The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RASKIN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, February 25, 2019.
I hereby appoint the Honorable J AMIE RASKIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.
You sent Your prophet Isaiah to Your people when they were in need of hope and vision. May Isaiah’s prophetic words guide us still.
Send Your spirit upon this Nation and this Congress, that we may be open to hearing Your word and actively seek the salvation You alone can bring.
Make of us, and the Members of this people’s House, a people of compassion and holiness. In pursuing the avenues of justice for all, may we be a sign to the community of nations.
The issues of this coming week promise to be contentious. Send Your spirit of amity and understanding, that the proceedings of the legislative sessions might be a model of good governance.
Lord, bless the Members of the people’s House today and all days, and 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.
Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.
The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.
The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. 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.

NATIONAL DEBT

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

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

Mr. Speaker, every year, THON is the accumulation of a year-long fundraising effort to raise money for the fight against childhood cancer. Since the first THON took place in the mid-1970s, students have raised more than $157 million.
All of the proceeds go to the Four Diamonds at Penn State University Children’s Hospital. Four Diamonds ensures that families who are battling pediatric cancer are not faced with any costs, allowing them to fully focus on the needs of their child.
During the THON event, participants stand and dance 46 hours straight, without sleep. THON gives students the chance to stand in solidarity with those affected by this terrible disease.

Mr. Speaker, every year, THON is the largest student-run philanthropy in the world; and every year, I am in awe of the passion and thoughtfulness that
our Penn State students have for this great cause.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Peters) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes 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 11(b) of rule XX.

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

PREVENTING ILLEGAL RADIO ABUSE THROUGH ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 583) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 583

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 "Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act" or the "PIRATE Act".

SEC. 2. PIRATE RADIO ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENTS.

Title V of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 511. ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR PIRATE RADIO BROADCASTING; ENFORCEMENT SWEEPS; REPORTING.

(a) INCREASED GENERAL PENALTY.—Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or suffers to be done any pirate radio broadcasting shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000,000.

(b) VIOLATION OF THIS ACT, RULES, OR REGULATIONS.—Any person who willfully and knowingly violates this Act or any rule, regulation, restriction, or condition made or imposed by the Commission under authority of this Act, or any rule, regulation, restriction, or condition made or imposed by any international radio or wire communications treaty or convention, or regulations annexed thereto, to which the United States is party, relating to pirate radio broadcasting shall, in addition to any penalties provided by law, be subjected to a fine of not more than $100,000 for each day during which such offense occurs, in accordance with the limit described in subsection (a).

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the PIRATE Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report summarizing the implementation of this section and associated enforcement activities for the previous fiscal year, which may include the efforts by the Commission to enlist the cooperation of Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel (including United States attorneys and the United States Marshals Service) for service of process, collection of fines or forfeitures, seizures of equipment, and enforcement of orders.

(d) ENFORCEMENT SWEEPS.—

(1) ANNUAL SWEEPS.—Not less than once each year, the Commission shall assign appropriate enforcement personnel to focus specific and sustained attention on the elimination of pirate radio broadcasting within the top 5 radio markets identified as prevalent for such broadcasts. Such effort shall include identifying, locating, and taking enforcement actions designed to terminate such operations.

(2) ADDITIONAL MONITORING.—Within 6 months after conducting the enforcement sweeps required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall conduct monitoring sweeps to ascertain whether pirate radio broadcasting identified by enforcement sweeps is continuing to broadcast and whether additional pirate radio broadcasting is occurring.

(g) PIRATE RADIO BROADCASTING DATA-BASE.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, and semi-annually thereafter, the Commission shall publish a database in a clear and legible format of all licensed radio stations operating in the AM and FM bands, and database shall be easily accessible from the Commission home page through a direct link. The database shall include the following information:

(A) Each licensed station, listed by the assigned frequency, channel number, or Commission call letters;

(B) All entities that have received a notice of unlicensed operation, notice of apparent liability, or a citation issued by the Commission.

(2) CLEAR IDENTIFICATION.—The Commission shall clearly identify in the database

(A) Each licensed station as a station licensed by the Commission; and

(B) Each entity described in paragraph (1)(B) as operating without a Commission license or authorization.

(h) DEFINITION OF PIRATE RADIO BROADCASTING.—In this section, the term 'pirate radio' means the transmission of communications on spectrum frequencies between 555 and 1705 kilohertz, inclusive, or 87.7 and 108 megahertz, inclusive, without a license issued by the Commission, but does not include unlicensed operations in compliance with part 15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend this amendment and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 583, the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act, or PIRATE Act, a bill sponsored by myself and Mr. BILIRAKIS. This measure is a bipartisan, commonsense bill that passed the House last Congress. I thank my former colleague, Congressman Leonard Lance, for all his work on this bill in the past. And I thank the New York State broadcasters for their dedication.

For years, I, along with many Members of the New York and New Jersey delegations, have voiced our concern that pirate radio operators are a threat to Americans' public health and safety. Yet these lawbreakers are as prevalent as ever, and their days have been met with few consequences. This legislation responds directly to that threat.

The FCC has taken some positive steps to remedy this issue, but more needs to be done.

In short, the PIRATE Act would increase penalties and restrictions on pirate radio.

Whether a radio frequency is being used by first responders coordinating to save lives, or parents who want to keep obscenity and bigotry away from their children, for example, our communities are better served when broadcasters respect the rule of law.

Previous drafts of the PIRATE Act included provisions creating liability for those who facilitate illegal pirate radio operation. These provisions were removed as being duplicative with existing law. For example, under current law, the FCC can hold a property owner liable for allowing a pirate radio operator access or other assistance.

Cutting these provisions should not be taken as limiting the Commission's authority to assess fines against those who assist illegal pirate operations. On the contrary, the consequences established in this act would also apply in these contexts.
The text of the bill before us today includes changes that were requested in the Senate last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 583 from the 50 State broadcasters associations.

JANUARY 18, 2019.

50 State Broadcasters Associations Urge Passage of the Bipartisan PIRATE Act

Hon. NANCY PELOSI, Majority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL, Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY, Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker PELOSI and Leaders McCARTHY, MCCONNELL and SCHUMER:

The undersigned broadcasters associations representing local, over-the-air broadcast stations, the National Association of Broadcasters, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands fully support the bipartisan PIRATE Act (H.R. 583). The PIRATE Act would provide the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) with critical new enforcement tools to combat pirate radio operators.

We are reaching the point where illegal pirate radio stations, which are spread throughout our nation, are harming communities across the country by undermining the Emergency Alert System (EAS) and with airport communications, posing direct health risks and interfering with licensed stations’ abilities to serve their listeners.

For years unauthorized pirate radio stations have harmed communities across the country by undermining the Emergency Alert System with airport communications, posing direct health risks and interfering with licensed stations’ abilities to serve their listeners. The time has come to take significant steps to resolve this vexing problem.

The PIRATE Act gives the FCC additional tools to address the growing pirate radio problem. It provides the authority to levy increased fines up to $100,000 per violation and $2,000,000 in total. The PIRATE Act streamlines the enforcement process and requires the FCC to conduct pirate radio enforcement sweeps in cities with a concentration of pirate radio stations. It recognizes the importance of coordination with federal, state, and local law enforcement authorities. Finally, the PIRATE Act would create a database of all licensed radio stations operating in the AM and FM bands as well as the entities that have been subject to enforcement actions for illegal operation.

We are reaching the point where illegal pirate radio stations undermine the legitimacy and purpose of the FCC’s licensing system to the detriment of listeners in communities across the country. The PIRATE Act will help the FCC restore integrity to the system. For these reasons, local broadcasters across our great nation fully support the bipartisan PIRATE Act and urge its swift passage without changes.

Respectfully,

Sharon Tinsley, Alabama Broadcasters Association; Cathy Hiebert, Alaska Broadcasters Association; Christopher Kline, Arizona Broadcasters Association; Luke Story, Arkansas Broadcasters Association; Joe Berry, California Broadcasters Association; Justin Sasso, Colorado Broadcasters Association; Michael Patrick Ryan, Connecticut Broadcasters Association; Gary C. Patrick Roberts, Florida Association of Broadcasters; Bob Houghton, Georgia Association of Broadcasters; Jamie Hartnett, Hawaii Association of Broadcasters; Connie Searles, Idaho State Broadcasters Association; Dennis Lyle, Illinois Broadcasters Association.

Dave Arland, Indiana Broadcasters Association; Sue Toma, Iowa Broadcasters Association; Kent Cornish, Kansas Association of Broadcasters; Chris Winkle, Kentucky Broadcasters Association; Polly Prince Johnson, Louisiana Association of Broadcasters; Suzanne Goucher, Maine Association of Broadcasters; Lisa Reynolds, Maryland/DC Delaware Broadcasters Association; Jordan Walton, Massachusetts Broadcasters Association; Karole L. White, Michigan Association of Broadcasters; Wendy Paulson, Minnesota Broadcasters Association; Margaret Perkins, Mississippi Association of Broadcasters; Mark Gordon, Missouri Broadcasters Association; Dewey Brucy, Nebraska Broadcasters Association; Jim Timm, Nevada Broadcasters Association; Mitch Fox, Nevada Broadcasters Association; Tracy Caruso, New Hampshire Association of Broadcasters; Paul Rotella, New Jersey Broadcasters Association; Paula Maes, New Mexico Broadcasters Association; Dan Donovan, New York State Broadcasters Association; Lisa Reynolds, North Carolina Association of Broadcasters; Beth Heilthin, North Dakota Broadcasters Association; Christine Merritt, Ohio Association of Broadcasters; Lance Harrison, Oklahoma Association of Broadcasters; John Tamerlano, Oregon Association of Broadcasters; Joe Conti, Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters; Jose A. Ribas Dominici, Radio Broadcasters Association of Puerto Rico; Lisa Johnson, Rhode Island Broadcasters Association; Margaret Wallace, South Carolina Broadcasters Association; Steve Willard, South Dakota Broadcasters Association; Whit Adamson, Tennessee Association of Broadcasters; Oscar Rodriguez, Texas Association of Broadcasters; Michele Zabriskie, Utah Broadcasters Association; Wendy Sayers, Washington Association of Broadcasters; Doug Easter, Virginia Association of Broadcasters; Keith Shipman, Washington State Association of Broadcasters; Michele Crait, West Virginia Broadcasters Association; Michelle Vetterkind, Wisconsin Broadcasters Association; Laura Grott, Wyoming Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 583 is a bipartisan, commonsense advance in public safety law that supports our first responders and protect our communities. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so it can be taken up in the Senate and signed into law.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, again, for all the reasons that I have stated here today on the PIRATE Act, I believe that this bill is essential to pass today, and I ask the House to pass H.R. 583.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, to close, I believe that this measure, H.R. 583, moves us forward in a way that better protects public health and safety. It has the endorsement of many in the field, including 50 State broadcast associations.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues to support H.R. 583, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 583, the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act, the PIRATE Act, introduced by my friends Mr. TONKO and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their leadership on this bipartisan legislation, and I urge its passage today.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, again, for all the reasons that I have stated here today on the PIRATE Act, I believe that this bill is essential to pass today, and I ask the House to pass H.R. 583.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
The PIRATE Act gives the FCC additional tools to address the growing pirate radio problem and increases the penalties for bad actors. These illegal broadcasts deprive Americans of important programming provided by legitimate broadcast license-holders serving the public interest. And they can disrupt important public safety communications, including our nation’s Emergency Alert System and critical aviation frequencies. In many cases, these pirate radio stations broadcast vile and vulgar content, which also harms consumers. By preventing illegal pirate radio operations, consumers are protected, and airwaves are kept free for legitimate broadcasts and public safety announcements.

Last Congress, this House passed the PIRATE Act by voice vote. I’d like to thank our former colleague Leonard Lance, who first authored this legislation last Congress, and my colleagues Mr. TONKO and Mr. BILIRAKIS for bringing this important bill to strengthen our public safety communications back to the House floor today. I urge its quick passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question proposed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 583.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POISON CENTER NETWORK ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 501) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and enhance the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

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

SEC. 1. ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER.

Section 1271 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–71) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1271. ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER. —

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall provide coordination and assistance to poison centers for—

(1) the development, establishment, implementation, and maintenance of a nationwide toll-free number; and

(2) the enhancement of communications capabilities, which may include text capabilities.

(b) Consultation.—The Secretary may consult with nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control to determine the best and most effective means of achieving the goals described in paragraph (a) of this subsection.

(c) Rule of Construction.—In assisting with public health emergencies, responses, or preparedness, nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the work of poison control centers or the use of their resources by the Secretary or other governmental agencies.

(d) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF POISON CONTROL CENTERS NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER.

Section 1271 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–71) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1271. ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER. —

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall—

(1) carry out, and expand upon, a national public awareness campaign to educate the public and health care providers about—

(A) poisoning, toxic exposure, and drug misuse prevention; and

(B) the availability of poison control center resources in local communities; and

(2) as part of such campaign, highlight the nationwide toll-free number and enhanced communications capabilities supported under section 1271.

(b) Consultation.—As part of carrying out and expanding upon the national campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary may consult with nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control and national media firms, for the development and implementation of the awareness campaigns under subsection (a), which may include—

(1) the development and distribution of poisoning, toxic exposure prevention, poison control center, and public health emergency awareness and response materials;

(2) television, radio, internet, and newspaper public service announcements; and

(3) other means and activities to provide for public and professional awareness and education.

(c) Evaluation.—The Secretary shall—

(1) establish baseline measures and benchmarks to quantitatively evaluate the impact of the nationwide public awareness campaign carried out under this section; and

(2) on a biennial basis, prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an evaluation of the nationwide public awareness campaign.

(d) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $300,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2024.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONWIDE PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CONTROL CENTER UTILIZATION AND THEIR PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY RESPONSE CAPABILITIES.

Section 1272 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–72) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1272. NATIONWIDE PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CONTROL CENTER UTILIZATION AND THEIR PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY RESPONSE CAPABILITIES.

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall—

(1) carry out, and expand upon, a national public awareness campaign to educate the public and health care providers about—

(A) poisoning, toxic exposure, and drug misuse prevention; and

(B) the availability of poison control center resources in local communities; and

(2) as part of such campaign, highlight the nationwide toll-free number and enhanced communications capabilities supported under section 1271.

(b) Consultation.—As part of carrying out and expanding upon the national campaign under subsection (a), the Secretary may consult with nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control and national media firms, for the development and implementation of the awareness campaigns under subsection (a), which may include—

(1) the development and distribution of poisoning, toxic exposure prevention, poison control center, and public health emergency awareness and response materials;

(2) television, radio, internet, and newspaper public service announcements; and

(3) other means and activities to provide for public and professional awareness and education.

(c) Evaluation.—The Secretary shall—

(1) establish baseline measures and benchmarks to quantitatively evaluate the impact of the nationwide public awareness campaign carried out under this section; and

(2) on a biennial basis, prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an evaluation of the nationwide public awareness campaign.

(d) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $300,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2024.

SEC. 4. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE POISON CONTROL CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1273 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–73) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1273. MAINTENANCE OF THE POISON CONTROL CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) Authorization of Program.—The Secretary shall award grants to poison control centers accredited under subsection (c) of this section, poison control centers accredited under subsection (d) of this section, and nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control for—

(1) poisoning, toxic exposure prevention, and treatment recommendations for, poisonings and toxic exposures including opioid and drug misuse;

(2) assisting with public health emergencies, responses, and preparedness; and

(3) complying with the operational requirements needed to sustain the accreditation of the poison center under subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Additional Uses of Funds.—In addition to the purposes described in subsection (a), the Secretary may also use amounts received under such grant for—

(1) to research, establish, implement, and evaluate best practices in the United States for poisoning prevention, poison control center outreach, opioid and drug misuse information, poisoning, public health emergency, response, and preparedness programs;

(2) to research, develop, implement, and evaluate broadcast and communication initiatives to support and expand the toxicologic expertise within poison control centers; and

(3) to develop, support, and enhance technology and capabilities of nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control to collect national poisoning, toxic occurrence, and related public health data;

(4) to develop initiatives to foster the enhanced public health utilization of national poison data collected by such organizations;

(5) to support and expand the toxicologic expertise within poison control centers; and

(6) to improve the capacity of poison control centers to answer high volumes of contacts and internet communications, and to sustain and enhance the poison control center's network capability to respond during times of national crisis or other public health emergencies.

(c) Accreditation.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary may award a grant to a poison control center under subsection (a) only if—

(1) the center has been accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization in the field of poison control, and the Secretary has approved the organization as having in effect standards for accreditation that reasonably provide for the protection of the public health with respect to poisoning;

(2) the center has been accredited by a State government, and the Secretary has approved the State government as having in effect standards for accreditation that reasonably provide for the protection of the public health with respect to poisoning;

(3) the center has been awarded a waiver of the accreditation requirements needed to sustain the accreditation of the poison control center that applies for a grant under this section if such center can reasonably demonstrate that the center will obtain such an accreditation within a reasonable period of time as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(d) Renewal.—The Secretary may renew a grant under paragraph (1) of this subsection for—

(1) initially for 2 years and thereubfor.

(2) renewal for a grant for which the Secretary has approved the organization or governmental entity as described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, if the Secretary determines that the State or governmental entity is meeting the conditions described in paragraph (1) for renewal of a grant.

(3) renewal for a grant for which the Secretary has approved the organization as meeting the conditions described in paragraph (1) for renewal of a grant, if the Secretary determines that the State or governmental entity is meeting the conditions described in paragraph (1) for renewal of a grant.

(e) Authorization of Appropriations.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $500,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2024.
Control Network Enhancement Act of 2019, grant to a poison control center waivers or renewals that total more than 5 years.

‘(e) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—
Amounts made available to a poison control center under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, or local funds provided for such centers.

‘(f) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—A poison control center, in utilizing the proceeds of a grant under this section, shall maintain the annual recurring expenditures of the center for its activities at a level that is not less than 80 percent of the average level of such recurring expenditures maintained by the center for the preceding 3 fiscal years for which a grant is received.

‘(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—
There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $28,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024. The Secretary may utilize an amount not to exceed 6 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence for each fiscal year for coordination, dissemination, technical assistance, program evaluation, data activities, and other program administration functions, which are determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for carrying out the program under this section.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 501.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 501, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act.

This bill, which I have coauthored with the gentlewoman from Indiana, Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS, reauthorizes for an additional 5 years the national network of poison control centers, known as PCCs, which play a critical role in the fight to end the opioid crisis.

Our country’s 55 poison centers are staffed by trained toxicologists, pharmacists, physicians, and nurses who are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year to provide real-time assistance via a national toll-free number, which is 1–800–222–1222. Some 330 million people are served by these critical centers, while handling 2.6 million cases.

In 2017, someone called a poison center every 12 seconds in our country. More than 90 percent of those calls were due to poison exposure in someone’s home, and more than half of all cases involved children under the age of 12. That is why speedy access to poison centers is such an invaluable resource, especially for parents.

Poison centers also save hundreds of millions in Federal dollars by helping to avoid the unnecessary use of medical services and shortening the length of time a person spends in the hospital, if hospitalization due to poisoning is necessary.

It is clear that these centers are a smart public health investment, but they are also a part of our response to the opioid epidemic. Since 2011, poison centers handled nearly 200 cases per day involving opioid misuse. Data from poison centers helped to detect trends in the epidemic, which experts helped educate Americans about the crisis in ways that could potentially save the lives of their loved ones.

The Upstate New York Poison Center, for instance, used the New York State Fair to educate New Yorkers about proper use of naloxone, the overdose reversal drug. This bill would make sure that activities like this can continue.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of coauthoring the last poison center reauthorization signed into law in 2014, and I am pleased to have worked on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BROOKS for partnering with me on this legislation, Congresswoman DEGETTE and Congresswoman HERRERA BEUTLER for being original cosponsors. Let me also thank Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN for their assistance in bringing this bill to the floor today.

As I mentioned earlier, in Westchester County, New York, much of which I represent, 124 people died due to opioids in 2016. In the Bronx, part of which I also represent, more New Yorkers died of overdoses than in any other borough in New York City.

We must do more to end this epidemic, and I am pleased to see this legislation moving forward as part of that effort.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support of H.R. 501, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act of 2019, introduced by Representatives BROOKS and ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my Committee on Energy and Commerce colleagues for their bipartisan work on this important initiative.

This legislation will reauthorize the national toll-free number, public awareness campaign, and grant program that supports the Nation’s 55 poison centers.

These centers are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to provide free and confidential assistance with emergencies and other information to help prevent poisoning. As of January 2019, poison control centers have managed over 4,000,000 poison exposure cases alone.

At a time when our Nation is still fighting to overcome an opioid crisis, these centers are on the front lines, helping to save individuals who overdose. Furthermore, these centers collect real-time data, enhancing public health surveillance and aiding in the detection of public health emergencies.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 501, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act.

This important bill, introduced by Reps. ELIOT ENGEL, SUSAN BROOKS, JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, and DIANA DEGETTE, reauthorizes the national network of Poison Control Centers.

The nation’s network of poison control centers offers free, confidential, and expert medical advice and often serves as the primary resource for poison information. These centers help reduce Emergency Room visits through in-home treatment and their lifesaving assistance helps prevent unnecessary poisoning deaths and injuries.

Poison control centers are also essential to combating the opioid crisis because not only are these centers often the first resource people seek after an opioid overdose occurs, but they also collect real-time data to alert impacted communities about opioid abuse and misuse.

Last Congress, Rep. BROOKS led similar legislation, which passed this House by voice vote and was then included in the House-passed version of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act, our broad legislative package to combat the opioid crisis. Unfortunately, after negotiations with the Senate, this language was not included in the final package that was signed into law.

Therefore, I’d like to commend Rep. ENGEL and Rep. BROOKS for their continued leadership on this bipartisan legislation in helping to bring this bill to the floor today, and I urge passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 501.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by Mr. ENGEL to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 501.

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

H.R. 525
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 “Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019”.

STRENGTHENING THE HEALTH CARE FRAUD PREVENTION TASK FORCE ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 525) to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a public-private partnership for purposes of identifying health care waste, fraud, and abuse.

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

H.R. 525
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
PARTY.—In carrying out the partnership, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with a trusted third party for purposes of carrying out the duties of the partnership described in subparagraph (C).

(b) POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(i) a review of activities conducted by the partnership over the 2-year period ending on the date of the submission of such report, including any progress to any objectives established by the partnership;

(ii) any savings voluntarily reported by health plans participating in the partnership attributable to the partnership during such period;

(iii) any savings to the Federal Government attributable to the partnership during such period; and

(iv) any other outcomes attributable to the partnership, as determined by the Secretary, during such period; and

(G) FUNDING.—The partnership shall be funded by amounts otherwise made available to the Secretary for carrying out the program described in paragraph (1).

