174. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 175. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 3 days after enactment.

SA 176. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources

of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike “3” and insert “4”.

SA 177. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 5 days after enactment.

SA 178. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike “5” and insert “6”.

SA 179. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 11. SAN JUAN COUNTY SETTLEMENT IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) EXCHANGE OF COAL PREFERENCE RIGHT LEASE APPLICATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF BIDDING RIGHT.—In this subsection, the term “bidding right” means an appropriate legal instrument or other written documentation, including an entry in an account managed by the Secretary, issued or created under subpart 3435 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, that may be used—

(A) in lieu of a monetary payment for 50 percent of a bonus bid for a coal lease sale under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.); or

(B) as a monetary credit against 50 percent of any rental or royalty payments due under any Federal coal lease.

(2) USE OF BIDDING RIGHT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary retires a coal preference right lease application under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) by issuing a bidding right in exchange for the relinquishment of the coal preference right lease application, the bidding right subsequently may be used in lieu of 50 percent of the amount owed for any monetary payment of—

(i) a bonus in a coal lease sale; or

(ii) rental or royalty under a Federal coal lease.

(B) PAYMENT CALCULATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall calculate a payment of amounts owed to a relevant State under section 35(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(a)) based on the combined value of the bidding rights and amounts received.

(ii) AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Except as provided in this paragraph, for purposes of calculating the payment of amounts owed to a relevant State under clause (i) only, a bidding right shall be considered amounts received.

(C) REQUIREMENT.—The total number of bidding rights issued by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) before October 1, 2029, shall not exceed the number of bidding rights that reflect a value equivalent to \$67,000,000.

(3) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make payments to the relevant State under paragraph (2) from monetary payments received by the Secretary when bidding rights are exercised under this section.

(4) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—A payment to a State under this subsection shall be treated as a payment under section 35(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(a)).

(5) TRANSFERABILITY; LIMITATION.—

(A) TRANSFERABILITY.—A bidding right issued for a coal preference right lease application under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) shall be fully transferable to any other person.

(B) NOTIFICATION OF SECRETARY.—A person who transfers a bidding right shall notify the Secretary of the transfer by any method determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(C) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A bidding right issued under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) shall terminate on the expiration of the 7-year period beginning on the date the bidding right is issued.

(ii) TOLLING OF PERIOD.—The 7-year period described in clause (i) shall be tolled during any period in which exercise of the bidding right is precluded by temporary injunctive relief granted under, or administrative, legislative, or judicial suspension of, the Federal coal leasing program.

(6) DEADLINE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an existing settlement of a coal preference right lease application has not been implemented as of the date of enactment of this Act, not later than 180 days after that date of enactment, the Secretary shall complete the bidding rights valuation process in accordance with the terms of the settlement.

(B) DATE OF VALUATION.—For purposes of the valuation process under subparagraph (A), the market price of coal shall be determined as of the date of the settlement.

(b) CERTAIN LAND SELECTIONS OF THE NAVAJO NATION.—

(1) CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN SELECTIONS.—The land selections made by the Navajo Nation pursuant to Public Law 93-531 (commonly known as the “Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974”) (25 U.S.C. 640d et seq.) that are depicted on the map entitled “Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act Selected Lands” and dated April 2, 2015, are cancelled.

(2) AUTHORIZATION FOR NEW SELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) and paragraph (3), the Navajo Nation may make new land selections in accordance with the Act referred to in paragraph (1) to replace the land selections cancelled under that paragraph.

(B) ACREAGE CAP.—The total acreage of land selected under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed 15,000 acres of land.

(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The following land shall not be eligible for selection under subparagraph (A):

(i) Land within a unit of the National Landscape Conservation System.

(ii) Land within—

(I) the Glade Run Recreation Area;

(II) the Fossil Forest Research Natural Area; or

(III) a special management area or area of critical environmental concern identified in a land use plan developed under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(iii) Any land subject to a lease or contract under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Act of July 31, 1947 (commonly known as the “Materials Act of 1947”) (30 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) as of the date of the selection.

(iv) Land not under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(v) Land identified as “Parcels Excluded from Selection” on the map entitled “Parcels excluded for selection under the San Juan County Settlement Implementation Act” and dated December 14, 2018.

(D) DEADLINE.—Not later than 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Navajo Nation shall make all selections under subparagraph (A).

(E) WITHDRAWAL.—Any land selected by the Navajo Nation under subparagraph (A) shall be withdrawn from disposal, leasing, and development until the date on which the selected land is placed into trust for the Navajo Nation.

(3) EQUAL VALUE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the acreage limitation in the second proviso of section 11(c) of Public Law 93-531 (commonly known as the “Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974”) (25 U.S.C. 640d-10(c)) and subject to paragraph (2)(B), the value of the land selected under paragraph (2)(A) and the land subject to selections cancellation under paragraph (1) shall be equal, based on appraisals conducted under subparagraph (B).

(B) APPRAISALS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The value of the land selected under paragraph (2)(A) and the land subject to selections cancelled under paragraph (1) shall be determined by appraisals conducted in accordance with—

(I) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(II) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(ii) TIMING.—

(I) LAND SUBJECT TO SELECTIONS CANCELLED.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the appraisal under clause (i) of the land subject to selections cancelled under paragraph (1) shall be completed.

(II) NEW SELECTIONS.—The appraisals under clause (i) of the land selected under paragraph (2)(A) shall be completed as the Navajo Nation finalizes those land selections.

(4) BOUNDARY.—For purposes of this subsection and the Act referred to in paragraph (1), the present boundary of the Navajo Reservation is depicted on the map entitled “Navajo Nation Boundary” and dated November 16, 2015.

(c) DESIGNATION OF AH-SHI-SLE-PAH WILDERNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 7,242 acres of land as generally depicted on the map entitled “San Juan County Wilderness Designations” and dated April 2, 2015, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, which shall be known as the “Ah-shi-sle-pah Wilderness” (referred to in this subsection as the “Wilderness”).