(H) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—To the extent that any Federal-State or other arrangements established before the date before the date of the enactment of this paragraph to the National Fraud Prevention Partnership, and improve and expand the task force's ability to fight waste, fraud, and abuse throughout our healthcare system.

The Healthcare Fraud Prevention Partnership is a public-private partnership between the Department of Health and Human Services, insurance companies, Federal and State law enforcement agencies, and State healthcare agencies. The partnership aims to improve the detection and prevention of health care fraud by facilitating the exchange of data and information between the public and private sectors on current trends and successful antifraud practices.

The legislation we are considering today would authorize the Healthcare Fraud Prevention Partnership, and improve and expand the task force's ability to fight waste, fraud, and abuse throughout our healthcare system.

We must continue to work on a bipartisan basis to enhance our fraud detection capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to work together to find meaningful solutions to root out fraud, waste, and abuse in our healthcare system.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 525. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 525.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to work together to find meaningful solutions to root out fraud, waste, and abuse in our healthcare system.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to work together to find meaningful solutions to root out fraud, waste, and abuse in our healthcare system.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to work together to find meaningful solutions to root out fraud, waste, and abuse in our healthcare system.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue to work together to find meaningful solutions to root out fraud, waste, and abuse in our healthcare system.
The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 525.

Sincerely,  
RICHARD E. NEAL,  
Chairman.  

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  

Hon. Richard E. Neal,  
Chairman, Ways and Means,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEAL: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Energy and Commerce and agreeing to discharge H.R. 525, Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019 from further consideration, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forthcoming action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will ensure our letters on H.R. 525 are entered into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,  
FRANK PALLONE, JR.,  
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 525, the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019, introduced by the Energy and Commerce Committee Republican Leader WALDEN and Chairman PALLONE.

This legislation will codify the Healthcare Fraud Prevention Partnership, which is currently operated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. The Partnership is a voluntary public-private partnership between the Federal Government, State agencies, law enforcement, private health insurance plans, and healthcare antifraud associations.

The Partnership was established by the Obama administration and the Trump administration recommended codifying it, solidifying the bipartisan nature of revealing and halting scams that cut across public and private payers.

H.R. 525 will ensure the continued operation of this important partnership to detect and prevent healthcare fraud through public-private information sharing, streamlining analytical tools and data, and providing a forum for government and industry experts to exchange successful anti-fraud practices.

This bill before us today is the product of bipartisan cooperation, as well as engagement with the Department of Health and Human Services and industry stakeholders.

Originally introduced in the 115th Congress, this legislation worked its way through the Committee on Energy and Commerce in a transparent manner and currently enjoys the support of the chairmen and Republican leaders of both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to work together to find meaningful solutions to curb the waste, fraud, and abuse in our healthcare systems, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 525, the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act.

This bipartisan legislation I introduced with Chairman Frank PALLONE, and which is supported by Ways and Means Chairman RICHARD NEAL and Republican Leader KEVIN BRADY—is a commonsense, bipartisan bill to improve the integrity of our nation’s health care system.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) currently operates the Health Care Fraud Prevention Partnership—a voluntary collaboration between the federal government, state agencies, law enforcement, private health insurance plans, and anti-fraud associations. Together, this group works to detect and prevent fraud that threatens to undermine our nation’s health care system. This program was created by the Obama Administration, and the Trump Administration has recommended codifying it into law. The bill before us today does just that.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress, the House passed this legislation by voice vote but unfortunately, we were unable to get this bill through the Senate and to the President’s desk before the end of the Congress.

In fact, the House Energy and Commerce Committee had 148 bills pass the House last Congress, and 93 percent of them received bipartisan votes. I’d like to thank Chairman PALLONE for continuing in that bipartisan spirit by helping to bring this bill back to the floor today.

I urge passage of H.R. 525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The following:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the "Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Science Foundation Innovation Corps Program (hereinafter referred to as ‘‘I-Corps’’), created administratively by the Foundation in 2011 and statutorily authorized in the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act, has succeeded in encouraging the commercialization of Government-funded research.

(2) I-Corps provides valuable entrepreneurial education to graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, researchers, and engineers, including providing formal training for scientists and engineers to pursue careers in business, an increasingly common path for advanced degree holders.

(3) The I-Corps Teams program is successful in part due to its focus on providing the specific types of education and mentoring entrepreneurs need at each stage of their companies, however the program does not provide similar support to them at later stages.

(4) The success of I-Corps in the very early stages of the innovation continuum should be expanded upon by offering additional entrepreneurship training to small businesses as they advance toward commercialization.

(5) The excellent training made available to grantees of participating agencies through the I-Corps Program should be made available to all Federal grantee agencies, Federal grant recipients, and other businesses willing to pay the cost of attending such training.

(6) The success of the I-Corps Program at promoting entrepreneurship research institutions and encouraging research commercialization has been due in part to the National Science Foundation’s efforts to help building a national network of science entrepreneurs, including convening stakeholders, promoting national I-Corps courses, cataloging best practices and encouraging sharing between sites and institutions, and developing a mentor network.

(7) As the I-Corps Program continues to grow and expand, the National Science Foundation should maintain its national networking and information sharing to ensure that innovators across the country can learn from their peers and remain competitive.

SEC. 3. EXPANDED PARTICIPATION IN I-CORPS.

Section 601(c)(2) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862e–8(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C) ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS.—

"(1) ELIGIBILITY.—The Director, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, as determined by the Director which may include Federal agencies, I-Corps regional nodes, universities, and public and private entities engaged in technology transfer or commercialization of technology, shall provide an option for participation in an I-Corps Teams course by—
Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 539, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LUCAS, is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act is a bill I introduced to spur entrepreneurship and turn American innovation into American jobs. This bill expands the National Science Foundation’s highly successful Innovation Corps, or I-Corps program, a program I am proud to have championed since its inception in 2012.

I-Corps teaches scientists and engineers, including many women and underrepresented minorities, how to turn their federally-funded laboratory research into successful products and services.

The program has educated more than 1,300 teams, representing 271 universities in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. It has been linked to almost 650 startup companies that have raised almost $300 million in follow-on funding.

In the 114th Congress, I led the effort that authorized I-Corps and expanded its reach to other agencies, including the National Institutes of Health, NASA, and the Department of Energy. The resulting program now invests billions of dollars in research and development annually, both at government facilities, such as national labs, and at universities and research institutions.

I-Corps is a modest investment that leads to a higher return on our research spending by significantly increasing rates of commercialization, economic activity, and job creation.

Our economy is driven by the ingenuity of our scientists and engineers, and they develop products that become tomorrow’s great products. And yet, still only a small minority of federally-funded research with commercial potential ever makes it to the marketplace. The I-Corps program helps to change that.

This bill expands I-Corps to meet some pressing needs.

First, it helps more people participate in the program. Right now, unless you are a grantee of NSF or another agency with an I-Corps program, the training can be difficult to access. This bill will give recipients of small business grants from any Federal agency the flexibility to pay for I-Corps with their grant funds, and will also allow other entrepreneurs to apply and pay out-of-pocket to participate.

Second, the bill directs NSF to establish a new course as part of the I-Corps program to teach scientist-entrepreneurs how to start and grow a company. While the current I-Corps course does a great job of helping scientists and engineers determine who their customers are and whether their innovation is suitable for commercialization, it currently only limited guidance on what to do after a scientist makes the decision to become an entrepreneur.

Skills like how to write a business plan, hire a team, and attract investment are taught in business schools, but not in Ph.D. programs. NSF recognized this need and has already begun a pilot program to test curriculum for this new course. This bill will make sure the new course is fully developed and made available around the country.

Finally, this bill requires a GAO assessment of the I-Corps program, its first comprehensive, independent evaluation since it was created. Although the program’s success speaks for itself, it is important to continuously improve it by developing metrics to measure its performance and ensure that Federal funds are well spent.

This bill has been endorsed by a wide range of stakeholders, including the “father of modern entrepreneurship,” who developed the curriculum that I-Corps is based on, Steve Blank; the former NSF program officer, who founded the program, Dr. Errol Arkilic; and several directors of I-Corps Nodes around the country.

This bill is also endorsed by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the National Venture Capital Association, the Association of American Universities; the Council on Governmental Relations; and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

I thank my cosponsors, DANIEL WEBSTER of Florida, ANTHONY GONZALEZ of Ohio, Science, Space, and Technology Committee Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ranking Member FRANK LUCAS of Oklahoma. I also thank Senators COONS and YOUNG, who are cosponsors on the Senate companion to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that helping our scientists, engineers, and academics not only advance our knowledge and understanding of the world, but also create jobs and products that fuel our economy, is a goal we all can share.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019.

H.R. 539 extends the outreach of the National Science Foundation’s Innovation Corps program, also known as I-Corps.
I-Corps trains and prepares scientists and engineers to take their research from the lab and turn it into commercial products and services. Research labs are making breakthroughs in new fields like quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and bioengineering. These breakthroughs will continue to transform our lives and the world we live in.

But many scientists and engineers are not trained for commercializing these discoveries and did not go to business school or take any business development classes. I-Corps gives researchers the tools to maximize the taxpayer investment in basic research and spur innovation.

H.R. 539 expands the eligible pool for I-Corps courses and allows a portion of Federal small business grants be used to cover I-Corps training expenses. The bill also allows any private citizen to apply to participate and pay out-of-pocket.

Finally, H.R. 539 authorizes a new I-Corps boot-camp course that teaches valuable skills, like structuring a company, attracting investors, and hiring staff.

In my district, Oklahoma State University has a successful support system for businesses both on and off campus. I-Corps is a key part of that system, helping students and faculty learn how to commercialize their ideas and build a business.
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H.R. 539 will help programs like the one at OSU grow and become self-sustaining.

I want to thank Representative DAN LIPINSKI and Representative DAN WEBSTER for their work on this legislation. I also want to thank my friend and our new chairwoman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for her work in advancing this bill.

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

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

I rise today to support and ask my House colleagues to pass H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act. I would like to issue a special thanks to my friend DAN LIPINSKI, who introduced this legislation, and he continues to serve as a champion for the time-proven I-Corps program.

The Innovation Core program was created by the National Science Foundation in 2011 to teach scientists and engineers how to turn their laboratory innovations into successful commercial products and services. I know engineers are lacking in that area. I am one. I think I invented, before I was 21 years old, about three or four, maybe five, things which were really awesome; but nobody bought them except me, and it wasn’t good.

So this program assists scientists and engineers in the development of their academic research and equips them to bring research into a private market where ingenuity and money can be won through that. We witnessed the wonderful success of this program in my home State of Florida, the University of Central Florida.

H.R. 539 expands the I-Corps program to create a new course in commercial-ready companies. Individuals who have completed an existing I-Corps course would be eligible for this new course which will help them create, market, and, eventually, expand their private-sector company.

This bill breaks down the barriers experienced by current scientists when attempting to bring their product to market. Through marketing, hiring, organizing, and attracting investors, these scientists can have a better shot at not only success, but also increasing, dramatically, their business.

Additionally, H.R. 539 expands the number of groups eligible to apply to the I-Corps program and offers new options on how to initially pay for the course.

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

Mr. LUCAS, Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI and the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee for their work on this bill, and I encourage all my House colleagues to join together to pass this commonsense piece of legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes a new I-Corps bill, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019.

I want to thank Mr. LIPINSKI, Chairwoman JOHNSON, Ranking Member LUCAS, and Mr. WEBSTER for all the hard work they have put into this important legislation.

Entrepreneurship is hard; it is risky; it is the road less traveled; it is an all-encompassing journey that tests every ounce of strength and skill that those bold enough to pursue it have to offer; and its successful practice is essential to the future prosperity of our Nation.

The bill we are considering today takes the breakthrough lessons of customer development first codified by Steve Blank, whose teachings are engrained in the conscience of many business school students—but less of our Ph.D. students—and forms the basis of the NSF I-Corps program, a program that has already proven its worth at turning breakthrough scientific research into successful commercial enterprise.

Since this program was created in 2011, more than 600 startups have been formed through the various I-Corps sites, including in my home State of Ohio at the University of Akron, The Ohio State University, and the University of Toledo.

As just one example, University of Akron I-Corps startup Fontus Blue produces software that helps water treatment plants to produce consistently excellent drinking water. The software is used by plants in 24 cities across the U.S., Canada, and Brazil.

Through programs like this, and many before us today expands upon the success of the current program by opening up access to small business innovation research grantees and also private individuals. Additionally, this bill allows small business innovation research grants and the small business technology transfer grants to be used to access I-Corps training.

Finally, this bill would require I-Corps to develop a course for commercialization-ready teams to help them learn the skills needed to attract investors, build a brand, and scale a business.

As we confront the economic challenges of the 21st century, it will be our innovators and entrepreneurs who will create solutions to these seemingly intractable problems by channeling the entrepreneurial spirit and force of will that has driven our country to its greatest economic heights.

The Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act safeguards our economy by empowering future generations of entrepreneurs in all corners of our country to turn their wildest dreams into our collective achievements.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his dedicated and diligent work over this decade on this subject matter. I think we both will be better off for it. I know those folks who utilize the program and will have greater opportunities to utilize the program will benefit all of us as a society.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank full committee Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for cosponsoring. I want to thank Ranking Member LUCAS, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WEBSTER for cosponsoring—Mr. WEBSTER as the lead Republican cosponsor on this bill now and in the previous Congress. Mr. WEBSTER talks about being an engineer. I was an engineer and then an academic; although, I wasn’t an academic as an engineer. I was a political scientist. But I understand that a lot of scientists, engineers, political scientists have a lot of great ideas, a lot of great research.

We as taxpayers put a lot of money into this research. There are a lot of...
great ideas that come out of it, the possibility for great innovations. I will always remember when I first met with Steve Blank and saw him teaching the course that was the basis for I-Corps out of Stanford University. I thought the course was complete nonsense to me, that scientists and engineers, teach them how to be entrepreneurs, teach them how to develop ideas into new products, new services, and, hopefully, new American jobs.

The Senate has been the birthplace of some of the most successful programs that I have seen during my term in Washington, D.C. This bill will help to advance that, and in doing so, help advance American innovation. I think that is a goal that we can all embrace. So I ask my colleagues to support this bill, and, hopefully, we will work on it and get it through the Senate and to the President’s desk, because I think this will be a great victory for our country.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019. I thank Mr. LIPINSKI for his leadership on this bipartisan legislation and look forward to working with him to see it through to the President’s desk.

Each dollar the U.S. invests in research grants at our universities is a dollar toward the birth of potentially game-changing discoveries and innovations. Innovation is the lifeblood of our economy. The radical new discoveries and security gains created by scientific advances can only be enjoyed if we fully support the innovation ecosystem from discovery to commercialization. Finding ways to maximize the benefits of federally funded research is critical to U.S. competitiveness in the global market.

H.R. 539 does just that. This bill creates a link between two of our most important programs that focus on creating a sustainable path from laboratory to market for valuable scientific research. This bill expands participation in Small Business Innovation Research grants. The Small Business Innovation Innovation Program grants, known as SBIR and STTR, are valuable programs that provide competitive research and development grants and contracts to innovative small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 539. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is whether to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 539.

The question was taken.

SUPPORTING VETERANS IN STEM CAREERS ACT

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 425) to promote veteran involvement in the education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

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 “Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS. In this Act:

(a) SUPPORTING VETERAN INVOLVEMENT IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND STEM EDUCATION.—The Director shall, through the research and education activities of the Foundation, encourage veterans to study and pursue careers in STEM and computer science, in coordination with other Federal agencies that serve veterans.

(b) VETERAN OUTREACH PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Committee shall submit to the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan for how the Foundation can enhance its outreach efforts to veterans. Such plan shall—

(1) report on the Foundation’s existing outreach activities;

(2) identify the best method for the Foundation to leverage existing authorities and programs to facilitate and support veterans in STEM careers and studies, including teaching programs; and

(3) include options for how the Foundation could track veteran participation in the Foundation, and describe any barriers to collecting such information.

(c) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BOARD INDICATORS REPORT.—The National Science Board shall provide in its annual report on indicators of the state of science and engineering in the United States any available and relevant data on veterans in science and engineering careers or education programs.

(d) ROBERT NOYCE TEACHER SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM UPDATES.—Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “and”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)F—

(A) by striking “and student” and inserting “and student”;

(B) by inserting “; and” before the period at the end; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting “and veterans” before the period at the end; and

(4) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “and veterans” before the period at the end.

(e) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION TEACHING FELLOWSHIPS AND MASTER TEACHING FELLOWSHIPS.—Section 10(a)(d) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n–1a(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(F)F—

(A) by striking “and individuals” and inserting “; and individuals”;

(B) by inserting “; and” before the period at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(B), by inserting “and veterans” before the period at the end.

(f) GRADUATE TRAINEESHIPS IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY BUILDING GRANTS UPDATE.—Section 5(a)(4) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 740(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and veterans” after “disciplines”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking (A), by striking and inserting “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as (A); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(C) the creation of opportunities for veterans to transition to careers in computer and network security; and”.

(g) GRADUATE TRAINEE SHIPS IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH UPDATE.—Section 5(c)(6)(C) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 740(C)(6)(C)) is amended by inserting “or veterans” after “disciplines”:

(h) VETERANS AND MILITARY FAMILIES STEM EDUCATION INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—In general.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with other Federal agencies that serve veterans and military spouses, and in consultation with veterans and military families, shall establish a multi-agency working group to coordinate Federal programs and policies for transitioning and transitioning veterans and military families into STEM careers.

(2) DUTIES OF INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The interagency working group established under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) coordinate any Federal agency STEM outreach activities and programs for veterans and military spouses; and

(B) develop and facilitate the implementation by participating agencies of a strategic plan.”.

March 5, 2019
(vi) identify any barriers that require Federal or State legislative or regulatory changes in order to be addressed.
(3) Duties of OSTP.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall encourage and monitor the efforts of the Federal agencies participating in the interagency working group to ensure that the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B) is developed and executed effectively and that the objectives of such strategic plan are met.

Report.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—
(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B); and
(B) include in the annual report required by section 101(d) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act a description of any progress made in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection.

Sunset.—The interagency working group established under paragraph (1) shall terminate on the date that it is established.

(4) Report.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—
(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B); and
(B) include in the annual report required by section 101(d) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act a description of any progress made in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection.

(b) Authorization of appropriations—

(1) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—
(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B); and
(B) include in the annual report required by section 101(d) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act a description of any progress made in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection.

(2) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—
(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B); and
(B) include in the annual report required by section 101(d) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act a description of any progress made in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection.

(3) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—
(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B); and
(B) include in the annual report required by section 101(d) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act a description of any progress made in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection.

(4) Report.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall—
(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress the strategic plan required under paragraph (2)(B); and
(B) include in the annual report required by section 101(d) of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act a description of any progress made in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2)(B) of this subsection.

We need to make the training available to people where they live at a cost that they can actually afford. We have no time to waste.

Our businesses are competing on a global stage against countries that will use the full machinery of their governments to make sure their workforces are ready. We need to meet their efforts with an even greater one.

Luckily, we already have a workforce that will go anywhere and do anything. When it comes to hard work, these folks are fearless. That is the veteran population here in the United States.

Marine officers are trained that if we are given an order to move that mountain over there, no sooner is the order completed than we are leading 100 marines down the road with shovels.

I still have great faith in the ability of 100 marines with shovels, but what we really need today are hundreds of thousands of veterans who can 3D print those shovels, put them in the hands of robots, program them to go down the road, and defend the entire network from foreign intrusion.

These are the jobs of today and tomorrow. These are the jobs that will support our families. Most importantly, these are the jobs that will grow the new middle class.

We want to make sure veterans get these jobs. To do that, we are going to use this bill to turn to the National Science Foundation. The National Science Foundation was born in the aftermath of World War II to make sure that we led the world in science and math, and the most important advancements. We knew that if we did that, we could make our country safe, healthy, and strong.

If we are going to continue that mission in the new generation, we will need veterans to lead the way.

We do have a global competition on our hands, Mr. Speaker, and I know we can win it if we have the veterans with us. This bill will help them, and I urge all my colleagues to come together to pass it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), one of the great proponents of veterans and a great proponent of moving us forward in the scientific perspective of this Congress.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, for yielding to me.
H.R. 425, the Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act, is about helping expand veterans' job and education opportunities in the sciences. This bill directs the National Science Foundation to develop a veterans outreach plan and publishes a database on veterans' participation in mathematics, science, and technology in its annual “Science and Engineering Indicators” report.

The bill also updates the NSF Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program, its fellowship programs, and the cyber grant programs to include outreach to veterans.

Additionally, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy is tasked with overseeing an interagency working group to examine how to increase veteran participation in the STEM career fields, including addressing any barriers for both servicemembers and their spouses.

In the next 5 years, between 1 million and 1.5 million members of the Armed Forces will separate from the military, according to the Department of Defense. Many of these veterans will be seeking new careers, and by a great margin, veterans cite finding employment as their number-one need when separating from Active-Duty service.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, occupations in STEM fields are projected to grow more than 9 million jobs by 2022. Research shows that many military veterans already have the skills and training that align with STEM careers, particularly in the area of information technology.

However, it also shows that veterans face many barriers as they reenter the workforce, including a lack of formal certified STEM education, career guidance, and the difficult task of transferring military credits to civilian college credits.

Our Nation's veterans deserve every opportunity to transition to a rewarding and successful civilian life. This bill will help all servicemembers continue to serve our Nation in new ways by fulfilling 21st century jobs and keeping America on the cutting edge of innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman Lamb, a fellow member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and a Marine Corps veteran, for cosponsoring this bipartisan legislation. And I salute my fellow veterans on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee who joined me in introducing this bill.

Last year, the House passed this legislation by an overwhelming margin, but we did not make it across the finish line in the Senate. This year, we have a bipartisan companion bill in the Senate, introduced by my home State Senator MARCO RUBIO and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that now is the time to get this done to help our Nation's veterans. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and the Senate to act on it and send H.R. 425 to the President's desk.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I note that I think the gentleman from Florida, Dr. DUNN, very eloquently summed up just moments ago. Veterans deserve every opportunity to transition back and to utilize those skills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. DUNN for introducing this bill again, and we will work hard to see this through to the end.

I thank Mr. LAMB for his comments. It is certainly something that I have experienced, which is employers needing to find more workers. The men and women who are coming out of our armed services have those skills that are needed. We just need to give them a little more help to get them connected. This bill does that.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 425, the Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act, I commend Mr. DUNN and Mr. LAMB for their leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

As Chair of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee I am committed to supporting a strong STEM workforce. In light of increasing global competition, we must do more to ensure workers are equipped with the STEM skills and knowledge employers need. Veterans are a highly trained and highly motivated group. They have the skills, the determination, and the know-how to thrive in high-paying, secure STEM careers. H.R. 425 directs the National Science Foundation and the Office of Science and Technology Policy to leverage existing data and programs to better support veterans in their transition to the STEM workforce. We need all hands on deck if we are to maintain our standing as the global leader in innovation. H.R. 425 is a good step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to align with STEM careers, particularly in the area of information technology.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the amendment, which has been the order of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. DUNN for introducing this bill again, and we will work hard to see this through to the end.

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

H.R. 276 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Classified school employees provide valuable service in the United States.

(2) Classified school employees provide essential services, such as transportation, facilities maintenance and operations, food service, safety, and health care.

(3) Classified school employees play a vital role in providing for the welfare and safety of students.

(4) Classified school employees strive for excellence in all areas of service to the education community.

(5) Exemplary classified school employees should be recognized for their outstanding contributions to quality education in the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) Classfied school employee.—The term classified school employee means an employee of a State or of any political subdivision of a State, or an employee of a non-profit entity, who works in any grade from prekindergarten through high school in any of the following occupational specialties:

(A) Paraprofessional, including paraeducator services.

(B) Clerical and administrative services.

(C) Transportation services.

(D) Food and nutrition services.

(E) Custodial and maintenance services.

(F) Security services.

(G) Health and student services.

(H) Technical services.

(I) Skilled trades.

(2) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—The terms used in this Act have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 4. RECOGNITION PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Education shall establish a national recognition program to be known as the “Recognizing Inspiring School Employees Award Program” or the “award program”. The purpose of the award program shall be to recognize and promote the commitment and excellence exhibited by classified school employees who provide exemplary service to students in prekindergarten through high school.

(b) AWARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to May 31 of each year (beginning with the second calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act), the Secretary shall select a classified school employee to receive the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees Award for the year.

(2) NON-MONETARY VALUE.—The award and recognition provided under this Act shall have no monetary value.

(c) SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) NOMINATION PROCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 1 of each year (beginning with the first calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act), the Secretary shall solicit nominations of classified school employees from the occupational specialties described in section 3(1) from the Governor of each State.

(B) NOMINATION SUBMISSIONS.—In order for individuals in a State to be eligible to receive recognition under this section, the
Governor of the State shall consider nominations submitted by the following:

(i) Local educational agencies.
(ii) School administrators.
(iii) Professional organizations.
(iv) Labor organizations.
(v) Educational service agencies.
(vi) Nonprofit entities.
(vii) Any other group determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) DEMONSTRATION.—Each Governor of a State shall authorize nominations for the RISE Award. The Secretary may require by the Secretary. Each such nomination shall contain, at a minimum, demonstrations of excellence in the following areas:

(A) Work performance.
(B) School and community involvement.
(C) Leadership and commitment.
(D) Local support.
(E) Enhancement of classified school employee's image in the community and schools.

(3) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall develop uniform national guidelines for evaluating nominations submitted under paragraph (2) in order to select the most deserving nominees based on the demonstrations made in the areas described in such paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada.

There was no objection.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, despite being under the weather, I decided to come down here to thank my colleague and the dean of our delegation, Congresswoman DINA Titus, for leading this bipartisan effort.

This legislation would establish the Classified School Employee of the Year RISE Award Program to recognize the achievements and contributions of classified school employees to student education in schools across the country.

Classified school employees are critical members of the education workforce, making up one out of every three public school employees who assist students in our Nation’s public schools. Classified school employees provide essential services, such as transportation, facilities maintenance and operations, food service, safety, and healthcare.

It is past time that the U.S. Department of Education recognizes the tireless efforts of our nation’s outstanding classified school employees. The stature of the Secretary of Education in recognizing the RISE Award will provide national leadership and partnership to encourage broad participation in the development, selection, and recognition process.

Classified school employees across the country do extraordinary and inspirational things in their schools and communities. They equalize education, foster positive learning environments, and ensure student success. The RISE Award will recognize the contributions of classified school employees to student success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 276. I thank my colleagues across the aisle, the gentlewoman from Nevada, and also all those who are original cosponsors in support of this bill.

It is not uncommon for a school employee to make a lasting impression on a student or even on entire generations of students. Front office attendants, school custodians, school safety personnel, food service workers, and others all have the honor of meeting countless students every day. Many of these school employees make lifelong impacts on the students who they serve.

Ask any student and they will probably tell you about a particular school employee who has been their best teacher, but, nevertheless, imparted crucial life lessons upon them or inspired joy and confidence in students who struggled to find either. Schools are made better by these leaders, and students benefit from their kindness, thoughtfulness, compassion, and respect that they show to others around them.

Mr. Speaker, these employees truly go above and beyond the call of duty to serve America’s students, and their steadfast devotion deserves our appreciation and recognition.

H.R. 276, the Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act, will direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees Award, otherwise known as the RISE Award. The RISE Award will be presented each year to a classified school employee in a nonteaching position in recognition of their valuable contributions to the lives of students at the schools that they serve.

The award will be nonmonetary and will go to employees who demonstrate excellent work performance, school and community involvement, leadership, and commitment, and who exemplify the very best of what it means to be a classified school employee.

H.R. 276 is just one small way to honor the men and women in our communities who demonstrate to students what it means to be outstanding citizens and civic leaders. Their tireless efforts deserve our recognition and thanks. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this commonsense legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. Titus), the lead sponsor of H.R. 276.

Ms. TITUS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for her support of this bill that creates the RISE Award.

I would like to address the bill before you by telling you the story of Ms. Virginia Mills. Ms. Mills started her career as a security guard at William E. Orr Middle School in District One in Las Vegas over two decades ago.

Almost immediately upon getting to the school, she saw that children were going to school without backpacks on their shoulders to carry their books and equipment. She saw athletes trying out for the basketball team without having the proper shoes on their feet. She saw children who didn’t have enough clothes to make it through the whole week without changing.

So in her very first month on the job, taking old items from her own daughter’s closet, she started a clothes closet for middle school students in need. She first enlisted the help of friends, then teachers, and then community members. Eventually, the closet grew to include school supplies and even food for children to take home on the weekends, when they might otherwise go hungry.

Ms. Mills has watched these students grow over the years to become assemblymen and -women in the legislature, business leaders, and community organizers. She said: “Giving a helping hand to these students has inspired them to become better adults. They now understand the importance of paying it forward.”

Virginia Mills has improved the lives of so many middle school students in my district, and she has filled a gap that too many young people had the danger of falling into. And she wanted me to tell you that she didn’t do it alone.

There are countless people in our schools, including security guards who do more than keep students safe; they keep them motivated. There are bus drivers who provide more than just a ride; they offer friendship. There are counselors and nurses and cafeteria workers who strive tirelessly behind the scenes to ensure the success of our students in our schools. Yet, too often, their contributions go unrecognized.

That is why I introduced this bipartisan legislation to celebrate the critical role that school staff plays in helping our students learn and enabling our teachers to teach.

The contributions of these vital school employees can’t really be measured, but they can and should be recognized.

It is in our children’s interest and certainly in our national interest for the Department of Education to...
present these RISE Awards to people like Virginia Mills who have made such a profound impact on our Nation’s youth. So for those who work so hard to help our students become the best versions of themselves, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the story that was shared about the woman working in that school district. I think we all probably have those stories as we think fondly back on our school experiences, whether it was elementary or high school, about individuals who weren’t necessarily teachers but were still very influential in making an impression and setting a great example to be followed in so many different ways. That is why I am so pleased to be able to support this piece of legislation.

I have had the privilege and honor to be in our schools that are recognized as the Blue Ribbon Schools and Schools to Watch, and there are wonderful. They are wonderful not just because of what has been accomplished for those kids, but they do become an inspiration to other schools to strive for and to achieve.

What this piece of legislation does, Mr. Speaker, is to take that down to the staff level, because we know that the most valuable resource and asset that we have in our schools are people—whether it is the classroom or anything that is physical like that, but it is the teachers, the faculty, and the staff. Being able to recognize the staff who work so hard each and every day there who are not necessarily teachers is a great opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I certainly am very excited about supporting this piece of legislation, H.R. 276. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would like to thank Representative T Torres for her leadership in bringing forth this bipartisan piece of legislation.

When it comes to delivering the promise of a great public school for every child, it is a team effort. Classified employees keep the lights on, students fed, and learning environments safe and welcoming.

This past year, we have seen unprecedented activism from teachers and school staff demanding better support for public schools across the country. While the media often speaks first about the contributions and working conditions for classroom teachers, it is important to recognize that behind every teacher is an army of classified school employees.

Passing this bill to recognize the contributions of classified school employees is an important first step, but I urge this body to do more. We must come together and continue to work across the aisle to invest in public education. We must invest in the staff who support our public schools and in students who count on public schools to reach their academic potential.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that swift passage of H.R. 276 is just the beginning, and I look forward to future action in this Chamber in support of public schools. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mrs. Lee) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 276.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. Lee of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Speaker ordered the yeas and nays to be a Committee of the Whole, whereupon the Committee of the Whole was seated under the Speaker of the House as Chairman.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1235
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 “MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act”.

SEC. 2. MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD.

The term of office of any member of the Merit Systems Protection Board shall be extended for a period of one year beyond the date the member’s service would otherwise end under section 1202 of title 5, United States Code, serving as such a member on the date of enactment of this Act shall be extended for a period of one year beyond the date the member’s service would otherwise end under subsection (c) of such section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Connolly) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Hice) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may add 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 gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank House leadership for bringing H.R. 1235, the MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act, so quickly to the floor at the request of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Chairman Cummings and I introduced this bill to prevent a potential crisis at the Merit Systems Protection Board, a vacant Board without any members. Acting Chairman Mark Robbins is and has been the sole member on the Board since January 2017. His 1-year term expires at the end of this month, the 28th of February, and it cannot be extended without legislation. We planned to address this issue through regular order, but circumstances arose that prevented us from doing so.

The subcommittee I am going to chair originally scheduled a hearing to examine the problem on February 14, but the hearing was postponed to the end of this month to allow all Members to attend the funerals of their colleagues John Dingell and Walter Jones.

We hoped that the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee would take action to address the problem at its business meeting on February 20. Although the Senate committee was able to approve two nominees for the Board, Chairman Johnson indicated he would withhold those nominations from the Senate floor pending the naming of a third nominee by the White House.

The Senate committee was also reportedly working on language to extend Mr. Robbins’ holdover term for another year, but no legislation was considered at the markup, thus our action today.

Given these events, it appears less and less likely that the Senate will be able to confirm new Board members before this Thursday. That is why the Committee on Oversight and Reform, Chairman Cummings and I, introduced this stopgap measure, H.R. 1235, to ensure some work by the MSPB will continue. The legislation will provide a one-time, 1-year extension for Mr. Robbins’ term to give the Senate more time to confirm the additional Board members.

This version of the bill before us eliminates the provision prohibiting dual appointments because Mr. Robbins assured us he would continue to recuse himself from working on matters related to OPM and that he would recuse himself from OPM matters that he was asked to vote on had taken at MSPB if this bill is enacted.

This amendment is in response to many of the concerns raised by our Republican friends.

We urgently need to pass this bill because we need to ensure that MSPB can continue its operations. If Mr. Robbins’ term expires without new members confirmed, it will be the first time in the agency’s history that the Board has no members at all. We will be entertaining uncharted new territory, and not good territory.

If there is no principal officer to lead the agency, not only is it unclear
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which agency functions may continue and which ones must be suspended, but also, whether the entire agency must shut down completely. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to risk that shutdown.

There is a lot at stake here. MSPB protects whistleblowers from retaliation, veterans from job discrimination, and Federal employees from prohibited personnel practices. The agency ensures that the Federal civil service is nonpartisan and complies with the merit system principles.

Since 2017, MSPB has been operating under certain constraints without a quorum on the Board. This has prevented the Board from hearing final appeals of agency adverse actions. The absence of a quorum has also prevented the Board from issuing special studies of the civil service and reviews of OPM rules and regulations, as is required. This has resulted in a backlog. Mr. Speaker, 2,000 final appeals which will take more than 3 years to process and eight Merit Systems studies pending issuance by the Board.

The current situation is certainly less than ideal, but let’s not make it worse by micromanaging and creating a complete vacancy on the Board.

This would cause decisions made by Mr. Robbins, by the way, to be voided, exacerbating the backlog, and any new Board members who are finally confirmed will have to start again from square one.

We should not and cannot allow that to happen. Addressing the problem should be a bipartisan concern, and I believe it is. We cannot let politics prevent MSPB from doing its job.

The bill in front of us is supported by the American Federation of Government Employees, the National Treasury Employees Union, the National Federation of Federal Employees, the Government Accountability Project, Public Citizen, Project on Government Oversight, the Make It Safe Coalition, the Senior Executives Association, and designed organizations, who all strongly value and support our nation’s professional nonpartisan civil service, we write to express our concerns about the future of the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) and convey our support for H.R. 1235.

As you know, the Board has already operated under unprecedented circumstances, lacking a quorum for nearly two full years. The result has been a backlog of nearly 2,000 cases and a delay in justice for federal employees, whistleblowers, veterans and federal annuitants with matters before the Board, as well as a lack of closure for agencies in personnel matters. Moreover, due to the lack of quorum MSPB has been unable to issue official reports or studies to Congress and the President during a critical time when there is growing appreciation for the imperative of modernizing our civil service.

On February 13 the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee advanced two of the President’s MSPB nominees, yet they are still awaiting floor action pending nomination of a third Board member by the President. Should the Senate be unable to approve the Board nominees and restore a quorum, effective March 1 the Board would be without the presidentially confirmed leadership for the first time in its history, due to the expiration of acting chairman Mark Robbins’ holdover period.

In order to ensure that the Board can continue operations at the most basic levels, including the critical role in issuing stays in whistleblower cases, passage of legislation to extend his holdover period is imperative. We strongly urge passage of H.R. 1235 to prevent the current crisis with the Board from doing permanent damage to the merit system and the civil service.

Thank you for your consideration of our perspective on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

J. DAVID COX, SR.,
National President,

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS: On behalf of the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), representing over 150,000 federal employees in 33 agencies, I write to applaud your efforts to support the important work performed by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) or Board, and ensure that it can continue. We believe that your bill, the MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act, is the appropriate response to address the impending loss of leadership at the Board.

As you know, Mark Robbins is the Acting Chairman and the only Member left on the Board. His original term expired last year and his holdover year will expire on February 28, 2019. Given the uncertainty regarding the operations of the Board once Mr. Robbins’ term ends, we appreciate that your bill would temporarily allow Mr. Robbins to remain on the Board for a short period of time while the President’s nominees for the MSPB undergo Senate consideration. We also appreciate that the bill stipulates that the individual who would be allowed to extend their term would be unable to hold another position in the government at the same time.

NTEU fully supports your carefully crafted temporary extension bill and we appreciate your efforts to safeguard the employee protections enshrined in the Civil Service Reform Act. Thank you.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. BRADON
National President
February 25, 2019.

HON. ELIJAH CUMMINGS
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

HON. GERALD CONNOLLY
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Washington, DC.

HON. JIM JORDAN
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

HON. MARK MEADOWS
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE), I am writing to urge support for the “Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) Temporary Term Extension Act,” introduced by Congressman Elijah Cummings (D-MD). This legislation would allow the acting Chairman, and the current and only MSPB member to be extended and avoid having a vacant Board.

An employee may appeal an adverse action to the third-party agency that hears and adjudicates civil service appeals. MSPB administrative judges (AJs) hear the matter in an adversarial setting and decide the case in accordance with established legal precedents. If dissatisfied with the AJ’s decision, either the agency or the employee may appeal the case to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB). Currently, the Board does not have a quorum. Mark Robbins is the only member on the Board and his term expires on February 28, 2019. His holdover term ended in March 2018, and he is currently serving under a maximum one-year statutory extension.

When Robbins’ term expires, the Board will have no Presidentially-appointed members. The “MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act” will extend his term for one additional year and avoid having an MSPB with no members. AFGE believes that the MSPB serves an important role in holding both the Merit Systems Principles and the rights of federal employees. Therefore, AFGE strongly urges you to support the “MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act,” to allow a temporary carryover of the current and only member of the MSPB.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

J. DAVID COX, SR.,
National President,

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS: On behalf of the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), representing over 150,000 federal employees in 33 agencies, I write to applaud your efforts to support the important work performed by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) or Board, and ensure that it can continue. We believe that your bill, the MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act, is the appropriate response to address the impending loss of leadership at the Board.

As you know, Mark Robbins is the Acting Chairman and the only Member left on the Board. His original term expired last year and his holdover year will expire on February 28, 2019. Given the uncertainty regarding the operations of the Board once Mr. Robbins’ term ends, we appreciate that your bill would temporarily allow Mr. Robbins to remain on the Board for a short period of time while the President’s nominees for the MSPB undergo Senate consideration. We also appreciate that the bill stipulates that the individual who would be allowed to extend their term would be unable to hold another position in the government at the same time.

NTEU fully supports your carefully crafted temporary extension bill and we appreciate your efforts to safeguard the employee protections enshrined in the Civil Service Reform Act. Thank you.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. BRADON
National President
February 25, 2019.

HON. ELIJAH CUMMINGS
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

HON. JIM JORDAN
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

HON. MARK MEADOWS
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CUMMINGS AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE), I am writing to urge support for the “Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) Temporary Term Extension Act,” introduced by Congressman Elijah Cummings (D-MD). This legislation would allow the acting Chairman, and the current and only MSPB member to be extended and avoid having a vacant Board.

An employee may appeal an adverse action to the third-party agency that hears and adjudicates civil service appeals. MSPB administrative judges (AJs) hear the
and Government Reform reported the bill favorably, but without a single vote from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

We all know an effective and functional MSPB is important to the health of our Federal workforce. MSPB’s primary responsibility is to adjudicate appeals of Federal personnel actions. MSPB also plays a vital role in Federal whistleblower protections.

To be effective and issue decisions, MSPB needs at least a two-member quorum, but the Board has not had a quorum for over 2 years. In January 2017, Mark Robbins, as my friend mentioned, became the sole remaining member of MSPB.

Last year, Mr. Robbins’ 7-year term came to an end, and he was granted a 1-year extension as authorized by law, but that extension ends this week. Starting Friday, the MSPB will be without a single Board member.

My colleagues claim this bill is an emergency measure to prevent the MSPB from extending this crisis of leadership, but I disagree. The real problem is the lack of a quorum.

Without a quorum for the last 2 years, a backlog of undecided appeals has grown to over 1,700 cases. Mr. Robbins cannot fix that problem on his own. His continued tenure will not resolve those cases.

In December, the President selected Mr. Robbins to serve as the general counsel at the Office of Personnel Management, but so for the last 10 weeks, he has served in both capacities at OPM and MSPB. Mr. Robbins is planning to serve at OPM in his full capacity beginning this Friday.

Mr. Robbins has stayed at MSPB as long as he has out of a sense of duty to MSPB and its mission. I trust that my colleagues do not intend to use this bill to coerce Mr. Robbins to stay any longer than he wants to.

☐ 1745

I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding Mr. Robbins for his dedication to MSPB, the Federal workforce, the President, and our country. I also urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Senate’s confirmation of President Trump’s nominees.

We owe it to our Federal workers to give MSPB a quorum so the board can do the important job that Congress gave it to do.

In the future, I certainly hope we can work together to provide certainty to Federal workers and whistleblowers by making MSPB operational once again.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

☐ 1830

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o’clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

☐ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Persyn) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 539, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 276, by the yeas and nays; and

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

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

IOVNNATORS TO ENTREPRENEURS 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. 539) to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to train commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Lipinski) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 18, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—385

Aggressive

Adams

Colin

Aderholt

Collins (GA)

Aguilar

Collins (NY)

Amodeo

Connolly

Anderson

Cook

Arrington

Cooper

Arora

Cortez

Baird

Cox (CA)

Balderas

Cranston

Banks

Crawford

Barr

Crenshaw

Baragoon

Crist

Bass

Crow

Beaty

Cuellar

Beatty

Garamendi

Berman

Garcia (CA)

Beyrer

Gates

Bishop (GA)

Gibbs

Bishop (UT)

Gonzales (TX)

Bittlmenauer

Gonzalez (OH)

Blamey

Gooden

Boedl

Cox (CA)

Best

Dean

Boyle, Brendan

DeGette

Boyle, Frank

DeLauro

Brown (MD)

DeSaulnier

Browley (CA)

DeSoto

Buchanan

DeSantis

Buchanon

Denis-Farber

Budd

Dent

Burchett

Diaz-Balart

Burgess

Dingell

Bustos

Doggett

Butterfield

Dole, Michael

Byrne

F.

Calvert

Farr

Carabaji

Duncan

Carland

Duncan

Carras

Eck

Carrasco (IN)

Eminger

Carrasen

Engler

Carrion

Feldman

Carter (GA)

Fellows

Carter (TX)

Feldman

Cartwright

Fleming

Case

Frelinghuysen

Castan (LA)

Frenz

Castan (NY)

Frenz

Cheney

Fresno

Chu, Judy

Fischel

Chung, Mike

Fleischmann

Clack

Florence

Clay

Florida

Clarke

Florida

Clark (MA)

Florida

Clark (NY)

Florida

Cline

Florida

Closson

Florida

Cloud

Florida

Clubby

Florida

Clyburn

Florida

Cocchiara

Florida

Coffman

Florida

Collins

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)

Florida

Collins (GA)

Florida

Collins (NY)
Mothers, HICE of Georgia and PALMER 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-worded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

RESIGNATION AS CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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


Hon. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker, House of Representatives,

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to inform you that I am resigning my position as Clerk of the House effective midnight on February 25, 2019. Thank you for the honor of nominating me to serve in the position of Clerk of the House in the 116th Congress.

With best wishes, I am, Sincerely,

Karen L. Haas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

THANKING KAREN L. HAAS FOR HER SERVICE AS CLERK OF THE HOUSE, AND WELCOMING CLERK—DESGNATE CHERYL L. JOHNSON

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank and congratulate Karen Haas, and say how very appreciative this House is for the extraordinary service that has been given to us for many years, and to the people of this country, by Karen Haas.

Karen, thank you so much.

She has been the Clerk of the House for a very long time. She was the Clerk of the House in the 109th and 110th Congresses as well.

Since the latter, realized just how much fun it is to be in this House and here once before, left, committed most notably to all of us, twice the House of Representatives.

And Karen, thank you so much.

She has been the Clerk of the House for a very long time. She was the Clerk of the House in the 109th and 10th Congresses as well.