(2) MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in accordance with this subsection and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(ii) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(C) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—Any land or interest in land that is within the boundary of the Wilderness that is acquired by the United States shall—

(i) become part of the Wilderness; and

(ii) be managed in accordance with—

(I) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

(II) this subsection; and

(III) any other applicable laws.

(D) GRAZING.—Grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, where established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue in accordance with—

(i) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(ii) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(3) RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the land within the Ah-shi-sle-pah Wilderness Study Area not designated as wilderness by this subsection has been adequately studied for wilderness designation and is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)).

(d) EXPANSION OF BISTI/DE-NA-ZIN WILDERNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System certain Federal land comprising approximately 2,250 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “San Juan County Wilderness Designations” and dated April 2, 2015, which is incorporated in and shall be considered to be a part of the Bisti/De-Na-Zin Wilderness.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the land designated as wilderness by paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management (referred to in this subsection as the “Director”), in accordance with—

(A) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) the San Juan Basin Wilderness Protection Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-603; 98 Stat. 3155; 110 Stat. 4211).

(3) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the land as wilderness by paragraph (1) to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around that land.

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the land designated as wilderness by paragraph (1) shall not preclude the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of that land.

(4) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—Any land or interest in land that is within the boundary of the land designated as wilderness by paragraph (1) that is acquired by the United States shall—

(A) become part of the Bisti/De-Na-Zin Wilderness; and

(B) be managed in accordance with—

(i) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

(ii) the San Juan Basin Wilderness Protection Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-603; 98 Stat. 3155; 110 Stat. 4211);

(iii) this subsection; and

(iv) any other applicable laws.

(5) GRAZING.—Grazing of livestock in the land designated as wilderness by paragraph (1), where established before the date of en-

actment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(B) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(e) ROAD MAINTENANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, shall ensure that L-54 between I-40 and Alamo, New Mexico, is maintained in a condition that is safe for motorized use.

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs may not require any Indian Tribe to use any funds—

(A) owned by the Indian Tribe; or

(B) provided to the Indian Tribe pursuant to a contract under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304 et seq.).

(3) ROAD UPGRADE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subsection requires the Secretary or any Indian Tribe to upgrade the condition of L-54 as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) WRITTEN AGREEMENT.—An upgrade to L-54 may not be made without the written agreement of the Pueblo of Laguna.

(4) INVENTORY.—Nothing in this subsection requires L-54 to be placed on the National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory.

SA 180. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 7003 and insert the following:

SEC. 7003. JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM.

Section 2(b) of the Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-358) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(36) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (1 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.

“(37) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (2 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.”.

SA 181. Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 695 of the amendment, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 90. REPORT ON MAINTAINING FEDERAL LAND HOLDINGS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Not later than 120 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget of the United States for fiscal year 2020, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes—

(1) all Federal land holdings under the jurisdiction of the Secretary; and

(2) the total cost of maintaining the Federal land holdings described under paragraph (1) for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019, including an accounting of holdings and expenditures by each Federal agency with respect to the land holdings.

SA 182. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 112 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 2402A. JOHN H. CHAFFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b) of the Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–358) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(36) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (1 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.”

“(37) The map entitled ‘Cape San Blas Unit P30/P30P (2 of 2)’ and dated December 19, 2018, with respect to Unit P30 and Unit P30P.”

(b) EFFECT.—Section 7003 shall have no force or effect.

SA 183. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3002.

SA 184. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title II, add the following:

SEC. 24 . MODIFICATIONS TO THE PRESERVE AMERICA PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to strengthen economic development across the United States by supporting cultural heritage tourism and historic preservation activities through the Preserve America Program; and

(2) to encourage the Director of the National Park Service to partner with gateway communities (including Native American communities and National Heritage Areas) to leverage local cultural and historic heritage tourism assets.

(b) PRESERVE AMERICA GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 311102 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and the Secretary of Commerce” after “Council”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ADVISORY ROLE OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall advise the program with respect to job cre-

ation, economic growth, and tourism policy and promotion.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year for which funds are not made available to provide grants under this section, to the extent practicable, the program shall, in lieu of the grants, provide technical assistance to the eligible entities described in subsection (a) for projects that meet the eligibility requirements described in subsection (b), as identified on the list of projects prepared by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (d).

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may take into account the availability of staff resources at the Department of the Interior, the Council, and the Department of Commerce for purposes of determining the number of projects that are provided technical assistance under this subsection.

“(3) FORM.—The form of technical assistance under paragraph (1) may include technical assistance provided by—

“(A) the Director, with respect to—

“(i) best practices in visitor services;

“(ii) the conduct of research, inventories, and surveys;

“(iii) the documentation of historic resources; and

“(iv) the interpretation and promotion of cultural and heritage assets;

“(B) the Council, with respect to historic preservation initiatives and best practices in stewardship; and

“(C) the Secretary of Commerce, with respect to economic development and job creation resources.”.

(2) PROGRAM METRICS.—Chapter 3111 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 311105 as section 311106; and

(B) by inserting after section 311104 the following:

“§ 311105. Reports

“(a) METRICS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Natural Resources Management Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Council and the Secretary of Commerce, shall develop specific metrics to measure the effectiveness of the program, including—

“(1) the economic impact of the program on local communities (including Native American communities and National Heritage Areas); and

“(2) the effect of the program on efforts to preserve heritage resources.

“(b) GRANTEE REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which a grantee receives a grant or technical assistance under this chapter, the grantee shall submit to the Secretary a report that—

“(1) describes the outcome of the project that was provided a grant or technical assistance under this chapter; and

“(2) based on the metrics developed under subsection (a), assesses—

“(A) the accomplishments of the project; and

“(B) the impact of the project on the community in which the project was carried out.