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

When you think about the different roles that she has played, serving this Chamber, this body, for decades in a number of different roles, but, of course, most notably to all of us, twice as Clerk of the House. She was actually here once before, left, realized just how much fun it is to be in this House and do this work for this great body, and came back.

We thank you for coming back again and for your great service during these times.

So much work goes into the operations of the House. The things that we do on a daily basis, whether it is a Member filing a bill, when you go down to drop your bill in the hopper, it is Karen and the entire team that she has put together at the Office of the Clerk that receives the bills, that processes the bills.

When we all vote for and sometimes against the Journal, it is the Clerk that puts together the Journal of the House to make sure that the things that we do are properly recorded throughout time for people to go review.

It is an important job. But it is the work that she has done that we all see on a daily basis that we are going to miss.

As Cheryl Johnson takes her place, best of luck to you as well. We wish you all the best, but we are going to miss Karen.
We wish you the best in your next endeavor. You can come visit us from time to time.

Karen, thank you so much for the work that you have done on behalf of not just us as Members of Congress, but on behalf of all the American people who count on this institution to function properly, for helping us make sure that it is done in a proper, efficient, fair, and impartial way. Best of luck to you, Karen.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Whip for his comments, and I certainly share his views. I am now pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I rise to congratulate Karen Haas, who after five terms as Clerk of the House, is retiring.

I would like to remind all Members in this body that fewer than 11,000 people have the privilege to serve in this House. It is even fewer for a Clerk.

Karen was our 34th Clerk and only the second woman to hold that position. We thank you for that leadership. When we think about the role of the House Clerk, you think of roll calls and recorded votes. But the Office of the Clerk is really about continuity. Without the Clerk, Congress could not fulfill its obligation to the American people and move in a smooth manner, which many people don’t see the challenge.

Few individuals are more committed to preserving the continuity than Karen. She has done that as Clerk and as a trusted staff member and floor assistant. Always, she has been a friend and counselor to Members, regardless of what side of the aisle you sat on.

Karen Haas also equipped and modernized this House for the 21st century. Often times, you don’t see that because it is behind the scenes, but it makes the legislative process more accessible to the people it serves.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to Karen for her dedication, her team’s professionalism, and her steady hand on the tiller. Her service reminds us of an important fact: The people’s House is only as good as its people.

You rose to the occasion. On behalf of a very grateful House, and a grateful Nation, we say thank you, Karen.

And to Cheryl, we wish you the best.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 143
Resolved, That Cheryl L. Johnson of the State of Louisiana, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives, effective February 26, 2019.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELCOMING CHERYL L. JOHNSON AS THE 36TH CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished leader for recognition and calling us together to salute two great women in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the great honor of swearing in Cheryl Lynn Johnson as the 36th Clerk of the House of Representatives. This is a very distinguished and prestigious role.

Mr. McCARTHY, I was pleased to appoint the first African American woman Clerk of the House, Lorraine Miller, when I was Speaker before, and now I am happy to be appointing the second.

We are privileged to be joined by Cheryl’s parents, the Reverend Charlie Davis and Cynthia Davis of New Orleans, who are with us in the Chamber. Thank you for being with us.

We are also pleased to welcome Cheryl’s husband, Clarence Ellison, and her son, Bradford, to this Chamber today as well. Welcome to you, and thank you.

I join our colleagues, the distinguished Democratic leader, the Republican leader, and distinguished Republican whip in saluting House Clerk Karen Haas for her many years of distinguished service to this institution.

Anyone who knows her is proud of her service. On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I thank you, Karen, for the great integrity and dedication for which you have served the people’s House. Thank you so much.

She has been magnificent. Cheryl Johnson embodies public service and has dedicated her career to strengthening many of the most important institutions of our democracy, including our own.

Indeed, today is a homecoming, as Leader HOYER has mentioned, as Cheryl returns to the House of Representatives where she worked with distinction and honor for Chairman Lacy Clay, Sr.—I emphasize senior—of the Committee on House Administration’s Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials; and the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Investigations.

Our country is stronger for her work on the then-Committee on Education and the Workforce to secure justice and progress for our children and advancement for our workers.

In the Congress, she earned the respect of all—Members and staff, Democrats and Republicans—for being a leader of compassion, courage, and commitment. Cheryl returns to the House after more than a decade at the Smithsonian Institution. Her great dedication to that American treasure—which is the largest museum in the world—has ensured that it will remain a source of creativity, innovation, and research for generations to come.

Our Nation is particularly grateful for her extraordinary vision and persistence in helping transform the dream of the National Museum of African American History and Culture into a reality.

Cheryl has made a difference empowering millions of Americans and visitors who are with us today and inspired by the beauty and richness of American culture and history.

Cheryl’s strong leadership and deep love and respect for the institutions of our democracy will be vital in her role as the House Clerk, strengthening and safeguarding the Congress in the tradition of Karen and the Congress, the first branch of government, Article I.

I thank Cheryl for her commitment to our institution and to our democracy; and with great, again, recognition and appreciation to Karen Haas for her service.

It is now my privilege to administer the oath of office to Cheryl Johnson.

ELECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 143
Resolved, That Cheryl L. Johnson of the State of Louisiana, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives, effective February 26, 2019.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Clerk-designate please take the well and all Members please rise.

The Chair will now swear in the Clerk-designate of the House.

The Clerk-designate took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you will take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Cheryl for her commitment to our institution and to our democracy; and with great, again, recognition and appreciation to Karen Haas for her service.

It is now my privilege to administer the oath of office to Cheryl Johnson.

WELCOMING CHERYL L. JOHNSON AS THE 36TH CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the newly installed Clerk of the U.S. House, Cheryl Lynn Johnson.

She is the 36th American to be elected to this critical position. The Clerk, as we know, serves as the legislative official in the House, a position that goes back to the first Clerk and to the first Congress in 1789. As was mentioned, she comes to us from the Smithsonian Institution where she served as the Director of Government Relations.

Among her many achievements, as was mentioned, Cheryl helped to make the National Museum of African American History and Culture a brilliant reality.

But this is not her first tour of duty on Capitol Hill. In fact, she previously spent almost two decades in service to this institution, and as was mentioned, her first position was serving on the
RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENT IN CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Petters). 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. 276) to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mrs. Lee) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 19, not voting 25, as follows:

YEAS—387

[Roll No. 89]

Blenmanean
Blunt Rochester
Bomani
Boehm
Boyle, Brendan
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucholz
Budd
Buchanan
Bursen
Bustos
Bynum
Calvert
Caraballo
Cárdenas
Carzon (TN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Carterwright
Casover
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (NY)
Cecil
Cedric
Cleeney
Clyburn
Colin (GA)
Colin (NY)
Comer
Cunaway
Connelly
Cook
Cortez
Cortez
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Cue
Cummings
Currie
Davis (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DesJarlais
Dent
Diaz Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dear, Michael
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Fine-Neuward
 Fitzpatrick
Finch Am献
Fitch
Flors
Fonseca
Franks
Furgur
Fulcher
Gabard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallero
Garner
Gardner
Garland
Garrard
Gates
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gipson
Glover
Gonzalez
Gonzalez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gorse
Gutierrez
Haaland
Hagedorn
Holding
Hoover
Huaman
Huffman
Hughes
Huyck
Ibarra
Ingram
Isham
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jackson
Jain
Jared
Jones (GA)
Jones (LA)
Jones (OH)
Jones (SD)
Jordan
Jordan
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnston
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean
Kerry
Kennedy
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kim
King
Kim
Kirkpatrick
Kirkshammuth
Krause
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamb
Lamb
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Lesko
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lewis
Loebback
Loi gren
Lewis
Loewendahl
Loewenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B
Maloney
Seward
Malone
Sloyton
Slovak
Staker
Siewert
Small
Smolka
Smucker
Soto
Spaebelt
Spain
Speier
Stanton
Staub
Stauber
Stefanik
Steele
Steube
Stevens
Stevens
Stevers
Suozzi
Takano
Tayor
Taylor
Miller
Mooney
(WV)
Miller
Moor
Moulton
Mcauliffe-Powell
Mallin
Murphy
Napoli
Natoli
Naus
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
O’Sullivan
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetti
Pappas
Pascrell
Parscale
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Phillips
Porter
Posey
Presley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reese
Rice
NY
Richmond
Riggle
Rogers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (NY)
Roe
Roudy
Rowley
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scaife
Scalise
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scherzer
Schrier
Schurick
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austine
Scott, David
Scott, Judy
Cicilline
Costello
Crow
Crenshaw
Cox
Coy
Crane
Crooks
Crowford
Crawford
Green
Green
Green
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grijalva
Hagedorn
Hahn
Hale
Halsey
Hanna
Hansford
Hargraves
Haugan
Hayes
Heck
Helfeld
Herrera Beutler
Horn
Joseph
Jones
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
Johnson
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Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 46, TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Mr. McGovern, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–13) on the resolution (H. Res. 46) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1112, ENHANCED BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

Mr. McGovern, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–14) on the resolution (H. Res. 145) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ENACTING INTO LAW A BILL BY REFERENCE

Mr. Peterson. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (S. 483) to enact into law a bill by reference, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 483

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

SECTION 1. (a) SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Extension and modification of maintenance fee authority.
Sec. 3. Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund.
Sec. 4. Experimental use permits for pesticides.
Sec. 5. Pesticide registration service fees.
Sec. 6. Revision of tables regarding covered pesticide registration applications and other covered actions and their corresponding registration service fees.
Sec. 7. Agricultural worker protection standard; certification of pesticide applicators.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF MAINTENANCE FEE AUTHORITY.

(a) MAINTENANCE FEE.—Section 4(i)(1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “an aggregate amount of $27,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017” and inserting “an average amount of $51,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2025”;

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “$115,500 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “$129,400 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”;

and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “$134,800 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “$207,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”;

(3) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “$70,600 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “$79,100 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”;

and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking “$122,100 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017” and inserting “$136,800 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023”;

and

(4) in subparagraph (I), by striking “2017...” and inserting “2023...”;

(b) PROHIBITION ON OTHER FEES.—Section 4(k)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “registration of a pesticide under this Act” and inserting “registration of a pesticide under this Act and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(1))”;

(2) by striking paragraph (3), “in the first sentence and all that follows through the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting the following: “paragraph (3), to offset the costs associated with tracking and implementing registration review decisions, including registration review decisions delayed to reduce risk as specified in paragraphs (4) and (5), and to enhance the information systems capabilities to improve the tracking of pesticide registration decisions.”;

(3) in clause (i), by striking “are allocated solely” and all that follows through “(3g);” and inserting the following: “are allocated solely for the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph;”;

and

(4) in clause (ii), by striking “necessary to achieve” and all that follows through “(3g);” and inserting the following: “necessary to achieve the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph;”.

(b) SET-ASIDE FOR REVIEW OF INERT INGREDIENTS AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—Section 4(k)(3)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(3)(A)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “The Administrator shall use” and all that follows through “and resources—” and inserting the following: “For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use between 1/4 and 1/5 of the maintenance fees collected in such fiscal year to obtain sufficient personnel and resources—”;

(c) SET-ASIDE FOR EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—Paragraph (4) of section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use not more than $500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) PRODUCTS CLAIMING EFFICACY AGAINST INVERTEBRATE PESTS OF SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC HEALTH OR ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE.—The Administrator shall use not more than $31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, to implement the necessary rulemaking and guidance for products, pest performance data requirements to evaluate products claiming efficacy against the following invertebrate pests of significant public health or economic importance (in order of importance):

2. Premise (including crawling insects, flying insects, and bats).
3. Pests of pets (including pet pests controlled by spot-ons, collars, shampoos, powders, or dips).
4. Fire ants.
5. DEATHS OF INDIVIDUALS.—The Administrator shall develop, and publish guidance required by subparagraph (B), with respect to claims of efficacy against pests described in such subparagraph as follows:

“(i) With respect to bed bugs, issue final guidance not later than 30 days after the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018.

“(ii) With respect to pests specified in clause (ii) of such subparagraph—

Amendment offered by Mr. Peterson

Mr. Peterson. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.
(1) submit draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2018; and
(2) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than September 30, 2019.

(iii) With respect to pests specified in clause (ii), in such subparagraph (B), insert—

(1) draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2019; and
(2) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than March 31, 2021.

(D) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION.—The Administrator shall revise the guidance required by subparagraph (B) from time to time, but shall permit applicants and registrants sufficient time to obtain data that meet the requirements specified in such revised guidance.

(E) DEADLINE FOR PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall, not later than September 30, 2021, issue draft guidance under subparagraph (B) in a covered application, after reviewing the data and recommendations specified in such revised guidance.

(F) E-REPORTING.—The Administrator shall issue final guidance under subparagraph (B) in a covered application, after reviewing the data and recommendations specified in such revised guidance.

(G) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator shall issue final guidance under subparagraph (B) in a covered application, after reviewing the data and recommendations specified in such revised guidance.

(H) GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—Section 4(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136c(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;
(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—

"(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use—

(1) not more than $500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator from the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall conduct inspections and audits conducted in support of pesticide product registrations under this Act. As part of such monitoring program, the Administrator shall ensure that each laboratory inspected under such program in support of such registrations a preliminary summary of inspection observations not later than 60 days after the date on which such an inspection is completed;";

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking "paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)" and inserting "paragraphs (3), (4), and (5)";

SEC. 5. PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

(a) EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF Fee AUTHORITY.—Section 35(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8a(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "PESTICIDE REGISTRATION" and inserting "PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS"; and
(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "for or on other action covered by a table specified in paragraph (3)" after "covered by this Act that is received by the Administrator on or after the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003;"

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS" and inserting "COVERED APPLICATIONS"; and
(B) by striking "pesticide registration application" both places it appears and inserting "covered application";

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "pesticide registration"; and
(ii) by striking "October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2015" and inserting "October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2021";

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking "2015" each place it appears and inserting "2021"; and
(ii) by striking "October 1, 2013" and ending on September 30, 2015" and inserting "October 1, 2019" and ending on September 30, 2021";

(C) by striking subparagraph (C)(i) and inserting the following as a new subparagraph (C)(i):

"(i) by striking "pesticide registration application" and inserting "covered application"; and
(ii) by inserting before the period at the end of clause (ii) the following: "except that no waiver or fee reduction shall be provided in connection with a request for certification of good laboratory practices (commonly referred to as a Gold Seal letter);";

(D) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(7) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting "a covered application";

(E) DEADLINE FOR PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA.—The Administrator shall, not later than September 30, 2021, issue draft guidance under subparagraph (B) in a covered application, after reviewing the data and recommendations specified in such revised guidance.

(F) E-REPORTING.—The Administrator shall issue final guidance under subparagraph (B) in a covered application, after reviewing the data and recommendations specified in such revised guidance.

(G) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator shall issue final guidance under subparagraph (B) in a covered application, after reviewing the data and recommendations specified in such revised guidance.

(H) GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—Section 4(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136c(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;
(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—

"(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use—

(1) not more than $500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B);

(2) ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards, monitoring program established under section 109 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), with respect to laboratory and data audits conducted in support of pesticide product registrations under this Act. As part of such monitoring program, the Administrator shall ensure that each laboratory inspected under such program in support of such registrations a preliminary summary of inspection observations not later than 60 days after the date on which such an inspection is completed;";

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking "paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)" and inserting "paragraphs (3), (4), and (5)";

SEC. 4. EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS FOR PESTICIDES.

Section 9(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136c(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking "permit for a pesticide," and inserting "permit for a pesticide. An application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b) shall conform with the requirements of that section;"; and
(2) by inserting "or for other action covered by a table specified in paragraph (3)" after "all required supporting data".

(1) by striking "permit for a pesticide," and inserting "permit for a pesticide. An application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b) shall conform with the requirements of that section;"; and
(2) by inserting "or for other action covered by a table specified in paragraph (3)" after "all required supporting data".
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(K) A review of the progress made in developing, updating, and implementing product performance test guidelines for pesticide products that are intended to control invertebrate pests of significant public health importance and, by regulation, prescribing product performance data requirements for such pesticide products registered under section 3.

(L) A review of the progress made in the priority review and approval of new pesticides to control invertebrate public health pests that may transmit vector-borne disease for use in the United States, including each territory or possession of the United States, and United States military installations globally.

(M) A review of the progress made in implementing enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(N) The number of approvals for active ingredients, new uses, and pesticide end use products granted in connection with the Design for the Environment program (or any successor program) of the Environmental Protection Agency and

(O) With respect to funds in the Pesticide Registration Fund reserved under subsection (c)(3), a review that includes—

(i) A description of the amount and use of such funds—

(ii) To carry out activities relating to worker protection under clause (i) of subsection (c)(3)(B);

(iii) To award partnership grants under clause (ii) of such subsection; and

(iv) To carry out the pesticide education program under clause (iii) of such subsection;

(v) An evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the activities, grants, and program described in clause (i);

(vi) A description of how stakeholders are engaged in the decision to fund such activities, grants, and program; and

(vii) With respect to activities relating to worker protection carried out under subparagraph (B)(i) of such subsection, a summary of the analyses from stakeholders, including from worker community-based organizations, on the appropriateness and effectiveness of such activities.

(f) Termination of Effectiveness.—Section 33(m) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(m)) is amended—

(1) In paragraph (1), by striking “2017” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) In paragraph (2)—

(A) In subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “FISCAL YEAR 2018” and inserting “FISCAL YEAR 2018”; and

(ii) by striking “FISCAL YEAR 2024”; and

(B) In subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “FISCAL YEAR 2018”; and

(ii) by striking “2017” and inserting “2023”; and

(C) In subparagraph (C), by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025.”

SEC. 6. REVISION OF TABLES REGARDING COVERED PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS AND OTHER COVERED ACTIONS AND THEIR CORRESPONDING REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

Paragraph (3) of section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) Schedule of covered applications and other actions and their registration service fees.—Subject to paragraph (6), the schedule of registration applications and other covered actions and their corresponding registration service fees shall be as follows:

“TABLE 1. REGISTRATION DIVISION—NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Food use. (2)(3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>753,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>627,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R040</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Food use; Experimental Use Permit application; established temporary tolerance; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>462,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R060</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor. (2)(3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>523,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R070</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>436,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R090</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>323,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R110</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor. (2)(3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>290,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R120</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>242,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R121</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>182,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Enriched isomer(s) of registered mixed-isomer active ingredient. (2)(3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>317,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment only; includes agricultural and non-agricultural seeds; resides not expected in raw agricultural commodities. (2)(3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>471,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R125</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>323,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new use (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be prorated. The service fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be prorated.

(3) A review of the priority review and approval of new pesticides to control invertebrate public health pests that may transmit vector-borne disease for use in the United States, including each territory or possession of the United States, and United States military installations globally.

(4) A review of the progress made in implementing enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(5) A review of the progress made in implementing enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(6) A review of the progress made in implementing enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).
(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

**TABLE 2. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R190 21</td>
<td>Additional uses; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>476,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 22</td>
<td>Additional Food Use; 6 or more submitted in one application; Reduced Risk. (3)(4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>396,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 23</td>
<td>Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48,986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 24</td>
<td>Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 25</td>
<td>Additional use; non-food; outdoor. (3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 26</td>
<td>Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26,427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 27</td>
<td>Additional use; non-food; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 28</td>
<td>Experimental Use Permit application which requires no changes to the tolerance(s); non-crop destruct basis. (3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 29</td>
<td>New use; non-food; indoor. (3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15,317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 30</td>
<td>New use; non-food; indoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 31</td>
<td>New use; non-food; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 32</td>
<td>Additional use; seed treatment; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R190 33</td>
<td>Additional uses; seed treatment only; 6 or more submitted in one application; limited uptake into raw agricultural commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>302,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.
(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registration service fee and decision review time for a new use. If the applicant withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee, the applicant must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