“(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the appropriate committees of Congress that includes data provided by grantees to demonstrate the economic impact of the program.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 3111 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 311105 and inserting the following:

“311105. Reports.

“311106. Authorization of appropriations.”.

(c) NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS WITH GATEWAY COMMUNITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subdivision 1 of division B of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code,

is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 3092—PARTNERSHIPS WITH GATEWAY COMMUNITIES

“Sec.

“309201. Definitions.

“309202. Partnerships with gateway communities.

“309203. Report.

“309204. Authorization of appropriations.

“§ 309201. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committee’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

“(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

“(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(D) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

“(E) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

“(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(2) GATEWAY COMMUNITY.—The term ‘gateway community’ means a community adjacent to a unit of the System, including a Native American community or a National Heritage Area.

“(3) HERITAGE TOURISM.—The term ‘heritage tourism’ has the meaning given the term in section 311101.

“§ 309202. Partnerships with gateway communities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, offer to enter into partnerships with gateway communities to leverage heritage tourism assets to strengthen local economies and create jobs in the gateway communities with the goal of establishing a standardized framework for partnerships throughout the System, including through—

“(1) providing financial assistance to gateway communities to support outreach and promotional efforts;

“(2) providing technical assistance to gateway communities based on Service best practices in tourism development and visitor management, such as—

“(A) inventorying tourism resources in the gateway community;

“(B) identifying historic heritage and cultural resources;

“(C) engaging collaborative partners and stakeholders;

“(D) designing community outreach and participation strategies;

“(E) developing concept plans for trails, parks, historic resources, and natural areas;

“(F) developing sustainable tourism development frameworks for community planning; and

“(G) encouraging regional strategies for tourism development and promotion; and

“(3) assisting gateway communities in accessing additional Federal resources available to strengthen tourism assets and support economic development.

“(b) OBTAINING FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, in consultation with stakeholders of System units, shall establish a process through which States, units of local government, and Tribal governments may apply for designation as a gateway community to become eligible for financial and technical assistance made available under this section.

“(c) METRICS.—The Secretary, in consultation with gateway communities, shall develop metrics to measure the impact of the financial and technical assistance provided to gateway communities under this section.

“§ 309203. Report

“Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

“(1) describes the efforts of the Secretary to partner with gateway communities under this chapter;

“(2) analyzes the results of the financial and technical assistance using the metrics developed under section 309202(c); and

“(3) identifies—

“(A) the next steps that should be taken to improve partnerships with gateway communities; and

“(B) any actions that the Secretary will take to improve the partnerships.

“§ 309204. Authorization of appropriations

“There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this chapter.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 3091 the following:

“3092. Partnerships with gateway communities 309201”.

SA 185. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 595 strike line 16 and all that follows through page 603, line 16.

SA 186. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources

of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 568 strike line 9 and all that follows through page 576, line 9.

SA 187. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. ROMNEY) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 112 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the amendment SA 111 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. MANCHIN) to the bill S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON THE EXTENSION OR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS IN THE STATE OF UTAH.

Section 320301(d) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “WYOMING” and inserting “THE STATE OF WYOMING OR UTAH”; and

(2) by striking “Wyoming” and inserting “the State of Wyoming or Utah”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Donald W. Washington, of Texas, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service, dated February 11, 2019.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Stephanie Mil-

ler, detailee with the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, be granted floor privileges through May 15.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2019

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, February 12; 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; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 47 and that the Senate recess from 12 noon until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on S. 47.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. TOOMEY. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:24 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 12, 2019, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING BARBARA PAHRE

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Barbara Pahre for her many successes throughout her career and at the American Association of University Women (AAUW) and the Napa County AAUW.

Ms. Pahre is an exceptional past president of the Napa County American Association of University Women. She started the Author's Forum, an event to raise scholarships for girls and young women for their educational and professional pursuits six years ago. The event has been a major success and has raised over \$100,000 in scholarship funds.

Ms. Pahre was born in Illinois and moved to Napa, California with her husband Keith in the early 1960s. She began her career as a teacher at Carneros School and retired as Napa Valley Unified School District's (NVUSD) Associate Superintendent and Director of Human Resources. During her time at NVUSD she also directed the gifted students' program and the state funded school improvement programs and was the main negotiator for salary and employment issues. Ms. Pahre has worked with students in other capacities as well. She ran Magic Years Preschool and taught master's level courses at Chapman University and Pacific Union College.

Ms. Pahre is engaged in our community and has given her time to many state and county commissions and boards. Some of them include Napa Civil Service Commission, Napa General Plan Review Committee, Napa Open Space Committee, Golden Gate Bridge and Highway Transportation District, and Sonoma/Marin Area Rail Transit.

Madam Speaker, Barbara Pahre has spent her career and retirement working to better our community and serve our county. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor the service of Barbara Pahre here today.

SAFEGUARDING DISASTER-RECOVERY FUNDS FOR ARMY CORPS CIVIL WORKS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduce legislation to prevent the President from diverting disaster-recovery funds from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' civil works projects.

I want to thank my colleagues—Representatives CISNEROS, VELÁZQUEZ, BERA, GOMEZ, TAKANO, LOWENTHAL, ROUDA, CARBAJAL, HUFFMAN, ESHOO, VARGAS, ROYBAL-ALLARD, SOTO, LOFGREN, MATSUI, SERRANO, NAPOLI-

TANO, PLASKETT, and HARDER—for their support as original cosponsors.

Last month, I received alarming reports that the President had reviewed a list of Army Corps civil works projects in California and Puerto Rico, totaling nearly \$5 billion, from which to divert disaster-recovery funding for border wall construction.

Madam Speaker, it is morally reprehensible that any President would take recovery funds from disaster victims as ransom for a campaign promise. Targeting funds for Californians to make a craven political point and residents of Puerto Rico, who are denied voting rights in national elections and full representation in Congress, is equally low.

One of the Army Corps levee projects the Trump Administration may defund protects 12,000 residents of Marysville, California from hypothermia-inducing floodwaters that could inundate the town in a matter of hours. This is a matter of saving lives in my Congressional district and helping California communities rebuild.

My bill would eliminate a provision from the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662), authorizing Presidents to divert funding from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' civil works directorate in exigent cases for national defense and emergencies. This obscure 1986 provision is the legal authority President Trump could invoke to divert disaster-recovery funding for his promised border wall.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, no President has ever invoked this 1986 legal authority, which was originally requested by the Reagan Administration for cases of Congressionally declared wars and presidentially declared national emergencies requiring civil defense during the Cold War.

In acting on my bill, the House can reassert its Constitutional authority to direct federal funding for national priorities that help communities rebuild and become more resilient to future natural disasters. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join us in cosponsoring this important legislation. I also expect my bill will be included in the next Water Resources Development Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVEN C. WATKINS, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call Vote Number 75. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 75.

HONORING THE WORK OF MRS. MILLIE RUTH MCCLELLAND CHARLES

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the work of Mrs. Millie Ruth McClelland Charles, a legendary social worker and native of New Orleans, Louisiana.

Mrs. Charles was born July 25, 1923 in New Orleans, Louisiana to Rev. Williams McClelland, a Baptist preacher, and Frankie Little, a school teacher.

Mrs. Charles entered Dillard University when she was only 15 years old and graduated with a degree in secondary education. However, after a few years of teaching in north Louisiana and loving the children in her classes, she realized she could find more fulfillment in social work because she would be able to help children and their families find ways to solve problems. Therefore, she earned a master's degree in the subject at the University of Southern California in the mid-1950s.

Millie McClelland Charles has greatly impacted the field of health and mental health through her leadership in the founding and guiding of the Southern University of New Orleans School of Social Work (BSW and MSW programs) into fully accredited programs providing opportunity for professional development to countless students. She is currently Dean Emeritus and founder of the School of Social Work. The founding of Southern University in New Orleans was a highly political event when it took place at the height of the Civil Rights Movement, reportedly to discourage black students from attending the predominantly white University of New Orleans, located less than a mile away.

Millie Charles' ability in ultimately taking the handful of social work courses taught at the University of New Orleans, which were transferred to Southern University of New Orleans, and subsequently expanding on them and developing them into fully accredited BSW and MSW programs is considered somewhat of a miracle in New Orleans. The high caliber Programs have attracted a well-credentialed, culturally diverse faculty; the student population is now well integrated also.

Dean Charles' interests in social work education go far beyond just working in the state of Louisiana. She has served as the Co-Chair, Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Annual Meeting; a Member of the CSWE Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Standards; and a Site Visitor for the CSWE Accreditation Commission. In addition, since 1972, she has consulted with numerous Undergraduate and Graduate Social Work Programs around the U.S., advising them on Curricula.

Millie Charles has received numerous awards. Some of them are: National Social

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

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

Worker of the Year (NASW), 1975; Humanitarian of the Year, Federal Women Employees Association, 1975; Founders Award, New Orleans Chapter, National Association of Black Social Workers, 1979; Doctor of Humane Letters, Dillard University, 1993; and she also was one of four women honored by the New Orleans YWCA for lifetime of service to the community. Millie Charles was hailed as a life-long crusader for equality during a ceremony in which she was presented The Times-Picayune Loving Cup on Tuesday June 24, 2013. Throughout her life, Charles, a native of New Orleans' Central City, has said consistently that anything she might have accomplished was the result of a group effort.

Madam Speaker, I honor the work of Mrs. Millie Ruth McClelland Charles.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I missed Roll Call vote number 72 on February 8, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE JOHNSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 74—MTR on H.R. 840 and "yea" on Roll Call No. 75—Final passage of H.R. 840.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KATIE PORTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for votes on Monday, January 28, 2019 due to a delayed flight. Had I been present, I would have voted on "YES" on roll call votes 52, 53, and 54.

HONORING GWENN KUSKIN
FELDMAN

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madman Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Gwenn Kuskinn Feldman, a beloved constituent of Florida's 21st Congressional District. Gwenn will be remembered as a loving mother and sister, generous friend, and the grandmother who never said no to her grandkids—Ellie, Ben, and Ruby.

I was introduced to Gwenn through her son, my colleague from New Jersey—Congress-

man JOSH GOTTHEIMER. Gwenn was a woman who stood strong in her convictions. She wasn't afraid to give me a report on how I was doing as her Congresswoman or speak her mind about issues of the day. Above all, she truly cared about the future of our country.

Gwenn's contribution to our community came from her immeasurable amount of love. Before moving to Florida, she spent years working with preschool children at Congregation Beth El in South Orange, New Jersey. Her dedication to the growth of our youths continued in Florida. Countless loved ones honored her memory through donations to Jewish Adoption & Family Care Options' (JAFCO) Gwenn Feldman Fund for Fun.

In facing this loss, I am reminded of a Hannah Senesh poem, "There are Stars" or Yesh Kochavim in the original Hebrew. The first few lines embody Gwenn:

There are stars whose radiance is visible on earth
though they have long been extinct.
There are people whose brilliance continues to light
the world even though they are not longer among the living.

Gwenn's star continues to shine bright through her children and the lives of the many she impacted. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering this incredible American and celebrating the inspiring life she lived.

HONORING CAPTAIN ROGER
HARLESS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Captain Roger Harless and honor his commitment to public service and our community.

Mr. Harless was born in Berkeley, California and grew up in the nearby towns of Lafayette and Moraga with his brother, Paul. In May of 1990, he joined the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. He was in the first Fire District class of paramedics and kept his certification throughout his entire career. In April 2003, he became the captain of the district's paramedics team, where he worked diligently to serve and protect the people of Contra Costa County. In 2018, Captain Harless was a member of the first group to complete Hazardous Materials training. Mr. Harless passed away on January 11, 2019 from an illness acquired in the line of duty. He spent 29 years at the Contra Costa Fire Protection District, rising to the rank of Captain at Station 11.