"TABLE 3. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — IMPORT AND OTHER TOLERANCES"

| EPA No. | New CR No. | Action | Decision Review Time (Months),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R280</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Establish import tolerance; new active ingredient or first food use. (2)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R290</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Establish Import tolerance; Additional new food use.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R291</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Establish import tolerances; additional food uses; 6 or more crops submitted in one petition.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R292</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase) and/or harmonize established tolerances with Codex MRLs; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R293</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Establish tolerance(s) for inadvertent residues in one crop; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R294</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Establish tolerances for inadvertent residues; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R295</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Establish tolerance(s) for residues in one rotational crop in response to a specific rotational crop application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R296</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Establish tolerances for residues in rotational crops in response to a specific rotational crop petition; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R297</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase) in one petition; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R298</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review), (3) (4)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R299</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review), (3) (4)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the same application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application is for outdoor, all non-food uses, the applicable fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(3) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the same application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application is for outdoor, all non-food uses, the applicable fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(4) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application is for outdoor, all non-food uses, the applicable fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.
(4) Amendment applications to add the revised use pattern(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the category. All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the amendment application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if an amendment application only proposes to register the amendment for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the base fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the category decision review time.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R300</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; no data review on acute toxicity, efficacy or CRP – only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R301</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy (identical data citation and claims to cited product(s)), where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R310    | 47        | New end-use or manufacturing-use product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s); includes products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only:
  - product chemistry and/or
  - acute toxicity and/or
  - child resistant packaging and/or
  - pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) | 7 | 7,301 |
| R314    | 48        | New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only:
  - product chemistry and/or
  - acute toxicity and/or
  - child resistant packaging and/or
  - pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) | 8 | 8,626 |
| R319    | 49        | New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only:
  - product chemistry and/or
  - acute toxicity and/or
  - child resistant packaging and/or
  - pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) | 10 | 12,626 |
| R318    | 50        | New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only:
  - product chemistry and/or
  - acute toxicity and/or
  - child resistant packaging and/or
  - pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) | 9 | 13,252 |
| R321    | 51        | New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only:
  - product chemistry and/or
  - acute toxicity and/or
  - child resistant packaging and/or
  - pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3) | 11 | 17,252 |
```

"TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS"
### TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months),1 Decision Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R315</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>New end-use, on-animal product, registered source of active ingredient(s), with the submission of data and/or waivers for only:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• animal safety and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• product chemistry and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• acute toxicity and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• child resistant packaging, (2)(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R316</td>
<td>53 (new)</td>
<td>New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• product chemistry and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• acute toxicity and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• child resistant packaging and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 3 and up to 7 target pests. (2)(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R317</td>
<td>54 (new)</td>
<td>New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• product chemistry and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• acute toxicity and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• child resistant packaging and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 7 target pests. (2)(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R320</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>New product; new physical form; requires data review in science divisions. (2)(3)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R331</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>New product; repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product, or identical registered manufacturing-use product as an end use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R332</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only; requires review in RD and science divisions. (2)(3)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R333</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Cite-all or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data. (2)(3)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R334</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of the active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Selective data citation. (2)(3)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the differences; or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as it appears on the final label, the Agency will issue the label to the registrant. For cases described in (c), the Agency will issue a draft accepted label to the registrant. For cases described in (b) or (c), the Agency will issue a draft label to the registrant.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, “pest(s) requiring efficacy” are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termite, carpenter ant, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.

### TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months),1 Decision Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R340</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements). Includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for up to 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)(1)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R341</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements), includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for greater than 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R345</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Amending on-animal products previously registered, with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: animal safety and pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or child resistant packaging. (2)(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R350</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Amendment requiring data review in science divisions (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or PHI, or use rate, or number of applications; or add aerial application; or modify GW/SW advisory statement). (2)(3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R351</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Amendment adding a new unregistered source of active ingredient. (2)(3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R352</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Amendment adding already approved uses; selective method of support; does not apply if the applicant owns all cited data. (2)(3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R371</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; (does not include extending a permit’s time period). (3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, “pest(s) requiring efficacy” are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/modified as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency regarding the Agency’s final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency. (5) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, “pest(s) requiring efficacy” are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/modified as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency regarding the Agency’s final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

TABLE 6. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)(1)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R124</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waivers; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R272</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Review of Study Protocol applicant-initiated; excludes DART, pre-registration conference, Rapid Response review, DNT protocol review, protocol needing HSRB review.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R275</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R370</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Cancer reassessment; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>198,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

TABLE 7. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)(1)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A380</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient; Indirect Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>137,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A390</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient; Direct Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>229,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee.

Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee.

Where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

If the action involves a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee.
(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was not requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

“TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A530</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>New product, identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite all data citation or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data; or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A531</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy, where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A532</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; cite-all data citation except for product chemistry; product chemistry data submitted. (2)(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A540</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>New end-use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; up to 25 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A541</td>
<td>85 (new)</td>
<td>New end-use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A542</td>
<td>86 (new)</td>
<td>New end-use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A550</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>New end-use product; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm); non-FQPA product. (2)(3)(5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A560</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>New manufacturing use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation. (2)(3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A565</td>
<td>89 (new)</td>
<td>New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of new generic data package; registered uses only; requires science review. (2)(3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A570</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Label amendment requiring data review; up to 25 public health organisms. (3)(4)(5)(6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A573</td>
<td>91 (new)</td>
<td>Label amendment requiring data review; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A574</td>
<td>92 (new)</td>
<td>Label amendment requiring data review; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A572</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>New Product or amendment requiring data review for risk assessment by Science Branch (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or use rate). (2)(3)(4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft acceptance letter and an acceptance label that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4)(a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(b) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) The applicant must identify the substantially similar product if opting to use cite-all or the selective method to support acute toxicity data requirements.
(6) Once a submission for a new product with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A540 or A541, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission’s original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number of organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

(7) Once a submission for a label amendment with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A570 or A573, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission’s original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number of organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

‘‘TABLE 10. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS AND OTHER ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months),1</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A520</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Experimental Use Permit application, non-food use. (2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A521</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Review of public health efficacy study protocol within AD, per AD Internal Guidance for the Efficacy Protocol Review Process; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A522</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Review of public health efficacy study protocol outside AD by members of AD Efficacy Protocol Review Expert Panel; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 2.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A537</td>
<td>97 (new)</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Direct food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>153,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A538</td>
<td>98 (new)</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Indirect food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A539</td>
<td>99 (new)</td>
<td>New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Nonfood use. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>92,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A529</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; requires data review or risk assessment. (2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A531</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Review of protocol other than a public health efficacy study (i.e., Toxicology or Exposure Protocols).</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A571</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Science reassessment: Cancer risk, refined ecological risk, and/or endangered species; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A533</td>
<td>103 (new)</td>
<td>Exemption from the requirement of an Experimental Use Permit. (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A534</td>
<td>104 (new)</td>
<td>Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A535</td>
<td>105 (new)</td>
<td>Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waiver or Data Bridging Argument; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A536</td>
<td>106 (new)</td>
<td>Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Direct Food, Indirect Food, Nonfood use determination; applicant-initiated.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

‘‘TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months),1</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B580</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B590</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B600</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>New active ingredient; non-food use. (2)(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B610</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish a temporary tolerance or temporary tolerance exemption. (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(4) All associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.
(3) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the covered application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to the conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the differences(s) and withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

**TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B652</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>New product; registered source of active ingredient; requires petition to amend established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B660</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. For microbial pesticides, the active ingredient(s) must not be re-isolated. (2)(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B670</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B671</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); requires a petition to amend an established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B672</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); non-food use or food use requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B673</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>New product MUP/EP; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); citation of Technical Grade Active Ingredient (TGAI) data previously reviewed and accepted by the Agency. Requires an Agency determination that the cited data supports the new product. (2)(3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B674</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>New product MUP; Repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B675</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>New Product MUP; registered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only. (2)(3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B676</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>New product; more than one active ingredient where one active ingredient is an unregistered source; product chemistry data must be submitted; requires: 1) submission of product specific data, and 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency, the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

``````TABLE 14. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B621</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; no change to an established temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B622</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; petition to amend an established or temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B641</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Amendment of an established tolerance or tolerance exemption.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B680</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Amendment; registered sources of active ingredient(s); no new use(s); no changes to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. Requires data submission. (2)(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B681</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Amendment; unregistered source of active ingredient(s). Requires data submission. (2)(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B683</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Label amendment; requires review/update of previous risk assessment(s) without data submission (e.g., labeling changes to REI, PPE, PHI). (2)(3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B684</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Amending non-food animal product that includes submission of target animal safety data; previously registered. (2)(3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B685</td>
<td>141 (new)</td>
<td>Amendment; add a new biochemical unregistered source of active ingredient or a new microbial production site. Requires submission of analysis of samples data and source/production site-specific manufacturing process description. (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-Initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-Initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency, the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.
(d) Registrant-initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division, are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new product registration service fee for the new active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling that will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant’s initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient. (4) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant-initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.
TABLE 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B615</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B682</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Protocol review; applicant initiated; excludes time for HSRB review.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B740</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP; 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct; 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s); (4)(12)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B741</td>
<td>(new) 154</td>
<td>Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP; 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct; 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s); SAP Review. (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>159,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B750</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Experimental Use Permit application; with a petition to establish a temporary or permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. Includes new food/feed use for a registered (3) PIP. (4)(12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>127,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B770</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows; SAP review. (5)(12)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>191,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B771</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows. (12)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>127,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B772</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; no petition since the established tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient is unaffected. (12)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B773</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; with petition to extend a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B780</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed. (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>159,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B790</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed; SAP review. (5)(12)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>223,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B800</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (12)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>172,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B810</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. SAP review. (5)(12)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>236,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B820</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. (12)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>204,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B840</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. SAP review. (5)(12)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>268,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B851</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Registration application; new event of a previously registered PIP active ingredient(s); no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>127,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B870</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product; new use; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (4)(12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA No.</td>
<td>New CR No.</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Decision Review Time (Months)</td>
<td>Registration Service Fee ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B880</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s).</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B881</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s).</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B882</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/exemption; SAP Review.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>191,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B883</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/exemption.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>127,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B884</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/exemption for the active ingredient.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>159,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B885</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Registration application; registered (3) PIP, seed increase; breeding stack of previously approved PIPs, same crop; no petition since a permanent tolerance/exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s).</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B886</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/exemption for the active ingredient. SAP Review.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>223,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B890</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to commercial registration; no petition since permanent tolerance/exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s).</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B891</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to a commercial registration; no petition since a permanent tolerance/exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). SAP review.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B900</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B901</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. SAP review.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B902</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>PIP Protocol review.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B903</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Inert ingredient tolerance exemption; e.g., a marker such as NPT II; reviewed in BPPD.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B904</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Import tolerance or tolerance exemption; processed commodities/food only (inert or active ingredient).</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>127,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B905</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>SAP Review.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B906</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/exemption for one or more active ingredients.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B907</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/exemption for one or more active ingredients based on an existing temporary tolerance/exemption.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B908</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/exemption for one or more active ingredients or inert ingredients.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.
(2) New PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that has not been registered.
(3) Registered PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that is currently registered.
(4) Transfer registered PIP through conventional breeding for new food/feed use, such as from field corn to sweet corn.
(5) The scientific data involved in this category are complex. EPA often seeks technical advice from the Scientific Advisory Panel on risks that pesticides pose to wildlife, farm workers, pesticide applicators, non-target species, as well as insect resistance, and novel scientific issues surrounding new technologies. The scientists of the SAP neither make nor recommend policy decisions. They provide advice on the science used to make these decisions. The advice is invaluable to the EPA as it strives to protect humans and the environment from risks posed by pesticides. Due to the time it takes to schedule and prepare for meetings with the SAP, additional time and costs are needed.
(6) Registered PIPs stacked through conventional breeding.
(7) Deployment of a registered PIP with a different IRM plan (e.g., seed blend).
(8) The negotiated acreage cap will depend upon EPA's determination of the potential environmental exposure, risk(s) to non-target organisms, and the risk of targeted pest developing resistance to the pesticidal substance. The uncertainty of these risks may reduce the allowable acreage, based upon the quantity and type of non-target organism data submitted and the lack of insect resistance management data, which is usually not required for seed-increase registrations. Registrants are encouraged to consult with EPA prior to submission of a registration application in this category.

(9) Application can be submitted prior to or concurrently with an application for commercial registration.

(10) For example, IRM plan modifications that are applicant-initiated.

(11) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged fees.

(12) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

**TABLE 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months)</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I001</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Approval of new food use inert ingredient. (2)(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I002</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; new data. (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I003</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; no new data. (2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I004</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Approval of new non-food use inert ingredient. (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I005</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; new data. (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I006</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; no new data. (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I007</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Approval of substantially similar non-food use inert ingredients when original inert is compositionally similar with similar use pattern. (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I008</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, food use. (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I009</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, non-food use. (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I105</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Petition to amend a single tolerance exemption descriptor, or single non-food use descriptor, to add ≤ 10 CASRN's; no new data. (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I106</td>
<td>196 (new)</td>
<td>Approval of new food use safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)(8)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>597,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I107</td>
<td>197 (new)</td>
<td>Approval of new non-food use safener. (2)(8)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>415,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I108</td>
<td>198 (new)</td>
<td>Approval of additional food use for previously approved safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I109</td>
<td>199 (new)</td>
<td>Approval of additional non-food use for previously approved safener. (2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I110</td>
<td>200 (new)</td>
<td>Approval of new generic data for previously approved food use safener. (2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>269,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I106</td>
<td>201 (new)</td>
<td>Approval of amendment(s) to tolerance and label for previously approved safener. (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.
TABLE 19. — EXTERNAL REVIEW AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA No.</th>
<th>New CR No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision Review Time (Months),</th>
<th>Registration Service Fee ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M001</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Study protocol requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M002</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Completed study requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M003</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of less than 12 months.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M004</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of greater than 12 months.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M005</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>New Product: Combination, Contains a combination of active ingredients from a registered and/or unregistered source; conventional, antimicrobial and/or biopesticide. Requires coordination with other regulatory divisions to conduct review of data, label and/or verify the validity of existing data as cited. Only existing uses for each active ingredient in the combination product.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M006</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Request for up to 5 letters of certification (Gold Seal) for one actively registered product (excludes distributor products).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M007</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Request to extend Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(ii) before the end of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M008</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Request to grant Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(vi) for a minor use, when a FIFRA Section 2(ll)(2) determination is required.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M009</td>
<td>210(new)</td>
<td>Non-FIFRA Regulated Determination: Applicant initiated, per product.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M010</td>
<td>211(new)</td>
<td>Conditional ruling on pre-application, product substantial similarity.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M011</td>
<td>212(new)</td>
<td>Label amendment to add the DfE logo; requires data review; no other label changes.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review times for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that is not yet registered but has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant’s written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) Due to low fee and short time frame this category is not eligible for small business waivers. Gold seal applies to one registered product.

(9) This category includes amendments to the sole purpose of which is to add DfE (or equivalent terms that do not use “safe” or derivatives of “safe”) logos to a label. DfE is a voluntary program. A label bearing a DfE logo is considered an Agency endorsement because the ingredient in the qualifying product must meet objective, scientific criteria established and widely publicized by EPA.”

SEC. 7. AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROTECTION STANDARD; CERTIFICATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS.

(a) In General.—Except as provided in subsection (b), during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending not earlier than October 1, 2021, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”)—

(1) shall carry out—

(A) the final rule of the Administrator entitled “Pesticides; Agricultural Worker Protection Standard Revisions” (80 Fed. Reg. 67496 (November 2, 2015)); and

(B) the final rule of the Administrator entitled “Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators” (82 Fed. Reg. 952 (January 4, 2017)); and
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bation Survivors Protection Act, and ask
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Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speak-

er, I ask unanimous consent that the

Committee on the Judiciary be dis-

charged from further consideration of

the bill (H.R. 962) the Born-Alive Abor-

tion Survivors Protection Act, and ask

for its immediate consideration in the

House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gen-

tleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third
time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider

was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEM-

BRANCE OF THE LIVES LOST TO

GUN VIOLENCE IN AURORA, ILLI-

NOIS

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given

permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his

remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, we rise
today to honor the lives that we lost to

gun violence in Aurora, Illinois, earlier

this month.

This is, unfortunately, not the first
time that we have mourned the unex-

cessess loss of life from gun violence.

Eleven years ago, when I first took off-

ice, I inherited a community in

mourning: 17 students were injured and

5 were killed in the Cole Hall mass

shooting at Northern Illinois Univer-

sity. So I spent my first weeks and

months in office doing what I could to

help my community recover.

Now, 11 years later, on February 15,

the call went out from Aurora, Illinois:

Workplace, Henry Pratt. Active gunman. Officers down.

More than 200 police units from

across the western suburbs of Chicago

responded to contain the situation.

They were running toward the sound of

gunfire, as they do countless times
each day in our country.

Six officers were injured during that

response, and, in the aftermath, we

learned that we lost five members of

our community:

Josh Pinkard, the plant manager at

Henry Pratt, who, when fatally shot,

sent a final text message to his wife,

Terra, to say “I love you”;

Trevor Wehner, on his first day at

work at Pratt as an intern from North-

ern Illinois University;

Clayton Parks, Trevor’s supervisor

and also a graduate of NIU;

Vicente Juarez, a hardworking fam-

ily man who lived with his wife, daugh-

ter, and grandchildren on a quiet street

in Oswego;

Russell Beyer, a mold operator and

union committee chairman from Ma-

chinists Local 1202 and the father of

two children.

Now, as we have done so many times

before in Congress, I will soon ask that

we pause for a moment of silence; but

this time, I would ask each of you to

take a few moments to honor the lives

that is a critical first step towards pre-

venting gun violence. I would like to

take a few moments to honor the lives

our community lost this month.

I wish to remember Russell Beyer.

Proud chair of his union and a 20-year

employee of Henry Pratt, Russell was

the father of two and a steadfast Patri-

ots fan.

So, our hearts go out to the family

members that he has served to

organizations that he has served to

his remarks.)

We remember Clayton Parks, a

Northern Illinois University grad

whose wife, Abby, describes as an in-

credible father to their young son,

Axl.

We remember Josh Pinkard. “I want
to shout from the rooftops about how

amazing Josh was,” said his wife, Terra.

written about a man who loved God, fam-

ily, and college football.

We remember Trevor Wehner, a col-

lege student at Northern Illinois Uni-

versity, killed on the very first day of

his internship. He was described by a

friend as someone who would go out of

his way for others.

We remember Vicente Juarez. The

patriarch of a tight-knit family, Vicente

was a caring husband, father, and grand-

father to eight. His neighbors

loved him for his efforts ridding the

neighborhood of dandelions each sum-

mer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All

Members will rise for a moment of si-

lence.

HONORING SHERIFF MIKE YEAGER

(Mr. FERGUSON asked and was given

permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his

remarks.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to honor Coweta County Sheriff

Mike Yeager.

Sheriff Yeager has dedicated over 35

years in law enforcement to keeping his

community safe and serving his neigh-

bors, both on and off of the job.

In fact, it would take far longer than

I have here tonight to list all of the

many organizations—such as the Geor-

gia Sheriff’s Association, the Newnan-

Coweta Public Safety Board, and the Boy Scouts—so many

organizations that he has served to

make his community and State a bet-

ter place.

It is no understatement that Sheriff

Yeager is a pillar of his community and

a model public servant. It is a testa-

ment to his hard work that President

Trump appointed him to be the U.S.

marshal for the Northern District of

Georgia. I cannot think of anyone who

is better suited for this position.

We are awfully proud of Sheriff

Yeager and his accomplishments, and I

know that he will continue to serve his

State and our Nation well.

REMEMBERING THE AURORA

VICTIMS

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was

given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend

her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, 10
days ago, five people, four of whom

were my constituents, left their homes

for work at the Henry Pratt Company

in Aurora, Illinois, and never returned.

These lives were taken by a speak-

ably horrible act, gun violence, which

happens heartbreaking frequently in

this country.

As we consider legislation this week

that is a critical first step towards pre-

venting gun violence, I would like to

take a few moments to honor the lives

our community lost this month.

I wish to remember Russell Beyer.

Proud chair of his union and a 20-year

employee of Henry Pratt, Russell was

the father of two and a steadfast Patri-

ots fan.

We remember Clayton Parks, a

Northern Illinois University grad

whose wife, Abby, describes as an in-

credible father to their young son,

Axl.

We remember Josh Pinkard. “I want
to shout from the rooftops about how

amazing Josh was,” said his wife, Terra.

Black, wrote about a man who loved God, fam-

ily, and college football.

We remember Trevor Wehner, a col-

lege student at Northern Illinois Uni-

versity, killed on the very first day of

his internship. He was described by a

friend as someone who would go out of

his way for others.

We remember Vicente Juarez. The

patriarch of a tight-knit family, Vicente

was a caring husband, father, and grand-

father to eight. His neighbors

loved him for his efforts ridding the

neighborhood of dandelions each sum-

mer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All

Members will rise for a moment of si-

lence.

HONORING DR. MANDERLINE

SCALES

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked

and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute.)
Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Dr. Manderline Scales of Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

During Black History Month, we especially remember the enduring contributions of great Americans like Dr. Scales, who is one of four Black teachers to integrate Winston-Salem schools.

Dr. Scales worked in the Winston-Salem Forsyth County Schools for over 20 years and spent nearly 30 years in various roles at Winston-Salem State University. She brought the first Spanish programs to these schools and was known for her belief that every encounter was an opportunity to impact students in a positive way.

Additionally, she served on numerous boards, including the YMCA of Northwest North Carolina, Delta Fine Arts Center, and Northwest Child Development Center.

Dr. Scales passed away last month, but her legacy as a dedicated educator and selfless community leader will endure through the many lives she touched in her 91 years.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH AND MEDICINE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, some of the greatest contributions to medicine have been made by African Americans in this country.

The first open-heart surgery in the United States was successfully completed by Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, a Black man. Not only was he a pioneer of this lifesaving surgery, but also, in the late 1800s, he opened the country’s first hospital with an interracial staff, Provident Hospital in Chicago.

Then, in the 1930s, Dr. Helen Dickens did her internship at Provident Hospital before becoming the first Black woman admitted to the American College of Surgeons.

And then, while Dr. Dickens was doing her internship at Provident, a young Black girl growing up in segregated Arkansas dreamed of becoming a doctor. Sixty years later, in 1993, Dr. Joycelyn Elders became America’s first African American Surgeon General.

Mr. Speaker. Black history is not something that is in the past. It is constantly unfolding. It is American history.

Our stories are being written and expanded upon all the time. That is why Black History Month is so important—expanded upon all the time. That is why it is American history.

The first African American Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders became America’s first African American Surgeon General.

The segregated Arkansas dreamed of becoming a young Black girl growing up in segregated Arkansas dreamed of becoming a doctor. Sixty years later, in 1993, Dr. Joycelyn Elders became America’s first African American Surgeon General.

Mr. Speaker, Black history is not something that is in the past. It is constantly unfolding. It is American history.

Our stories are being written and expanded upon all the time. That is why Black History Month is so important—not just to honor our past, but to celebrate our present and prepare for our future.

TEXANS FROM SWEDEN

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, there is a force of nature that all Texans know: Texans from Sweden. But the most powerful one is a 17-year-old Cinco Ranch Cougar. Her name is Jennifer Lindgren.

As you can see, Jennifer was born without a left hand. But a prosthesis was a life enhancer. Jennifer says: “Most of the time, I forget that I have one hand. I have always just done pretty much what everybody else has done.”

JUVENILE JUSTICE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I just recently, I was very proud and pleased that this body passed my legislation, the Juvenile Block Grant Anti-Bullying and Intervention Act, dealing with the prevention of bullying but, more importantly, dealing with the opportunities for communities across America to begin to think more creatively about how you deal with juvenile justice, how you deal with young people of juvenile age who have gone away from school laws in serious terms of criminal activities. How do you deal with these young people?

It is clear that the juvenile justice system needs to be reformed. As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, it is my job to listen to people from across the Nation.

Many people don’t realize that once you are committed to a juvenile detention center or facility or jail, under juvenile laws in most States, and many of them receiving Federal dollars, you will find that there is no definitive sentence. They are sentenced and could be there from age 14 to 21. It may be that their parents do not have resources to get them out; it may be that they do not have an alternative place to go; and it may be that they have no representation. That is not the way to treat young people.

So we will be looking for legislation to incentivize our States to change the juvenile justice and the criminal justice system, and we look forward to working with all of our colleagues.

CONGRATULATING MAUREEN MCFADDEN ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Maureen McFadden on a remarkable 40-year career at WNDU-TV. I want to take a moment to honor the iconic legacy Maureen is leaving behind and thank her for all she has done for Michiana communities.

A lifelong Hoosier, Maureen has been a fixture in South Bend as a reporter and anchor at WNDU Newscenter 16 for the past four decades. She has played a...
vital role in making northern Indiana stronger not only by bringing us the day's news, but always finding ways to serve her neighbors and give back to the community she loves to call home. I am grateful to Maureen not only for her excellence in journalism, but also for the incredible example she has set for aspiring journalists and young Hoosier women who are always looking for ways to give back to build a brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the exceptional character, leadership, and compassion Maureen has demonstrated both on and off the air. Mo, I wish you the very best.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

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

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 47, the Natural Resources Management Act, which we will vote on tomorrow. This comprehensive public lands package has numerous provisions that benefit my State of Utah and makes permanent the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In my district, this legislation provides an important land conveyance to Juab County that will be used to house personnel to prevent and fight wildfires. This bill also facilitates a land transfer in Utah County to Utah's School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, or SITLA.