Mr. Harless was dedicated to public service and our community. He cherished the time he spent mentoring new recruits and his fellow firefighters. Mr. Harless also mentored children in our community as a youth basketball and soccer coach. One of his joys was watching talent develop, whether at the fire station, on the court or on the field.

Mr. Harless leaves behind a loving and devoted family. He was married to his wife, Karen, for nearly 35 years. He was the father of Jessica, Martin and Kelsie and the grandfather to Sophia, Claire, and Mattisyn. He was adored by his wife, children, grandchildren, extended family, friends and many others throughout our community.

Madam Speaker, we thank Mr. Harless for his dedication to public service. For this reason, it is fitting and proper that we honor and remember him here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. W. GREGORY STEUBE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. STEUBE. Madam Speaker, I missed this vote series due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on Roll Call No. 72; yea on Roll Call No. 73; yea on Roll Call No. 74; and yea on Roll Call No. 75.

REMEMBERING MIKE BOWEN

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Memphis businessman Mike Bowen who was killed in a car accident in Costa Rica on Saturday but who will be long remembered for his grace in giving others, including formerly incarcerated individuals, a second chance. He was 61. Mr. Bowen was the CEO of Champion Awards and Apparel, a company that grew out of Custom Print, founded in 1979, now the largest local licensee of University of Memphis-branded merchandise. Mr. Bowen was a 1979 graduate of then-Memphis State University and was active in its alumni association. He was also an active member of the Tiger Scholarship Fund, the Beale Street Merchants Association, the Greater Memphis Chamber of Commerce, the Memphis Jaycees, Leadership Memphis and the Special Olympics. For years, Mr. Bowen coordinated the Memphis Business Journal's Small Business Awards ceremony.

Growing up in Parkway Village, he said his mother taught him that the only color he and his brother should see is green, hopefully with a "Benjamin" on it. In 2007, Bowen made the principled decision to hire people with felony convictions for his business in a program that he called Late Bloomers, begun in 2007. By late 2016, 18 of his 48 employees had been formerly incarcerated. Mr. Bowen said he hired the men and women because his company was doing 20th Century work in the 21st Century and need people willing to work hard and sweat. In exchange, they received a living wage and a lot of guidance on staying straight, including meeting their legal obligations. Known for hugging his employees, Mr. Bowen called many of them "heroes" for overcoming adversity and sticking with hard work. I want to express my condolences to his wife, Suzie, and his sons Colby and Michael, his extended family and his many friends. He led a good life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was absent from votes last week for personal reasons.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 72; YEA on Roll Call No. 73; NAY on Roll Call No. 74; and YEA on Roll Call No. 75.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, on May 17, 2018, had I been present, I would have voted no on Roll Call vote No. 198 and No. 199.

On May 18, 2018, had I been present, I would have voted no on Roll Call vote No. 203.

HONORING SAND IN MY SHOES
AWARD RECIPIENT TONY ARGIZ**HON. DONNA E. SHALALA**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of Tony Argiz, recipient of this year's prestigious Sand in My Shoes Award from the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce. Tony Argiz is an exemplary community leader and illustrates the "sand in my shoes" tenet of life that sets Miami apart as a fantastic place to live and work.

The Sand in My Shoes Award takes its name from a letter Damon Runyon wrote to his friend Bill, a Hollywood movie producer, detailing why he had opted to stay in South Florida rather than return to California to write a movie script. He wrote:

"The truth of the matter is, Bill, we've got sand in our shoes. It's pretty difficult to explain that to anyone who doesn't know what it means. It means a land covered with sunlight . . . warm and soft. It means white and pink houses, with red and blue and green roofs . . . It means palm trees whispering mysteriously and tall melaleucas nodding their plumed heads to every breeze. It means big fat porpoises playing in Biscayne Bay and gaunt pelicans patrolling the sky at dusk, and folks fishing from bridges all day. . . . It means Hialeah and stately avenues of giant palms and pink flamingo, black swan and wild duck. . . . Turquoise blue waters of the ocean lapping white beaches and always the sun shining down in kindly warmth. . . . It means Bimini where the big game fish lurk and the nearby Keys where the ghosts of bearded old buccaneers still guard their buried treasure. . . ."

Originally from Cuba, Tony Argiz came to the United States with Operation Pedro Pan. He lived at a Catholic boarding school in Tampa until his parents came over, five years

later. He credits his early years in Florida with giving him the hunger for education, for hard work, and for success. He later attended Florida International University on a baseball scholarship, an experience that taught him the value of teamwork.

Today, Tony is Chairman and CEO of Morrison, Brown, Argiz & Farra, LLC, one of the top 40 accounting firms in the nation. In 1986, he was appointed to Florida's Board of Accountancy, which he later chaired. He has served on the American Institute of CPAs Nominations Committee and on the PCP Executive Committee and its Technical Issues Committee. He is also a leader among South Florida nonprofit organizations, as chairman of the Adrienne Arsht Center Foundation and of Facts About Cuban Exiles.

I am pleased to recognize the contributions of my friend Tony to the greater Miami area and to celebrate his extraordinary achievements as a community leader.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN H. RUTHERFORD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at the time of the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 70; "yea" on Roll Call No. 72; "yea" on Roll Call No. 73; "yea" on Roll Call No. 74; and "yea" on Roll Call No. 75.

RECOGNIZING THE RACHEL CARSON
COUNCIL'S "CLEAR CUT"
REPORT**HON. JAMIE RASKIN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the important work of the Rachel Carson Council (RCC), which is named after the visionary marine biologist, nature writer and environmentalist who was a proud resident of Silver Spring, Maryland.

Founded and based in Bethesda, the RCC pays tribute to Rachel Carson's imperishable legacy by linking environmental, health, and social policy solutions "with the goal of building a more just, sustainable, and peaceful future."