SITLA holds lands in trust, proceeds which support Utah's education system. This land transfer will ultimately benefit Utah State University and its students.

I also want to congratulate my colleague, Representative JOHN CURTIS, for his work in bringing together and working with State, city, and county stakeholders in Emery County. The Emery County title in this bill has broad local support and will protect over 600,000 acres of wilderness, the largest wilderness designation in 25 years. This legislation is good for Utah's economy. The Land and Water Conservation Fund should never have been allowed to expire because it is such a vital program.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COMMISSIONER MARCUS HARDY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness, but also to honor a commissioner, Commissioner Marcus Hardy, who was a highly respected leader in his community.

Marcus served as a city commissioner in the town of Crescent City, Florida, which is located in the district which I am proud to represent. I was fortunate enough to work alongside Mr. Hardy in efforts to improve Crescent City and the greater community. Beyond being a devoted public servant, a coach, and a role model, Marcus was a family man and a friend to many. Everyone who knew him knew his heart and his passion for serving others. He often spent his free time serving as a mentor for the Boys II Men organization in Crescent City or working to revitalize Putnam County for the benefit of the whole community.

Marcus will be remembered for his compassion, his leadership, his friendship, his large, firm hand grip and contagious smile.

Thank you for your service, Marcus. You will be missed by many.

AMERICANS' SHIFTING VIEWS ON ABORTION

(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, I rise today to speak about a recent shift we have seen in this country over the recent weeks—that is Americans' views on abortion.

Not long ago, a Marist poll found that 55 percent of Americans were likely to identify as pro-choice compared to about 38 percent identifying as pro-life—in fact, a 17-point gap. Now, the polls are tied.

As reported this week by Axios, a similar Marist poll found that Americans are now, for the first time, equally likely to be pro-life as they are to be pro-choice, both registering at 47 percent.

Why the sudden change? The horrific rhetoric offered by some of the left, that is why, including the Virginia Governor's indefensible remarks that he would support the murder of a baby post-birth. It is inconceivable to me that someone could differentiate a post-birth "abortion" from actual murder.

The good news is I think most Americans agree with me. That is why we are seeing, finally, this dramatic shift.

My colleague from Missouri, Representative ANN WAGNER, has introduced the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act in order to end infanticide taking place after failed abortion attempts. The Democrats have repeatedly blocked the effort, including tonight. We need to have a vote on this bill.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues have made public the details of the so-called Green New Deal. Among other things, if implemented over the next 10 years, it would eliminate the use of fossil fuels and nuclear power. That means our gasoline-powered vehicles and implements would be useless, and there would be no air travel.

It would also require that virtually all building structures would be rebuilt or made to the point where the very fabric of life would be forced to change.

The most frightening thing about this is that my colleagues sponsoring it are actually serious.

Furthermore, the architects failed to explain how they are going to rebuild the economy they would decimate.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the architects of this legislation change the color of the Green New Deal and call it the Red—as in stop sign red—New Disaster.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSE of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to lead a Special Order alongside my colleagues to discuss, frankly, a reckless and misguided and radical proposal recently introduced by some of my Democratic colleagues, the Green New Deal.

Tonight, together with many of my fellow members of the Congressional Western Caucus, we will be taking the time to share with the American people the details of the ill-advised and bizarre provisions included in this green manifesto and the grave impacts that they would have on our Nation's economy.

□ 2000

We will also share what we, as Republicans in the people's House, believe when it comes to our national strategy to innovate, diversify, and strengthen America's energy sector.

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal is a bad deal for the American people. This so-called deal calls for cutting of greenhouse gas emissions to net zero in only 10 years.

And while many studies are still working to grasp the perilous impacts and the enormous costs of this proposal, one independent estimate, led by a team of Stanford engineers, suggests it would cost our Nation in the neighborhood of $7 trillion to convert all of America's power to renewable power sources.
To quote the former Secretary of Energy under President Obama, Ernest Moniz, he said: "I’m afraid I just cannot see how we could possibly go to zero carbon in the 10-year timeframe. It is just impractical."

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal goes much further than just the energy sector, however. It also mandates the guarantee of a job for everyone, paid vacations for everyone, free college for everyone. It dictates that every existing building in this country must be upgraded and retrofitted for "comfort."

It calls for a drastic overhaul of our transportation systems across the country, that something not only our trucking and airline industries, but also the daily lives of the 85 percent of Americans who drive every morning or evening to get to work.

Mr. Speaker, while calling for all of these incredible policies, the Green New Deal would also insert the Federal Government into seemingly every aspect of our daily lives.

By expanding our Federal bureaucracy far beyond what we have ever seen in history and undermining the federalist principles our country was founded upon in the Constitution, this proposal would jeopardize the future of America as we know it. It would sacrifice the American energy, manufacturing, and transportation sectors; jeopardize businesses small and large across the Nation; and lead our country down the path of socialist nations like Venezuela, North Korea, and Cuba.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the House Democratic Whip Dick Durbin said after reading the proposal: "What in the heck is this?"

Mr. Speaker, I couldn’t agree more.

My State, the great State of Washington, consistently ranks among the top of the list of States with the cleanest energy production. Do you know why that is? It is because of the strong reliance on our incredible system of hydroelectric dams, many of which are in my congressional district along the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

Nearly 70 percent of our power comes from hydropower, a clean, renewable, reliable, and affordable source of base-load energy.

It also comes from our use of nuclear power. The Columbia Generating Station, which is also in the Fourth Congressional District which I represent, is the only nuclear power plant in the greater Northwest region. It too provides clean and reliable power for the Pacific Northwest.

On top of these sources, Washington State uses a variety of other energy sources, including natural gas, coal, wind, solar, and biomass.

It is easy to see how we use an all-of-the-above mix of energy sources, but large-scale concentrated on clean, renewable, reliable hydropower, that Washington State continues to demonstrate how we can lead in the use of clean energy while still diversifying and thereby strengthening our energy portfolio.

Unfortunately, the Green New Deal negates this ability to do so. Not once is the word "hydropower" mentioned in the legislation. And in the frequently asked questions document that was released to accompany the introduction of the Green New Deal, it stated that "The plan is to transition off of nuclear energy."

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to continue to strengthen America's energy independence and increase our use of clean sources of energy, we must absolutely include hydropower and nuclear power. The science says so, the facts say so.

So when Democrats in Congress release a sweeping, colossal overhaul of our Nation's energy policies and do not include these clean energy sources, it is clear that this is far more about politics and not about sound science.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow House Republicans and I continue to advocate for sound, comprehensive approaches to energy policy. We must continue to explore every opportunity to develop viable alternative energy sources, which is why under Republican control of the House in recent Congresses, we have made serious investments in advanced nuclear and basic science research, grid-scale energy storage, and equipped our national laboratories with robust resources to lead the way in research, development, and innovation.

National laboratories, like the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in my district, play a crucial role in developing the basic science research needed to pave the way for these alternative sources. Then when private industry can utilize this research, the open marketplace can put these new sources to use.

That is exactly what our country needs: more collaboration, more innovation; not a top-down mandated system of bureaucratic dictates based upon a green manifesto.

Mr. Speaker, I often share with my constituents that as a third generation farmer, I consider myself to be a conservationist and on the front lines of being a good steward of our natural resources, I know that we must respect our environment, we must ensure clean air and clean water for our citizens, and we must encourage innovative ways to produce energy through a variety of reliable, renewable traditional and alternative sources.

Tonight I am looking forward to hearing from my friends and my colleagues in the Congressional Western Caucus on why the Green New Deal would be catastrophic for our constituents and what we in our Nation's capital should really be prioritizing in order to continue America's energy independence dominance.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my first speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the gentleman that represents the Eighth District of that great State.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues in opposition to the Green New Deal.

This disastrous plan, cooked up by out-of-touch Washington elites, simply does not work for Minnesota families.

According to the Energy Information Administration, 68 percent of Minnesota’s energy consumption comes from a combination of coal, natural gas, nuclear, hydropower, and gasoline, all of which are to be banned completely by the Green New Deal in 10 years.

Allowed under this radical pipe dream are wind, solar, and biomass, which barely account for 15 percent of Minnesota’s energy consumption.

Picture a family in Ely, Minnesota, where wind chill temperatures reached 30 below zero this January, waking up in a warm house heated by natural gas.

They start a hot pot of coffee, powered by our affordable electric grid; take a hot shower, again, heated by natural gas; drive their kids to school in a car powered by affordable gasoline; go to work, possibly at a mine or a local hospital; drive home again in that same gasoline-pow- ered car; make dinner for their family, using their gas-powered oven; and then wash it all up again and do it all over.

The little things that we take for granted every day are powered by conventional energy.

The Green New Deal would have a severe impact on our everyday lives, something that Northern Minnesotans do not want or need.

The Green New Deal would force every Minnesota family to turn in their cars for electric vehicles and retrofit their homes for solar power with no guarantee the plans would work.

As an astute Minnesota farmer, I consider myself to be a conservative and on the front lines of being a good steward of our natural resources. I know that we must respect our environment, we must ensure clean air and clean water for our citizens, and we must encourage innovative ways to produce energy through a variety of reliable, renewable traditional and alternative sources.

Picture a family in Ely, Minnesota, currently getting by with a gas-powered stove; and then the next day, waking up again and do it all over.

I understand elites from D.C. and New York City may love this plan, but I know the reality. I encourage my colleagues, especially those who support this plan, to go back to their districts, like I did last week and really listen to their constituents, listen to their concerns, listen to how this plan would devastate the middle class and devastate hardworking Minnesota families.

Retrofitting homes, buying electric cars, and ending the mining, airline, and much of the shipping industries may be fun ideas for the ultra-wealthy, but I know what it really means for middle-class families in Northern Minnesota.

We cannot let these unrealistic ideas get in the way of actual progress. We must develop renewable forms of energy at the same time that we do not shut out conventional, affordable energy sources which, like solar or wind.
However, I will stand up for the farmers, our miners, our small business owners, manufacturers, and workers threatened by this Green New Deal.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for expressing, so eloquently, how Amendment the country would be affected by this if this legislation was adopted into law. People from different parts of the country with extreme weather, as you have heard, depend on different sources of energy.

From what I understand, the next speaker I am going to yield to is the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the chairman of our Western Caucus and the representative from the Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington, for organizing this important Special Order on the Green New Deal.

Mr. Speaker, America’s energy renaissance is one of our economy. It is a story of freedom, prosperity, and opportunity.

After decades of reliance on other countries to meet our energy needs, the U.S. Energy Information Administration recently announced that America will export more energy than it imports starting in 2020. We are no longer dependent on volatile foreign sources produced in Russia or Saudi Arabia.

Recent innovation and technology improvements, associated with fracking and horizontal drilling have allowed shale resources, previously deemed uneconomical, to be developed, and are the main reason the U.S. was the world leader in carbon emissions reductions in 2015, 2016, and 2017.

That is right. Fracking, demonized by environmental extremists without justification, has proven to be the best energy solution for our environment.

Abundant oil and natural gas has reduced electricity bills, kept gas prices low, and provided the largest share of U.S. electric power generation in recent years.

The oil and gas industry supports more than 10.3 million jobs and nearly 8 percent of our economy.

The United States is the world’s top energy producer, and the American Dream is thriving.

January 2019 saw the hundredth consecutive month of positive jobs growth in America, one of the longest periods of continuous jobs growth on record.

The U.S. job market is strong, and in December, employers posted 7.3 million open jobs, a new record.

Now, despite America’s energy renaissance and the aforementioned emissions reductions, we continue to hear hyperbolic statements about pending climate catastrophe and the need for radical change to stave off future disaster.

The Democrat socialists pushing the Green New Deal want to get rid of all energy sources except wind, solar, and batteries by 2030. How are we going to do that when wind and solar only produced 7.6 percent of our electricity in 2017?

The Green New Deal would drive energy production and jobs to countries like China and India where they have much worse environmental standards. Global greenhouse gas reductions would decrease as a result, in direct contradiction to the main talking point of the Green New Deal.

The socialist Green New Deal says it will provide higher education, higher quality healthcare, and affordable, safe, and adequate housing to all.

The Mercatus Center estimates that the cost of the single-payer healthcare provision alone would cost $32 trillion in the first 10 years, something that I think is probably on the low side.

The Green New Deal is an alarmist pipe dream that seeks to fundamentally transform America without a blueprint. This socialist manifesto changes by the day, and important details on how a transition of the Green New Deal got our area missing, including how we will pay for this pie in the sky aspiration.

If one needs to have more evidence that the Green New Deal is not plausible, look no further than the country of Australia where electricity prices are the highest in the world and the Aussies’ obsession with renewables has destroyed their electric grid. Mass blackouts and mass power cuts are the new norm, and a massive Tesla battery backup system ran dry this past month as the Aussie power grid crashed in summer temperatures. Ninety thousand Aussie homes had no air-conditioning for the next 2 weeks of blistering heat.

Let’s learn from Australia’s mistakes. Let’s not repeat them.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to enlightening everyone on this legislation further in the coming days.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for expressing his thoughts on how this would impact the people not only in Arizona, but also around the country.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents continue to ask me what is actually in this Green New Deal legislation. Unfortunately for the American people, the Members of Congress who introduced the resolution had, I guess, several hiccups along the way during their rollout and released conflicting documents to accompany the bill.

One significant piece of legislation that my constituents have asked me about is whether the related resolution mandated a job for everyone in the United States. Well, that is, in fact, true. A part of the frequently asked questions document that was released with the legislation even stated that economic security would be provided for those who are ‘unwilling to work.’” Many of my constituents think that is an amazing statement.

After an adviser to the Green New Deal accused Republicans of doctoring this document, The Washington Post later reported that he erroneously made that accusation. In fact, this document was released by Congresswoman Ocasio-Cortez’s office.

Representative Ocasio-Cortez has since retracted this frequently asked questions document, but the message I hope my constituents and the American people hear clearly is that we know the motives behind this legislation. We know the intent. From ending the airline industry to shutting down all nuclear power, unfortunately, some people on the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the Democratic side, are threatening the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the frequently asked questions document that was released by Congresswoman Ocasio-Cortez’s office.

LAUNCH: Thursday, February 7, at 8:30 a.m.

OVERVIEW

We will begin work immediately on Green New Deal bills to put the nuts and bolts on their scale not seen since World War 2 to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and create economic prosperity for all. It will: Move America to 100% clean and renewable energy Create millions of family-sustaining wage, union jobs Ensure a just transition for all communities and workers to ensure economic security for people and communities that have historically relied on fossil fuel industries Ensure justice and equity for frontline communities by prioritizing investment, training, climate and community resiliency, economic and environmental benefits in these communities. Build on FDR’s second bill of rights by guaranteeing: A high-quality education, including higher education and trade schools Clean air and water and access to nature Healthy food Safe, affordable, adequate housing Economic environment free of monopolies Economic security for all who are unable or unwilling to work. There is no time to waste. IPCC Report said global emissions must be cut by 40-60% by 2030. US is 20% of total emissions. We must grow and lead the world in a global Green New Deal. Americans love a challenge. This is our moonshot.

When JFK said we’d go to the moon by the end of the decade, people said impossible. If Eisenhower wanted to build the interstate highway system today, people would ask how we’d pay for it. When FDR called on America to build 185,000 planes to fight World War 2, every business leader, CEO, and general laughed at him. At the time, the U.S. had produced 3,000 planes in the last year. By the end of the war, we produced 300,000 planes. That’s what we were capable of if we had real leadership.

This is massive transformation of our society with clear goals and a timeline. The Green New Deal resolution a 10-year plan to mobilize every aspect of American society at a scale not seen since World War 2 to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and create economic prosperity for all. It will: Move America to 100% clean and renewable energy Create millions of family-sustaining wage, union jobs Ensure a just transition for all communities and workers to ensure economic security for people and communities that have historically relied on fossil fuel industries Ensure justice and equity for frontline communities by prioritizing investment, training, climate and community resiliency, economic and environmental benefits in these communities.

Build on FDR’s second bill of rights by guaranteeing: A high-quality education, including higher education and trade schools Clean air and water and access to nature Healthy food Safe, affordable, adequate housing Economic environment free of monopolies Economic security for all who are unable or unwilling to work. There is no time to waste. IPCC Report said global emissions must be cut by 40-60% by 2030. US is 20% of total emissions. We must grow and lead the world in a global Green New Deal. Americans love a challenge. This is our moonshot.

When JFK said we’d go to the moon by the end of the decade, people said impossible. If Eisenhower wanted to build the interstate highway system today, people would ask how we’d pay for it. When FDR called on America to build 185,000 planes to fight World War 2, every business leader, CEO, and general laughed at him. At the time, the U.S. had produced 3,000 planes in the last year. By the end of the war, we produced 300,000 planes. That’s what we were capable of if we had real leadership.

This is massive transformation in our economy and society, not expenditure.
We invested 40-50% of GDP into our economy during World War 2 and created the greatest middle class the US has seen.

The interstate highway system has returned decades later in economic productivity for every $1 it cost. This is massively expanding existing and building new industries at a rapid pace—growing our economy.

The Green New Deal has momentum. 92 percent of Democrats and 64 percent of Republicans support the Green New Deal. Near term, Democratic Presidential contender say they back the Green New Deal including: Elizabeth Warren, Cory Booker, Kamala Harris, Jeff Merkeley, Julian Castro, Gillibrand, Tulsi Gabbard, and Jay Inslee.

45 House Reps and 30+ groups backed the original resolution for a select committee on the Green New Deal. Over 30 state and local politicians have called for a federal Green New Deal. New Resolution has 20 co-sponsors, about 30 groups (numbers will change by Thursdays).

**FAQ**

Why 100% clean and renewable and not just 100% renewable? Are you saying we won’t transition off fossil fuels?

Yes, we are calling for a full transition off fossil fuels and zero greenhouse gases. Anywho has read the resolution sees that we spell this out through a plan that calls for eliminating all fossil fuel emissions from every sector of the economy. Simply banning fossil fuels immediately won’t build the new economy to replace it—this is the plan to build that new economy and spells out how to do it technically. We do this through a huge mobilization to create the renewable economy as fast as possible. We set a goal of 100% net-zero, rather than zero emissions, in 10 years because we aren’t sure that we’ll be able to fully get rid of farting cows and airplanes that fast, but we think we can make the transition off fossil fuels and zero emissions by 2050, with a 90% reduction in 2030.

Is nuclear a part of this?

The Green New Deal is a massive investment in renewable energy production and would not include creating new nuclear plants. It’s unclear if we will be able to decarbonize energy if we do not invest in nuclear in the short term. The plan is to transition off of nuclear and all fossil fuels as soon as possible. No one has put the 10-year plan together yet, and if it is to be fully 100% renewable in 10 years, we will do that.

Does this include a carbon tax?

The Green New Deal is a massive investment in the production of renewable energy industries and infrastructure. We cannot simply tax gas and expect workers to figure out another way to get to work unless we’ve first invested in making it more affordable op.

Is there a carbon tax, or a Green New Deal in the face of the gigantic expansion of our productive economy and would have to be preceded by first creating the solutions necessary so that workers and working class communities are not affected. While a carbon tax may be a part of the Green New Deal, it misses the point and would be off the table unless we create the clean, affordable options first.

Does the Green New Deal ban all fossil fuels?

The Green New Deal is about creating the renewable energy economy through a massive investment in our society and economy. Capturing the existing assets and how we will solve this problem for us, and that’s simply not true. While cap and trade may be

in order to reap future benefits (for e.g., building a new factory to increase production or buying new hardware and software to totally modernize its IT system), a country will be incentivized to create value-added services that will be the key for further incremental investments and growth. The plan will need to create big investments today to jump-start and develop new projects and sectors to power the new economy.

Does a GND ban all new fossil fuel infrastructure or nuclear power plants?

The Green New Deal makes new fossil fuel infrastructure and nuclear power plants unnecessary. This is a massive mobilization of all our resources into renewable energies. It would be possible to build some new fossil fuel infrastructure because we will be creating a plan to reorient our entire economy to work off renewable energy. Simply one lesson is that investments immediately won’t build the new energy to replace it—this is the plan to build that new economy and spells out how to do it technically.

Are you for CCUS?

We believe the right way to capture carbon is to plant trees and restore our natural ecosystems. CCS technology to date has not proven effective.

How will you pay for it?

The same plan for the New Deal, the 2008 bailout and extended quantative easing programs. The same way we paid for World War II and all our current wars. The Federal Reserve can extend credit to power these projects and investments and new public banks can be created to extend credit. There is also space for the government to take an equity stake in projects to get a return on investment. At the end of the day, this is an investment in our economy that should grow our wealth as a nation, so the question is not how we pay for it, but what will we do with our new shared prosperity.

Why do we need a sweeping Green New Deal investment program?

The level of investment required is massive. Even if every billionaire and company came together and were willing to pour all the resources at their disposal into this investment, the level of the investments they could make would not be sufficient.

The speed of investment required will be massive. Even if all the billionaires and companies could make the investments required, they would not be able to pull together a coordinated plan to roll out the massive window of time required to jump-start major new projects and major new economic sectors. Also, private companies are wary of making massive investments in new technology and R&D, without necessarily having a commercial outcome or application in mind at the time the investment is made. Major examples of government investments in “new” tech that subsequently spurned a boom in the private sector include DARPA-projects, the creation of the internet—and, perhaps most recently, the government’s investment in Tesla.

Simply put, we don’t need to just stop doing some things we are doing (like using fossil fuels for energy needs); we also need to start doing some things (like overhauling whole industries or retrofitting all buildings to be energy efficient). Starting to do new things requires some upfront investment. In the language of Wall Street, this isn’t just a question of changing how it does business may need to make big upfront capital investments today.
Clean up all the existing hazardous waste sites and abandoned sites

Identify new emission sources and create solutions to eliminate those emissions

Make a plan in addressing climate change and share our technology, expertise and products with the rest of the world to bring about a global Green New Deal

Social and economic justice and security through 15 requirements:

- Massive federal investments and assistance to organizations and businesses participating in the green new deal and ensuring the public gets a return on that investment
- Ensure the environmental and social costs of emissions are taken into account
- Provide job training and education to all
- Invest in R&D of new and renewable energy technologies
- Doing direct investments in frontline and deindustrialized communities that would otherwise be hurt by the transition to prioritize economic benefits there

Use democratic and participatory processes led by frontline and vulnerable communities to implement GND projects locally

- Ensure that all GND jobs are union jobs that pay prevailing wages and hire local workers
- Guarantee a job with family-sustaining wages

- Protect right of all workers to unionize and collective bargaining

Strengthen and enforce labor, workplace health and safety, antidiscrimination, and wage and hour standards

- Enact and enforce trade rules to stop the transfer of jobs and pollution overseas and grow domestic manufacturing
- Ensure public lands, waters, and oceans are protected and eminent domain is not abused
- Obtain free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous peoples
- Ensure an economic environment free of monopolies and price competition
- Provide high-quality health care, housing, economic security, and clean air, clean water, healthy food, and nature to all

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), who represents the Fifth District and I believe served on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee very well.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I applaud and give my thanks and gratitude to the gentleman from Washington for his efforts in leading this today, and to the Congressional Western Caucus and the members who are exposing what is really not a Green New Deal, but really is a green socialist manifesto.