The RCC recently released a comprehensive report called "Clear Cut," examining wood pellet production and its adverse effects on the health and sustainability of our forests and communities. The report details the process by which Southeastern forests are being cut down, chopped up, and dehydrated before being shipped and burned as carbon-intense fuel.

According to the report, despite being touted as a "green" alternative to fossil fuels, the sourcing of wood pellets contributes to widespread deforestation and pollution throughout much of the American Southeast. In North Carolina alone, the largest producer of wood pellets, Enviva, clear cuts more than 50 acres of forest each day. Left standing, these forests would help control the climate, maintain the

biodiversity of our ecosystems, and filter our air and water.

Following this environmentally invasive sourcing process of clear-cutting, pellets are burned, producing Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen oxides (NO), and carbon monoxide (CO₂), all of which pose serious health risks to human beings. Although the pollutants emitted by wood pellet mills are indiscriminately harmful to nearby inhabitants, the RCC report notes that wood pellet mills have been disproportionately constructed near poor communities of color, which are bearing the disproportionate burdens of deforestation, including poor air quality and increased flood risks.

Although the environmental drawbacks of wood pellet production are clear—wood pellet mills emit approximately 65-percent more CO₂ per megawatt hour than modern coal plants—the RCC argues that the industry has continued to mislead the public about the sustainability of this practice. Moreover, the RCC's report concludes that the expansion of the wood pellet industry is making it harder for us to maintain our environmental standards and address the global crisis of climate change.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to review the well-researched and well-documented "Clear Cut" report by visiting the RCC website at www.rachelcarsoncouncil.org. We must keep the profound concerns raised in this report in mind as we enact environmental, forestry, and energy policies and work to protect the public health and safety.

HONORING THE NATIONAL COURT
REPORTERS ASSOCIATION'S
COURT REPORTING AND CAPTIONING
WEEK**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of the National Court Reporters Association's Court Reporting and Captioning Week.

The NCRA supports and promotes excellence among those who capture and convert spoken words to text. These skills provide a foundation of public transparency for our courts, government hearings, and even our very own House of Representatives.

Court Reporting and Captioning Week is a nationwide initiative. It brings awareness to the importance of the work that court reporters and captioners do. Without the records they provide, assuring accountability and oversight over government institutions would be impossible. For this reason, court reporters, captioners, and the NCRA stand as part of the foundation of our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I commend the NCRA for its work and the work of its members, and I congratulate the NCRA on celebrating Court Reporting and Captioning Week.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF THE HONORABLE WALTER BEAMAN JONES, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American and a distinguished member of this House, the Honorable WALTER B. JONES, Jr.

The Honorable WALTER B. JONES, died on Sunday, February 10, 2019 after a long illness.

In addition to being a beloved and highly respected member of the House, WALTER JONES was also a small business owner and a veteran of the National Guard.

His presence will be greatly missed and we all mourn his loss and extend our sincerest condolences to his family and friends.

WALTER BEAMAN JONES, Jr. was born February 10, 1943 in Farmville, North Carolina to Walter B. and Doris Long Jones, where he was raised.

Madam Speaker, WALTER JONES attended Hargrave Military Academy in Chatham, Virginia and graduated in 1966 with a Bachelor of Arts from Atlantic Christian College (now Barton College) in Wilson, North Carolina.

Shortly after graduation WALTER JONES joined the North Carolina National Guard while also working as an executive with his family's business supply company.

In 1982, WALTER JONES, the son of Congressman Walter B. Jones, Sr., was first elected as a Democrat to the North Carolina House of Representatives.

After serving five successful terms and being known for his advocacy of campaign finance reform and lobbying reform, in 1994, WALTER JONES sought and won a seat in the United States House of Representatives representing the Third Congressional District of North Carolina.

WALTER JONES was a dedicated and tireless advocate for his community and always put the interests of his district before the interests of his party.

In Congress, WALTER JONES was an effective and powerful voice for those serving on active duty as well as veterans.

In 2000, WALTER JONES fought to help clear the names of two Marine pilots wrongly blamed for the deadly crash of a V-22 Osprey.

In 2016, the Navy issued a clarification about the cause of the fatal crash.

Anyone who met WALTER JONES knew of his tenacity and abiding love for the military.

WALTER JONES fought against the corrosive influence of money in politics for much of his career.

As co-chair of the Campaign Finance Reform Caucus, WALTER JONES pushed for reforms to lessen the impact and role of large campaign contributions and called for the repeal of the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United, v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 310 (2010), which opened the floodgates for dark money and super PACs, and he advocated for public financing of election campaigns.

During his quarter century of service in Congress he served on the Committee on Armed

Services as well as its Subcommittees on Tactical Air and Land Forces and on Military Personnel.

Madam Speaker, a dear colleague has fallen but he will not be forgotten.

We are all saddened by the passing of the Honorable WALTER B. JONES, Jr. but we are happy to have served with him and our prayers and condolences are with his family and loved ones.

Madam Speaker, WALTER B. JONES, Jr. was a faithful public servant, a great legislator, and a good man, who will be missed by all who knew and loved him.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of the Honorable WALTER BEAMAN JONES, Jr., of North Carolina.

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, February 12, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 13

Time to be announced

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

SD-226

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on cyber operations to defend the midterm elections.

SVC-217

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, Don Munce, of Florida, and Bruce M. Ramer, of California, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and a routine list in the Coast Guard.

SD-G50

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the invasive species threat, focusing on protecting wildlife, public health, and infrastructure.

SD-406

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 380, to increase access to agency guidance documents, S. 396, to amend section 1202 of title 5, United States Code, to modify the continuation of service provision for members of the Merit Systems Protection Board, S. 394, to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions, S. 195, to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain a website accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, S. 196, to save taxpayer money and improve the efficiency and speed of intragovernmental correspondence, S. 395, to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule, S. 406, to establish a Federal rotational cyber workforce program for the Federal cyber workforce, S. 375, to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments, S. 315, to authorize cyber hunt and incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, S. 333, to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with cybersecurity consortia for training, S. 74, to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, S. 387, to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, H.R. 504, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and the nominations of Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be Chairman, and Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member, all of the of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Ronald D. Vitiello, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD-342

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing on asset recovery in Eurasia.

SD-562

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Rules and Administration
Business meeting to consider S. Res. 50, improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees for the 116th Congress, and committee rules.

SR-301

2 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel

To hold a joint hearing to examine the current condition of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Small Business Administration.

SR-428A

FEBRUARY 14

9:30 a.m.
 Committee on Armed Services
 To hold hearings to examine United States Special Operations Command and United States Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program. SD-G50

10 a.m.
 Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, and Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, both to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, and Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency. SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
 To hold hearings to examine the status and outlook for cybersecurity efforts in the energy industry. SD-366

2 p.m.
 Select Committee on Intelligence
 To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters. SH-219

FEBRUARY 26

10 a.m.
 Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To hold hearings to examine the Semi-annual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress. SD-106

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
 To hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. territories. SD-366

FEBRUARY 27

10 a.m.
 Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 To hold hearings to examine policy principles for a Federal data privacy framework in the United States. SH-216

2:30 p.m.
 Committee on Armed Services
 Subcommittee on Personnel
 To hold an oversight hearing to examine military personnel policies and military family readiness. SR-222

MARCH 14

10 a.m.
 Committee on Appropriations
 Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies
 To hold hearings to examine the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other emerging health threats. SD-124

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1151–S1174

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 430–437, and S. Res. 62–66. **Pages S1165–66**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 62, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

S. Res. 64, authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. **Page S1165**

Measures Considered:

Natural Resources Management Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1152, S1155–64**

Rejected:

Lee Amendment No. 187 (to Amendment No. 112), to limit the extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Utah. (By 60 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 20), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Page S1160**

Pending:

Murkowski/Manchin Modified Amendment No. 111, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1152**

Murkowski Amendment No. 112 (to Amendment No. 111), to modify the authorization period for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program. **Page S1152**

Rubio/Scott (FL) Amendment No. 182 (to Amendment No. 112), to give effect to more accurate maps of units of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System that were produced by digital mapping. **Page S1161**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 87 yeas to 7 nays (Vote No. 21), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Page S1161**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule

XXII, at 4:30 p.m., on Tuesday, February 12, 2019, all post-cloture time be considered expired on the bill; that following disposition of any pending amendments, the substitute amendment as amended, if amended, be agreed to, and Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended. **Pages S1161–62**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Tuesday, February 12, 2019; and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and Leader remarks count post-cloture on the bill. **Page S1174**

Department Of Homeland Security Further Continuing Appropriations—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H. J. Res. 1, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019. **Pages S1152–55**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice. **Page S1155**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S1155**

Messages from the House: **Page S1165**

Measures Referred: **Page S1165**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1166–67**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1167–69**

Additional Statements: **Page S1165**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1169–74**

Notices of Intent: **Page S1174**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1174**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—21) **Pages S1160–61**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 7:24 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday,

February 12, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1174.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 1137–1149; 1 private bill, H.R. 1150; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 17 and H. Res. 119–121 and 123–124, were introduced.

Pages H1517–18

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H1518–19

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 122, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (H. Rept. 116–8).

Page H1516

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Butterfield to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H1495

Recess: The House recessed at 12:04 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m.

Pages H1495–96

Whole Number of the House: The Chair announced to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Jones, the whole number of the House is 432.

Page H1496

Recess: The House recessed at 2:02 p.m. and reconvened at 4 p.m.

Page H1496

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2019: H.R. 1063, amended, to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations;

Pages H1496–97

Social Media Use in Clearance Investigations Act of 2019: H.R. 1065, to provide for a study on the use of social media in security clearance investigations, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 377 yeas to 3 nays, Roll No. 76;

Pages H1498–99, H1504–05

Amending title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients: H.R. 1064, amended, to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow whistleblowers to disclose information to certain recipients; and

Pages H1499–H1500

Creating Advanced Streamlined Electronic Services for Constituents Act of 2019: H.R. 1079, amended, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance on electronic consent forms, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 379 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 77.

Pages H1502–04, H1505

Recess: The House recessed at 4:45 p.m. and reconvened at 6:29 p.m.

Page H1504

Expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Walter B. Jones: The House agreed to H. Res. 121, expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Walter B. Jones.

Page H1504

Honoring the life, achievements, and distinguished public service of John David Dingell, Jr., and expressing condolences to his family on his passing: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 120, honoring the life, achievements, and distinguished public service of John David Dingell, Jr., and expressing condolences to his family on his passing.

Page H1506

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, February 12th.

Page H1508

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Settlement Agreement Information Database Act of 2019: H.R. 995, amended, to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements.

Pages H1500–02

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representatives Sanchez, Larsen (WA), Davis (CA), Meeks, Brendan F. Boyle (PA), and Costa.

Page H1509

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1504–05 and H1505. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and at 8:36 p.m., pursuant to House Resolution 121, it stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow, February 12th, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Walter B. Jones.