Here is what we need to understand about this. This is so broad and expansive, as Mr. NEWHOUSE has said, it will, basically, invade every aspect of every American’s life, and it will cost tens of trillions of dollars to implement.

How will we pay for that? We are going to pay for that with crushing new taxes on individuals, families, and companies. We are going to destroy the current foundation of our entire American economy.

There will be more borrowing, not just from the public sector, but from the private sector. The public sector is in trouble because the Federal Government just hit $22 trillion of national debt.

The question is, what will the impact of this be on the environment? It would do little to solve the alleged problem of carbon in the atmosphere because the United States is no longer the primary source of carbon emissions.

Between 2005 and 2017, our Nation has reduced CO2 emissions by 862 million tons. Today, the U.S. is responsible for only 15 percent of global CO2 emissions. During roughly the same period, China increased its emissions by 4 billion tons and India by 1.3 billion tons.

Needless to say, the GND doesn’t explain how we would compel other nations to change their behavior. But domestically, as I have said, we are going to emasculate our economy. The coal, nuclear, natural gas, petroleum, and air travel industries will be wiped out, and all of the industries that support those industries. That means hundreds of thousands of people will lose their jobs almost instantly.

At the same time, the Green New Deal, or the green socialist manifesto, is going to guarantee income for everyone.

As Representative RYAN said, we can’t green the economy without the power of the free market system. He is right.

That’s the ultimate point of what I want to say today.

We know that science doesn’t support the green socialist manifesto, but we know something that is really critical to understand. This proposal, which today is so vast, so encompassing, and so primitive in its creation, is also so destructive to our economy and multiple industries, multiple sectors of our economy, that I would say there is no one left on this side of the aisle that support such an outlandish and reckless idea, and that is to use the awesome, overreaching power of government not just to induce, but to coerce implementation of this faulty idea.

In its scope, breadth, and depth, this plan is authoritarian in nature. It will require government flexing its muscules to mandate activities and forbid other actions in every American’s life.

We can’t do this. This plan will not provide what it says it is going to do. Moreover, in a free, constitutional Republic, you can never allow this kind of socialism to be combined with authoritarianism.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BIGGS for sharing his thoughts on the direction that this would take our Nation and the dangerous path it would lead us upon.

Those are things that we need to make sure that we don’t allow happen, and I think the American people would agree with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the good doctor from Kansas’ First District who serves on the Agriculture Committee. I know this is going to have a huge impact on many industries, but particularly agriculture.

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

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that, back home, the Green New Deal means that John Deere dealers are having a new combine sale.

I stand before you this evening to tell you exactly why the Green New Deal is a sham. Rather than setting realistic goals to reduce carbon emissions and incentivize cleaner energy development, this so-called deal stalls innovation, has major economic consequences, and government involvement in almost every aspect of everyday life, at a price tag of more than $50 trillion.

Over the past 2 years, we have unleashed our economy by reducing government overregulation of businesses, allowing Americans to invest in their families, futures, and pursuits. The Green New Deal will throw the brakes on our economy, as well as the world’s economy.

Nothing will increase worldwide carbon record exports more than a stalled economy.

Additionally, this Green New Deal reverses our success by imposing harsher regulations that will put American workers and American companies at an economic disadvantage. This green socialist proposal that Democrats are championing completely ignores the cost to American taxpayers and fails to address the negative impacts that other countries have on global climate change.

This deal will absolutely devastate our economy with its outrageous demands for new green infrastructure, new green labor practices, and new green taxes. It will crush American manufacturing and transportation industries. It would completely halt domestic energy production that has had record exports under the Trump administration.

I am a firm believer that we must focus on leaving this world better than we found it for the next generation. For my children, for your children, and for our grandchildren, we need to be good stewards of the resources and the planet we have been given, but any reasonable solution will require us to use common sense when approaching the issues.

We must also be careful not to fall into the trap of believing that the U.S. Government is the answer to correct all our problems. America has always been a nation of innovators, and instead of imposing new regulations and taxes, we must continue to lead the world and partner with American industries to develop creative solutions and new innovative technologies. Innovation will do more to impact climate change than any law Washington, D.C., can write.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. MARSHALL for sharing with us his thoughts from the great State of Kansas.

Some of the proponents of the Green New Deal have criticized others for criticizing the Green New Deal, saying that we don’t have any room to talk if we are not going to offer something to address the issues that we face as a world and as a country.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, we do have options, and we do have solutions
that we have been offering. Let me share a piece written by my Republican colleagues just recently who lead the Energy and Commerce Committee. Mr. GREG WALDEN, Mr. FRED UPTON, and Mr. JOHN SHIMKUS shared an article that was published in several newspapers around the country. Some of the things that they say go like this: “America’s approach for tackling climate change should be built upon the principles of innovation, conservation, and adaptation. Republicans have long championed realistic, innovative, and free-market strategies to promote a cleaner environment and to reduce emissions. The results are clear: The United States is leading the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions thanks to vibrant energy sector competition and innovation.”

They go on to say: “We should continue to encourage innovation and renewable energy development. We should promote carbon capture and utilisation, renewable hydropower, and safe nuclear power, which is emissions-free. We should also look to remove barriers to energy storage and commercial batteries to help make renewable sources more viable and our electricity grid more resilient. And we must encourage more research and business investments in new clean energy technologies. These are bipartisan solutions that we must seize on to deliver real results for the American people.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) from the 27th District.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. Speaker, the Green New Deal is a bad deal for the people of America. Just days ago, we passed $22 trillion in debt for which we have no plan to begin paying down. The Green New Deal would only add trillions more while simultaneously destroying the American economy, which not only means families across our Nation would lose their ability to sustain themselves, but it would also shut down the innovation engine of the world.

The 27th District of Texas, which I represent, has a better approach. We are home to a diverse energy portfolio, which includes wind, nuclear, LNG, oil production—not to mention our fair share of cows and airplanes.

We are home to a safe, reliable nuclear power plant in Matagorda County that generates 2.7 gigawatts of power, and that is a power of nearly 2 million American households, which not only means families across our Nation would lose their ability to sustain themselves, but it would also shut down the innovation engine of the world.

In Texas our market-based approach to energy is leading the way even as our economy continues to boom. Furthermore, a thriving economy is absolutely essential to creating and deploying the innovative solutions we need to face the environmental challenges of the future.

So when it comes to the Green New Deal, let’s stop looking to socialism for answers and start looking to places like Texas. This Green New Deal would be devastating to American jobholders, harmful to our allies around the world, and it is also counterproductive to advancing protections to our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to firmly oppose this outlandish and unrealistic idea.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for giving us great thoughts about the impacts of what the Green New Deal would actually mean for Americans and jobs in the United States of America.

As the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) makes his way to the microphone, I just want to share with you one study that was released today by the American Action Forum. It says that the Green New Deal will cost a startling $93 trillion over 10 years.

Now, put that into perspective. That is equivalent to $600,000 per household. To generate $93 trillion in income tax revenue, we would have to tax every household earning more than $30,000 at a 100 percent rate for 10 years. If every household earning more than $200,000 was taxed at 100 percent for 10 years...
Mr. LaMALFA. Mr. Speaker, thank you to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Indeed, what we know so far about the Green New Deal, it is more like a green pipe dream. It would lead to a total government takeover of just about every aspect of our lives.

Now, it is interesting to watch, since the deal was proposed not that many days ago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of them are starting to back away from it. There were that, we are seeing some starting to back away, saying, well, this really isn’t the dream or the deal; it is more of an aspiration.

Well, by the time you freaked out half the country with these ideas that you put into legislation, maybe we need a little more heads-up on what really is the goal here.

Some of the guarantees in it:

A government paycheck for those unwilling to work

Is it really in there? What are we talking about here?

The cost of this implementation? $93 trillion, quadruple of what our national debt is right now. The cost will be passed on, of course, to—as always—the taxpayer, to families. To those struggling—especially middle-income folks—who could see their energy bills going up from already at a high point to an additional $4,000 annually per family.

We should really have our supporters of this bill benefit from the lessons learned in California on the high-speed rail boondoggle that tripled in a short amount of time soon after it was barely approved, $10 billion by the taxpayers to a nearly $100 billion project, all under the guise of saving greenhouse gases.

Except during the construction of the high-speed rail in California, it will make a whole bunch of greenhouse gases from the equipment involved so we are going to plant trees to offset that. Yet, at the same time, they are running the rails through hundreds of acres of almond trees in the middle of California that they are supposed to be offsetting.

It is a reckless attempt to undermine America’s increasing dominance—not just energy independence—but now dominance in energy around the world.

It ignores the basic reality: a lot of what was built upon were indeed fossil fuels, those known reserves that we have in this country.

Now, let’s talk a little bit about the Paris accord that I think President Trump rightfully withdrew the United States from. That goal being greenhouse gas reduction, CO2 reduction.

Well, when you look at the stats, who is already leading the way outside of the accord? The U.S.—of those western countries—is the only one that has actually reduced its number of CO2 in that amount of time.

Are we the ones doing it. You know why? Because we have freedom; because we have the ability to innovate here, to invent the new technology, to invent the things that are going to help us do things better and cleaner into the future.

I don’t hear a lot of talk on this about new hydropower, which is clean and ready to go any time you turn on the switch or open the gates to allow the turbines to flow.

Biomass. In my area of the country—the Western Caucus, my colleagues here—we burn part of the west every year. We should be putting that fuel into clean burning power plants to make electricity, cleaning our forest, making it more fire-safe, better for the wildlife, better for the environment, not having all that CO2 go up. And then creating jobs in our backyards to get people to work from cleaning up the over-inventory the U.S. forest and BLM has from allowing their forest to run rampant with no management for the last 100 years.

These are things we should be talking about this green dream thing. Instead, we are going to hear nothing but climate change, climate change, climate change, with solutions that just harness or handcuff the economy, the jobs, and the people of this country inside this chamber and in the real world out there where people actually produce things.

We need to focus on the things that we know can work, producing energy with hydropower. Yes, with nuclear power, with biomass, help clean that inventory that burns hundreds of thousands of acres every year of forest land, and put it to work for us.

That is what we are going to be successful at, because the United States is always number one in developing the new technology, the new ways to do cleaner, better, more efficiently, instead of handcuffing our economy and that innovation and exporting it somewhere else.

I do agree with my colleagues that have spoken here tonight. And in sending the message, we need to strongly oppose this bill and get back to something that actually works for the working people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time of the gentleman.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LaMALFA). I appreciate very much having California’s thoughts—about what we have in front of us and the impact it would have.

And if anyone is thinking that this is just a bunch of Republicans that are thinking this way and have these thoughts, let me share with you some quotes from some of my friends across the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

Representative JEFF VAN DREW, a Democrat from New Jersey. He says of the Green New Deal, “It is not a serious policy solution to address the critical reorganization of American society, which took hundreds of years to build, in a matter of 10 years.”

Or the senior Senator from California—Mr. LaMALFA’s state—just stated last week that “There’s no way to pay for it.”

From my own State, my colleague, Representative RICK LAHREN just said recently, “It is difficult to support the resolution right now when one of the lead sponsors says one of the intentions is to make air travel unnecessary.” He is the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation.

My neighbor from Oregon, Mr. DAVIS, chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, said, “The idea that in 5 or 10 years we’re not going to consume any more fossil fuels is technologically impossible. We can have grand goals, but let’s be realistic about how we get there.”

Even our own Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI from California, said of the proposal: “The green dream or whatever they call it, nobody knows what it is, but they’re for it, right?”

So you can see, it is not just us, this is a bipartisan feeling about the Green New Deal that it needs a lot more consideration.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), my good friend from the Palmetto State, Fifth District, and a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NEWHOUSE for leading the effort on this.

And I rise to oppose the Green New Deal for many of the reasons that have already been said, but this is the most amateurish resolution that has come before this Congress in a long time, not from only my point of view but many others who have served longer than I have.

We were asked to consider a policy that would change the course of American life, deciding what we eat, how we travel, how we stay warm, and even what jobs we can take and what homes we are allowed to live in.

We are presented with a total overhaul of society, but with no explanation how. There is no roadmap, no method of implementation, and, of course, no price tag. All we know is that this will be dictated by a cabal of better-knowing bureaucrats. Yet every estimate shows just how unrealistic this green deal really is.

According to the American Action Forum, the total cost could run as high as $93 trillion over 10 years.

This totals 21 times our current Federal budget of $4.3 trillion. That can only mean one thing for the American people: taxes, taxes, and more taxes.

This resolution is so lacking in detail that we might as well vote on the merits of a scrap of paper that says, “solve the problem.” This is no way to govern.
The only details we do have are from a survey that enjoyed a brief existence online before it was removed out of embarrassment and has since been denied.

One source of embarrassment was the call to get rid of cows. To my knowledge, this is the first time that a Member of this House has called for bovine genocide.

That the deal’s supporters are now hiding these facts reveals that the true agenda behind the Green New Deal is too horrifying to be shared with any of the public. As a rule of thumb, any law that cannot be shared with the people cannot serve the people.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his input on this important issue. It underscores the cost to the Nation if this were adopted and its impact on our economy. I thank the gentleman for that tremendous help.

I thank all my colleagues, members of the Congressional Western Caucus, for participating tonight to point out some of the fallacies of the Green New Deal. Certainly, it is something that, as legislation is proposed, this is the process: We talk about what we like, what we don’t like, and we offer alternatives, trying to find solutions in a bipartisan way.

Republicans have always advocated to continue looking at these issues of climate change, of energy use and production, of issues facing the environment. We are always looking for ways to innovate, to adequately fund research, but, basically, underscores all of that, relying on the use of sound science for any decisions that we make, to make sure that the policies that we adopt are those that will be sustaining and good for not only our country, but for the world.

So we base our decisions on science, not politics. As Republicans, as members of the Congressional Western Caucus, which is a bipartisan organization, we love debating seriously and making serious decisions in regard to these very important issues that face our country, face the next generation, and face the world.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing our debates on the important topic, and I yield back the balance of my time.

TODAY'S FLOOR ACTION:

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of inclement weather.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BIENNIAL REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS

U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS


Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Speaker.
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR) to biennially submit a report containing recommendations regarding Federal workplace rights, safety and health, and public access laws and regulations that should be made applicable to Congress and its agencies. The purpose of this report is to ensure that the rights afforded by the CAA to legislative branch employees and visitors to Capitol Hill and district offices remain equivalent to those in the private sector and the executive branch of the Federal government. As such, these recommendations support the intent of Congress to keep pace with advances in workplace rights and public access laws.

Accompanying this letter is a copy of our section 102(b) report—titled “Recommendations for Improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act”—for consideration by the 116th Congress. We welcome discussion on these issues and urge that Congress act on these important recommendations.

Your office is receiving this initial copy prior to it being uploaded to our public website. On March 4, 2019, this report will be disseminated to the larger Congressional community and available on www.ocwr.gov. As required by the Congressional Accountability Act, 2 U.S.C. § 102(b), I request that this publication by printed in the Congressional Record, and referred to the Committees of the House of Representatives and Senate with jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

SUSAN TSUI GRUNDMANN,
Executive Director.

116TH CONGRESS—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Office of Congressional Workplace Rights—Board of Directors’ Biennial Report required by § 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act issued at the conclusion of the 115th Congress (2017–2018) for consideration by the 116th Congress

Statement From the Board of Directors

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) embodies a promise by Congress to the American public that it will hold itself accountable to the same federal workplace and accessibility laws that it applies to private sector employers and executive branch employees. This legislation was also crafted to provide for ongoing review of the workplace and accessibility laws that apply to Congress. Section 102(b) of the CAA thus requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR)—formerly the Office of Compliance—to review legislation and regulations to ensure that CAA protections in the legislative branch are on par with private sector and executive branch agencies. Accordingly, every Congress, the Board reports on: (A) our findings and recommendations of Federal law (including regulations) relating to (A) the terms and conditions of employment (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, grievances and disciplinary proceedings, protections in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave) of employees; and (B) access to public services and accommodations of that are applicable or inapplicable to the legislative branch, and . . . with respect to provisions inapplicable to the legislative branch, whether such provisions should be made applicable to the legislative branch. This section of the CAA also requires that the recommendations to Congress and the Senate cause our report to be printed in the Congressional Record and refer the report to committees of the House and Senate with jurisdiction.

On December 21, 2018, as we were in the process of finalizing our Section 102(b) Report for the 115th Congress, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, S. 3749, was signed into law. Not since the passage of the CAA in 1995 has there been a more significant moment in the evolution of the legislative branch’s workplace rights. The new law focuses on protecting victims, strengthening transparency, holding violators accountable for their conduct, and improving the adjudication process. Some of the changes in the CAA Reform Act are effective immediately, such as the name change of our Office, effective 180 days from enactment, i.e., on June 19, 2019. The CAA Reform Act incorporates several of the recommendations that the OCWR has made to Congress in past Section 102(b) Reports and in other contexts, such as in testimony before the Committee on House Administration (CHA) as part of that committee’s comprehensive review of the protections that the CAA offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace. These changes include the following:

Mandatory Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Anti-Retaliation Training

The Board has consistently recommended in its past biennial Section 102(b) Reports and in testimony before Congress that anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal training should be mandatory for all Members, officers, employees, and staff of Congress and the other employing offices in the legislative branch. Last year, the House and the Senate adopted resolutions (S. Res 395 and H. Res 630) that call on Members, officers, employees, and staff of Congress and the other employing offices in the legislative branch to participate in training on mandatory anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal training. We are pleased that the CAA Reform Act includes these broader mandates for the congressional workforce at large. Under the new law, employing offices (in the House and the Senate) are also required to develop and implement a program to train and educate employees on their rights and protections provided under the CAA, and the procedures available under CAA title IV, which describes the OCWR administrative and judicial dispute resolution procedures. 509(a), 2 U.S.C. §1438(a). Employing offices must submit a report on the implementation of their CAA-required training and education programs to the CHA, the Board, and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate no later than 45 days after the beginning of each Congress, beginning with the 117th Congress. As of the start of the 117th Congress, this is no later than 180 days after the enactment of the CAA Reform Act, which is June 19, 2019.

509(b)(1), (b)(2), 2 U.S.C. §1438(b)(1), (b)(2)

While these changes are an important step forward, we consider the OCWR’s role to be in developing the training curriculum, and continuing to work with the House and Senate employing offices in developing their anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal
programs by providing training opportunities and materials that are easily understood, practical rather than legalistic, proven effective, and which emphasize the change of culture on Capitol Hill. Through these programs, we can achieve the goal of a legislative branch that is free from discrimination, harassment, and reprisal.


deleted by the CAA. The Board has therefore consistently recommended in its Section 102(b) reports that Congress adopt all notice-posting requirements that exist under the Federal antidiscrimination, anti-harassment, and other workplace rights laws covered under the CAA. Through permanent postings, current and new employees about their rights regarding their location, employee turnover, or other changes in the workplace. The notice also serves as a reminder about their responsibilities and the legal ramifications of violating the law. They are also a visible commitment by Congress to the workplace protections afforded under the CAA. The Reform Act now requires that employing offices post and keep posted in conspicuous places on their premises the notices provided by the Board’s recommendation that this period be eliminated from the statute. The Reform Act thus ensures that unpaid interns, fellows, and detailers are covered by the CAA.

Extending Coverage to Library of Congress Employees

Prior to 2018, only certain provisions of the CAA applied to employees of the Library of Congress (LOC). Congress therefore expressed its support for proposals to amend the CAA to include the LOC within the definition of ‘employing office,’ thereby extending CAA to LOC employees that law provides. The 2018 omnibus spending bill amended the CAA to bring the LOC and its employees within the LOC’s (then OOC’s) jurisdiction. Patsy Gillamm conveyed the Board’s view that, although counseling need not remain mandatory under the CAA, the CAA should not be amended in such a manner as to eliminate the availability of counseling for employees who voluntarily seek confidential assistance from our office. Under the new procedures set forth in the CAA Reform Act, counseling will no longer be mandatory. Rather, the CAA Reform Act provides for the optional services of a confidential advisor—an attorney who can, among other things, provide information to confidential employees, on a confidential basis, about their rights under the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1402(a)(3).

Name Change

As stated above, the CAA presently includes the LOC as an ‘employing office’ for all purposes. The Reform Act renamed the ‘Office of Compliance’ as the ‘Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.’ This name change notifiesetten employees that the Office is tasked with protecting their workplace rights through its program of dispute resolution, education, and enforcement. As the Office is committed to the mission of advancing workplace rights, safety and health, and accessibility for workers and visitors on Capitol Hill, as envisioned in the CAA and the CAA Reform Act.

Extending Coverage to Interns, Fellows, and Detailers

The Board also has consistently recommended in its Section 102(b) Reports that Congress extend the coverage and protections of the anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-reprisal provisions of the CAA to interns, fellows, and detailers working in any employing office in the legislative branch, regardless of how or whether they are paid. The CAA Reform Act extends section 201(c) of the CAA which applies title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (outlawing discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin), the Rehabilitation Act, and title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—to apply the protections and remedies of those laws to interns, fellows, and former employees. ‘‘Unpaid staff’’ is defined in the Reform Act as ‘‘any staff member of an employing office who carries out official duties of the employing office but who is not paid by the employing office for carrying out such duties . . . including an intern, an individual detailed to an employing office, an individual participating in a fellowship program.’’ These laws apply to unpaid staff ‘‘in the same manner and to the same extent as are applicable to such a person in the context of being an employee of an employer covered by such law.’’ 201(d), 2 U.S.C §1311(d). The Reform Act thus ensures that unpaid interns, fellows, and detailers are covered by the CAA.