Committee Meetings

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.J. Res. 37, directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–3, a structured rule providing for consideration of H. J. Res 37, Directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–4 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one

motion to recommit with or without instructions. Section 2 of the rule waives the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of February 17, 2019, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. Section 3 of the rule provides that it shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of February 17, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, and that the Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section. Section 4 of the rule provides that the chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than February 17, 2019, such material as she may deem explanatory of measures making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. Testimony was heard from Chairman Engel and Representative McCaul.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the United States Indo-Pacific Command and United States Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on the United States Indo-Pacific Command and United States Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine managing pain during the opioid crisis, 10 a.m., SD–430.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “The Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Management of Housing Contracts During the Shutdown”, 4 p.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Underpaid Teachers and Crumbling Schools:

How Underfunding Public Education Shortchanges America's Students", 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled "Climate Change: Preparing for the Energy Transition", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing entitled "The Impacts of Climate Change on Tribal Communities", 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Cost of Rising Prescription Drug Prices", 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of February 12 through February 15, 2019

Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, Senate will continue consideration of S. 47, Natural Resources Management Act, post-cloture, and vote on or in relation to amendments to the bill and on final passage at 4:30 p.m.

Following disposition of S. 47, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: February 12, to hold hearings to examine the United States Indo-Pacific Command and United States Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

February 12, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on the United States Indo-Pacific Command and United States Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SVC-217.

February 13, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on cyber operations to defend the midterm elections, 9:30 a.m., SVC-217.

February 13, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, with the Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold a joint hearing to examine the current condition of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative, 2 p.m., SD-G50.

February 14, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine United States Special Operations Command and United States Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: February 14, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, and Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, both to be a Member of the

National Credit Union Administration Board, and Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: February 13, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, Don Munce, of Florida, and Bruce M. Ramer, of California, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and a routine list in the Coast Guard, 10 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: February 14, to hold hearings to examine the status and outlook for cybersecurity efforts in the energy industry, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: February 13, to hold hearings to examine the invasive species threat, focusing on protecting wildlife, public health, and infrastructure, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: February 12, to hold hearings to examine managing pain during the opioid crisis, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: February 13, business meeting to consider S. 380, to increase access to agency guidance documents, S. 396, to amend section 1202 of title 5, United States Code, to modify the continuation of service provision for members of the Merit Systems Protection Board, S. 394, to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to improve the orderly transfer of the executive power during Presidential transitions, S. 195, to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain a website accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, S. 196, to save taxpayer money and improve the efficiency and speed of intragovernmental correspondence, S. 395, to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule, S. 406, to establish a Federal rotational cyber workforce program for the Federal cyber workforce, S. 375, to improve efforts to identify and reduce Governmentwide improper payments, S. 315, to authorize cyber hunt and incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, S. 333, to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with cybersecurity consortia for training, S. 74, to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, S. 387, to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, H.R. 504, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and the nominations of Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be Chairman, and Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member, all of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Ronald D. Vitiello, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: February 13, to hold hearings to examine pending nominations, Time to be announced, SD-226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: February 13, business meeting to consider S. Res. 50, improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate, an original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees for the 116th Congress, and committee rules, 10:30 a.m., SR-301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: February 13, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Small Business Administration, 2:30 p.m., SR-428A.

Select Committee on Intelligence: February 14, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, February 13, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Oversight Hearing: Department of Energy’s Weatherization Assistance Program, 10 a.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

February 13, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Library of Congress, 10 a.m., H-309 Capitol.

February 13, Subcommittee on Defense, hearing entitled “U.S. Military Service Academies Overview”, 11 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

February 13, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Long Term Healthcare Challenges and Long Term Care Hearing”, 2 p.m., HT-2 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, February 13, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled “Military Service Academies’ Action Plans to Address the Results of Sexual Assault and Violence Report at the Military Service Academies”, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, February 13, Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services; and Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, joint hearing entitled “Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7): Equal Pay for Equal Work”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, February 13, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “Protecting Consumers and Competition: An Examination of the T-Mobil and Sprint Merger”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 13, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Strengthening Our Health Care System: Legislation to Reverse ACA Sabotage and Ensure Pre-Existing Conditions Protections”, 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

February 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Committee Tributes to the Late Honorable John D. Dingell, Jr.”, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, February 13, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Homeless in America: Examining the Crisis and Solutions to End Homelessness”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 13, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions, hearing entitled “Challenges

and Solutions: Access to Banking Services for Cannabis-Related Businesses”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 14, Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance, hearing entitled “The Affordable Housing Crisis in Rural America: Assessing the Federal Response”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 13, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Venezuela at a Crossroads”, 11 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, February 13, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Defending Our Democracy: Building Partnerships to Protect America’s Elections”, 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, February 14, Full Committee, hearing entitled “For the People: Our American Democracy”, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, February 13, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 8, the “Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019”; and H.R. 1112, the “Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

February 14, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, hearing entitled “The State of Competition in the Wireless Market: Examining the Impact of the Proposed Merger of T-Mobile and Sprint on Consumers, Workers, and the Internet”, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, February 13, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, hearing entitled “Climate Change and Public Lands: Examining Impacts and Considering Adaptation Opportunities”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, February 14, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Effects of Vacancies at the Merit Systems Protection Board”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, February 13, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The State of Climate Science and Why it Matters”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, February 13, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Small Business Priorities for the 116th Congress”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, February 13, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “Putting U.S. Aviation at Risk: The Impact of the Shutdown”, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, February 13, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Ways and Means, February 13, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, hearing entitled “How Middle Class Families are Faring in Today’s Economy”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: February 13, to receive a briefing on asset recovery in Eurasia, 10 a.m., SD-562.

Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Tuesday, February 12

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Tuesday, February 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 47, Natural Resources Management Act, post-cloture, and vote on or in relation to amendments to the bill and on final passage at 4:30 p.m.

Following disposition of S. 47, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

(Senate will recess from 12 noon until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Boyle, Brendan F., Pa., E159
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E158
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E158
Garamendi, John, Calif., E157
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E159

Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E160
Johnson, Mike, La., E158
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E158
Porter, Katie, Calif., E158
Raskin, Jamie, Md., E159
Richmond, Cedric L., La., E157
Rutherford, John H., Fla., E159

Shalala, Donna E., Fla., E159
Shimkus, John, Ill., E159
Steube, W. Gregory, Fla., E158
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E157, E158
Watkins, Steven C., Jr., Kans., E157



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.