Conducting Mediation In its Section 102(b) report, the Board expressed its support for proposals to amend the CAA to include the LOC within the definition of ‘employing office,’ thereby extending CAA to LOC employees that law provides. The 2018 omnibus spending bill amended the CAA to bring the LOC and its employees within the LOC’s (then OOC’s) jurisdiction. Patsy Gillamm conveyed the Board’s view that, although counseling need not remain mandatory under the CAA, the CAA should not be amended in such a manner as to eliminate the availability of counseling for employees who voluntarily seek confidential assistance from our office. Under the new procedures set forth in the CAA Reform Act, counseling will no longer be mandatory. Rather, the CAA Reform Act provides for the optional services of a confidential advisor—an attorney who can, among other things, provide information to confidential employees, on a confidential basis, about their rights under the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1402(a)(3).

As with counseling, the Executive Director also conveyed to the Board the view supporting the elimination of mediation as a mandatory jurisdictional prerequisite to asserting claims under the CAA. The Board nonetheless recommended that mediation be maintained as a valuable option available to those parties who mutually seek to settle their dispute. The OCWR’s experience over many years has been that a large percentage of controversies were successfully resolved without formal adversarial proceedings, due in large part to its mediation processes. Many of those disputes have involved some litigation, which can be expensive, time consuming, and a drain on resources and workplace productivity. Mediation also grants both parties an opportunity to explore resolving the dispute themselves without having a result imposed upon them. Furthermore, OCWR mediators are highly skilled professionals who have the sensitivity, expertise, and flexibility to customize the mediation process to meet the concerns of the parties. In short, the effectiveness of mediation as a tool to resolve disputes cannot be understated. Under the CAA Reform Act, mediation still remains available, but it is optional. It is no longer a jurisdictional prerequisite to asserting claims under the CAA, and it will take place only if requested and only if both parties agree.

‘Cooling Off’ Period

As stated above, the CAA presently requires an employee to wait 30 days after mediation ends to pursue a formal administrative complaint or a lawsuit in a U.S. District Court. In her testimony before the CHA, Executive Director Grundmann conveyed the Board’s recommendation that this period be eliminated from the statute. The Reform Act appears to do so.

As the changes set forth in the Reform Act take effect, the Board will carefully monitor
their effectiveness and advise Congress of its findings in this regard. In this Report, we also highlight key recommendations that the Board has made in past Section 102(b) Reports that have not been implemented (see note 1). We continue to believe that the adoption of these recommendations, discussed below, will promote effective workplace in the legislative branch. The Board welcomes an opportunity to further discuss these recommendations and asks for careful consideration of the requests by the 116th Congress.

Sincerely,

BARBARA CHILDES WALLACE, Chair, Board of Directors.

Recommendations for the 116th Congress

Analysis of Pending FMLA Regulations:

On June 22, 2016, the Board of Directors adopted and transmitted to Congress for approval its regulations necessary for implementing the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) as amended by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. In accordance with theCAA, those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor, 29 C.F.R. Sec. 825.301 et seq. Congress was advised that those regulations established that FMLA workers’ rights were to be given the same weight as USERRA protections. The FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations apply to the legislative branch. When there is uncertainty or ambiguity regarding the applicability to the legislative branch, the Board makes clear through these regulations that the rights and protections are the same as the substantive regulations applying to the legislative branch. This knowledge will undoubtedly save taxpayers money by ensuring pre-construction reviews of construction projects for ADA compliance—rather than providing for only post-construction inspections and costly redos when the access is not adequate. Second, the regulations implement protections for all employees, including those with disabilities. The Board recommends that Congress approve the Board’s pending regulations as soon as possible.

Analysis of Pending ADA Regulations:

Public access to Capitol Hill and constituent access to district and state offices has been a hallmark of many congresses. The Board recommends that Congress approve the three sets of Board-adopted regulations implementing titles II and III of the ADA to Capitol Hill and the district offices. First, the Board’s ADA regulations implement attributes of the ADA regulations apply to the legislative branch. This knowledge will undoubtedly save taxpayers money by ensuring pre-construction reviews of construction projects for ADA compliance—rather than providing for only post-construction inspections and costly redos when the access is not adequate. Second, the regulations implement protections for all leased spaces must meet some basic accessibility requirements that apply to all federal facilities that are leased or constructed in the legislative branch. In this way, Congress will ensure access and employment status for persons with disabilities. Our efforts to improve access to the buildings and facilities on the campus are consistent with the primary purpose of the ADA regulations, which it adopted in February 2016. Congressional approval of those regulations would reaffirm its commitment to provide for public access to the visiting public to the Capitol Hill complex.

Analysis of Pending USERRA Regulations:

On December 3, 2008, the Board of Directors adopted USERRA regulations to apply to the legislative branch. Those regulations, transmitted to Congress over 10 years ago, should be immediately approved. They support our nation’s veterans by requiring continuous health insurance for deployed service members, and providing protections for the men and women of the service who have supported our country’s freedoms. The 114th Congress was particularly focused on issues concerning veteran employment. In this way, Congress will improve access and employment status for persons with disabilities. The Board recommends that Congress approve the Board’s adopted USERRA regulations as soon as possible.

The Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act, enacted in 2015, affords wounded warriors the flexibilities to receive medical care in order to transition to serving the nation in a new capacity. Specifically, new federal employees who are also disabled veterans with a 30% or more disability rating may receive 180 hours of “wounded warrior leave” during their first year in the federal workforce so that they may seek medical treatment for their service-connected injuries. The Act was passed as a way to show gratitude and deep appreciation for the hardship and sacrifices of veterans. Congress can lead by example by applying the USERRA law encompassed by the Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act, which passed in 2015, affords wounded warriors the Supreme Court precedent, and adding military caregiver leave. Adoption of these regulations would reduce uncertainty for both employing offices and employees and provide greater predictability in the congressional workplace. First, these FMLA regulations add the military leave provisions of the FMLA, enacted under the National Defense Authorization Acts (NDAA) for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010. Second, the Board adopted USERRA regulations which implement the FMLA in light of the DOL’s February 25, 2015 revised definition of “spouse” under the FMLA in the case of a provision that “employing offices in the legislative branch or the executive branch of the United States.” Although some employing offices in the legislative branch other than the Armed Services Committee have not adopted USERRA regulations which implement the FMLA in light of the DOL’s February 25, 2015 revised definition of “spouse” under the FMLA in the case of a provision that “employing offices in the legislative branch... apply to the legislative branch...” (in the case of a provision which “... apply to the legislative branch [of the CAA]” (in the case of a provision which “... apply to the legislative branch) as required by section 102(b)(3) of the CAA. (see note 3)

Consequently, when the FMLA was amended to add these additional rights and protections, it was not clear whether Congress intended that these additional rights and protections apply to the legislative branch or “include a statement of the reasons the provision does not apply to the legislative branch” (in the case of a provision which “... apply to the legislative branch) as required by section 102(b)(3) of the CAA. (see note 3).

The FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations apply to the legislative branch. This knowledge will undoubtedly save taxpayers money by ensuring pre-construction reviews of construction projects for ADA compliance—rather than providing for only post-construction inspections and costly redos when the access is not adequate. Second, the regulations implement protections for all employees, including those with disabilities. The Board recommends that Congress approve the Board’s pending regulations as soon as possible.

The FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was advised that those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations establish that FMLA workers’ rights are to be given the same weight as USERRA protections. The FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was advised that those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor. Congress was advised that those FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was advised that those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was advised that those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was advised that those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor. Congress was further advised that the FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave as FMLA. Congress was advised that those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor.
managers effectively implement the laws’ protections and benefits on behalf of the workforce.

**Prohibit Discharge of Employees Who Are or Have Been in Bankruptcy (11 U.S.C. § 525)**

Section 525(a) of title 11 of the U.S. Code provides that a “governmental unit” may not deny employment to, terminate the employment of, or discriminate against, an employee who is or has been a debtor under the bankruptcy statutes. This provision currently extends to the legislative branch. Reiterating the recommendations made in the 1996, 2000, 2006, and 2018 Section 102(b) reports, the Board advises that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to employing offices within the legislative branch.

**Prohibit Whistleblower Protections to the Legislative Branch**

Civil service law provides broad protection to whistleblowers in the executive branch to safeguard workers against reprisal for reporting violations of laws, rules, or regulations, gross mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety. In the private sector, whistleblowers also are often protected by provisions of specific federal laws. However, these provisions do not apply to the legislative branch.

**Provide Whistleblower Protections to the Legislative Branch**

Committee report language confirms that the OCWR is required to conduct safety and health inspections of covered employing offices at least once each Congress and in response to any request, and to provide to employees with technical assistance to comply with the OSHAAct’s requirements. But Congress and its agencies are still exempt from criminal requirements imposed upon American businesses. Under the CAA, employing offices in the legislative branch are not subject to investigatory subpoenas as private sector employers under the OSHAAct. Similarly, Congress exempted itself from the OSHAAct’s recordkeeping requirements pertaining to workplace injuries and illnesses that apply to the private sector. The Board recommends that legislative branch employing offices be subject to the investigatory subpoena provisions contained in OSHAAct §§8(b) and that legislative branch employing offices be required to keep records of workplace injuries and illnesses under OSHAAct §8(c). 29 U.S.C. 658(c).

**Adopt Recordkeeping Requirements Under Federal Workplace Rights Laws**

The Board, in several Section 102(b) reports, has recommended and continues to recommend that the CAA be amended to adopt recordkeeping requirements under Federal workplace rights laws, including title VII. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch keep records, there are no legal requirements under the CAA to do so.

**ENDNOTES**

1. The Board has long advocated for legislation granting the OCWR General Counsel the authority to investigate and prosecute complaints of discrimination, harassment, and reprisal in order to assist victims and to improve the adjudicatory process under the CAA. As discussed in this Report, the Reform Act establishes new procedures that are designed to promote the goals of these policy goals. Under these circumstances, the Board believes that the best course of action is to evaluate the efficacy of the new Reform Act procedures once they have been implemented before revisiting the issue of whether Congress should consider this investigatory and prosecutorial authority. Accordingly, this recommendation is not discussed further below.


**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows: 223.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 110th    | 2007 | A letter from the Acting Architect, Architect of the Capitol to the Chairmen of the Committees of the House on House Administration and the Committee of the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed in the Congressional Record.

224. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting biennial report on recordkeeping and inspections to the Congress, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1862, jointly to the Committee on House Administration and Education and Labor.

**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:

Mrs. TORRES of California: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 141. Resolution providing for consideration of the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, (Rept. 116–13). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RASKIN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 145. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for firearm purchases, and for providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee (Rept. 116–14). 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 subsequently referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HODGINS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DELAUGRO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ZELIKIN, Mrs. DINOKELL, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GONZALEZ-COLLON of Puerto Rico, Mr. KATKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. HIMES, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESROO, Mr. LEUCKS, Ms. BRANN of Washington, Mrs. WARREN COLEMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. BLUNT ROCKETT, Mrs. PASCHELL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. JACKSON-ELISI, Mr. S. HENRY, Mr. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GRALIVA, Mr. SHORES, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DELAUGRO, Ms. CORTEZ, Mrs. LOWERY, Ms. FALLONE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. M. C. F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COOK, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WILD, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. GONZALEZ H有时, Mr. KOWSKY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAYES, Ms. TAKANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARRAJAL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MALONEY of California, Mr. VAN DEER, Mr. REED, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KEANNA, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. KIRK-PATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DIAZ, Ms. NGUSSIE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BRYER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COLE, Ms. REED of California, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 1327. A bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 1328. A bill to establish the Office of Internet Connectivity and Growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 1329. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for medical assistance under Medicaid for inmates during the 60-day period preceding release from public institution; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 1332. A bill to address the high costs of health care services, prescription drugs, and health insurance coverage in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Reform; for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CRAIG (for herself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 1331. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to nonpoint source management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to create a buffer in between oil and gas drilling operations and homes, businesses, and other structures.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 1334. A bill to provide grants for projects to acquire land and water for parks and other outdoor recreation purposes and to develop new or renovate existing outdoor recreation facilities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 1334. A bill to provide grants for projects to acquire land and water for parks and other outdoor recreation purposes and to develop new or renovate existing outdoor recreation facilities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 1335. A bill to provide that the production safety systems rule and the well control rule in section 250 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, shall have the same force and effect as if such rules had been enacted by an Act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1336. A bill to require the Federal Government to provide mental health services to each child who has been separated from one or more parent as a result of implementation of the Trump Administration's zero tolerance policy at the United States border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELAUR, Mr. GUTRUNK, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. LIWIS, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LEDUE of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. HARRIS of California, Mr. CARR, Mr. WRIGHT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1337. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to report on chemicals related to pesticides that may affect pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 1338. A bill to provide for automatic continuing appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SENSENIBRENNER, Mr. STEUERE, Mr. CLEINE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BACON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LING, Mr. ESTES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. MOOLENAR, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MURDOCH, Mr. RUPP, Mr. BROWN of Illinois, Mr. BUD, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 1339. A bill to enhance penalties for theft of a firearm from a Federal firearms licensee, to establish a Mass Violence Prevention Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 1340. A bill to designate the Quindaro Townsite in Kansas City, Kansas, as a National Commemorative Site; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING of Missouri, Mr. MURCHEST of Tennessee, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1341. A bill to designate the Mental Health Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Facility Expansion of the Department of Veterans Affairs Alvin C. York Medical Center in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, as the "Sergeant John Toombs Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Facility"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DINELLE (for herself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 1342. A bill to authorize the Money Follows the Person Preadmission Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINELLE (for herself and Mr. UPSCH:

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove an institutional bias by making permanent the prohibition against aspousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGIE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KARTWHIT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CUMINGS, Ms. DE LAURO, Mr. DEBACUINHER, Mr. GHJALVA, Mr. HILL of New York, Mr. CARR, Mr. RAIIN, Mr. KRANH, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LANGIVIN):

H.R. 1344. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COLE, Mr. GUALYA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WILDE):

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend titles XVI, XVII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to remove limitations on Medicaid, Medicare, SSI, and CHIP benefits for persons in custody pending disposition of charges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. LASRON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENNAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SRAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEeks, Mr. NORTON, Mr. PELMUTTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITTS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILD, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an option for individuals who are ages 50 to 64 to buy into Medicare, to provide for health insurance market stabilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1347. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SPEIZER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DREIBENE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MCDONNAD, Mr. BRENNAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENTAUR, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SCHE MANDEY, Mr. BURLASSA, Mr. HASTIN:

H.R. 1348. A bill to require the publication of the name of any person pardoned by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LHOOOD (for himself and Ms. DelO:

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce the reporting compliance burdens in the beauty service industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MOORE of New Mexico, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RAUL K. KINZEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 1350. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate plans throughout the United States, for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Ms. COLOMBO, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to victims of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1352. A bill to provide for parity for Guam and the United States Virgin Islands under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to apply the same apportionment formula to territories and the District of Columbia as is applied to States with respect to available for State purposes from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 1354. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself), Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHN son of Ohio, Mr. FASCHBLL, Mrs. RUTT, Mr. CESARIA of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JOHN son of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MEeks, Ms. FUDOE, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SKEWELL of Alabama, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1355. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Simeon Booker in recognition of his achievements in the field of journalism, including his reporting during the Civil Rights movement and his social and political commentary; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KING of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 49. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pursuant to which Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the number of persons in each State who are citizens of the United States, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 133. A resolution electing the Clerk of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PETTERS, Mr. LAM-BOIN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOFFOREN, Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BROWNSLYE of California, Mr. FOCAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WASSERMAN-SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHN son of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CINNERS, Mrs. WATSON-COLEMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MCBARTY, Mr. INFELSI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 146. A resolution recognizing the seriousness of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) and expressing support for the designation of March 3, 2019, as World Polycystic Ovary Syndrome Day;

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Res. 147. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of September 2019 as Polycystic Ovary Syndrome Awareness Month;

By Mrs. PLASKETT (for herself, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PETTERS, Mr. LAM-BOIN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOFFOREN, Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BROWNSLYE of California, Mr. FOCAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WASSERMAN-SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHN son of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CINNERS, Mrs. WATSON-COLEMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MCBARTY, Mr. INFELSI, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 148. A resolution recognizing the seriousness of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) and expressing support for the designation of the month of September 2019 as "PCOS Awareness Month";

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H. Res. 149. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 3, 2019, as World Polycystic Ovary Syndrome Day;

By Mrs. HJLUMENAUER:

H. Res. 137. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H. Res. 138. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H. Res. 140. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. DES-JARLAIS:

H. Res. 9. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. Amada B. MALONEY of New York:

H. Res. 127. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TONKO:

H. Res. 119. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 129. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BUCK:

H. Res. 130. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT: H.R. 1344. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS: H.R. 1355. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: Congress has the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KING: H.R. 1356. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XI, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in H.J. Res. 46 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.
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.
Our Father in Heaven, we honor Your Name. Strengthen our lawmakers so that they will not become weary in doing what is right. Continue to use them to accomplish Your purposes on Earth. Give them the wisdom to help lift burdens and to bring hope to those on life’s margins.
Lord, renew the strength of our Senators, inspiring them to bring light to darkness and hope to despair. Lengthen their vision that they may see beyond today and make decisions that will have an impact for eternity.
And Lord, today, we remember the life and legacy of our first President, George Washington.
We pray in Your sacred 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

READING OF WASHINGTON’S FARWELL ADDRESS
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as amended by the order of February 6, 2019, the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER, will now read Washington’s Farewell Address.
Mrs. FISCHER, at the rostrum, read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country—and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence which it has supported me and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and
persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise and as an instructive example in our annals that, under circumstances in which the passion to confound every line of direction were liable to mislead, amongst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has characterized the spirit to which the cause of liberty, the constitution of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful and so prudent a dispensation of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude, urge me on an occasion like the present to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. The means by which the safety and happiness of the individual are secured, will be the subject of discourse. But these considerations, however powerful they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the Union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South in the same intercourse, benefitting by the agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the sea-men of the North, it finds its particular navigation and navigation widely spread and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The West, in its intercourse with the East, supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenancy by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionally greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value! they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflicting neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalships alone would be sufficiently to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is a virtue of the Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculations in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—northern and southern—Atlantic and western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local
interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson. They have seen in the negotiation by the executive—and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate—of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states unfriendly to their interests in regard to the tribute on foreign manufactures. All obstructions to the execution of the laws, and all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize factions; to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests. However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are, in the course of time and things, to become potent which canning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to just dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily dis- countenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institu- tions. The obvious standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country, that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypotheses and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypotheses and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so unstable from our nature, having its root in the channel of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government and to serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true—and in governments of a monarchical cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is indispens- able; liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guard- ian. It is indeed little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property. It has already estimated to you the danger and peril in the state, with par- ticular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehen- sive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human heart. It exists and does shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dis- sension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of such prevailing factions, more able or fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which neverthe- less not at no distant day) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it. It serves always to distract the pub- lic councils and enfeeble the public admin- istration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments oc- casionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated ac- cess to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country is subjected to the policy and will of another.
exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of our masters, therefore, pronounces to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness. These firmer props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious statesman, is indispensable. In permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of public defense. As avenues to foreign influence innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to produce arts of sedition or to the arts of seduction, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most powerful levers for propelling in the direction of despotism. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, however much it may be favored by the foreign Ministers, is injurious as well to the public opinion as to the public interest, since it leads to the exportation of parts of our public money.

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulge towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each in turn to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes and absurd pretenses to effect that which one party would willingly and indifferently allow the other to do, which another party would equally with the public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater expense; and avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government, to the payment of revenue, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations. Enter into no new engagement or make any permanent联盟, which ungenerously throwing upon posterity which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government, to the payment of revenue, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Promote then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public
The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us start.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore we must be wise enough not to substitute our preferences for hers. But even our nations, are recommended by policy, extraordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance, and lightly hazard the giving us provocation; as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rival-ship, interest, honor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold no less applies to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy—I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on arespectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary vicissitudes. Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed—in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them—conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another, that it is important of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character—that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being regarded and treated for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will produce any considerable change of passions or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the imposts of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for our welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 23d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfuenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case—was bound in duty and interest to take—a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am conscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I hope they may be, I believe, objects of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.
UNITED STATES, 19th September 1796.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.
The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLOODING IN KENTUCKY
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first, today I would like to turn attention to the severe weather that is afflicting communities throughout my home State.

Nearly 20 counties from one end of this State to the other have declared states of emergency in response to historically high water levels. Just moments ago, Governor Matt Bevin put
the entire Commonwealth under a state of emergency to mobilize resources where they are needed most. Many families are evacuating toward safety. Approximately 2,400 people in eastern and southern Kentucky are still without power. Mudslides have closed some roads. Bridges are flooded, and emergency personnel have been deployed to rescue stranded drivers and others in danger.

I want to express my gratitude to the first responders working around the clock keeping our communities safe. It may be a difficult road to recovery, but Kentuckians are already pitchin in to help their neighbors in need.

My staff and I are ready to work with emergency management officials and will continue to monitor the situation closely.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, this week the Senate will resume our work in the personnel business by considering yet another of President Trump's qualified judicial nominees.

Mr. Miller has been chosen to sit on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and one look at his legal career to this point says he is well prepared to do so.

Mr. Miller is a graduate of Harvard and the University of Chicago, where he served on the Law Review editorial staff. He has held prominent clerkships on both the DC Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court. His record of public service at the Justice Department and in private practice reflects a legal mind of the highest caliber.

I hope each of my colleagues will join me in voting to advance the first circuit court nominee of this new Congress. That will be 31 since President Trump took office. But first, in just a few hours, the Senate will vote on advancing a straightforward piece of legislation to protect newborn babies. This legislation is simple. It would simply require that medical professionals give the same standard of care and medical treatment to newborn babies who have survived an attempted abortion as any other newborn baby would receive in any other circumstance. It isn’t about new restrictions on abortion. It isn’t about changing the options available to women. It is just about recognizing that a newborn baby is a newborn baby, period.

This bill would make clear that in the year 2019, in the United States of America, medical professionals on hand when a baby is born alive have a legal duty to maintain their basic ethical and professional responsibilities to that newborn. It would make sure our laws reflect the fact that the human rights of newborn boys and girls are innate; they don’t come and go based on the circumstances surrounding their birth. Whatever the circumstances, if that medical professional comes face-to-face with a baby who has been born alive, they are looking at a human being with human rights, period.

To be frank, it makes me uneasy that such a basic statement seems to be generating actual disagreement. Can the extreme, far-left politics surrounding abortion really have come this far? Are we really supposed to think that it is normal that there are now two sides debating whether newborn, living babies deserve medical attention?

We already know that many of our Democratic colleagues want the United States to remain one of seven nations in the world that permit elective abortions after 20 weeks—seven countries, including North Korea, China, and the United States of America. But now it seems the far left wants to push the envelope even further. Apart from the entire abortion debate, they now seem to be suggesting that newborn babies’ right to life may be contingent—on the circumstances surrounding their birth. Well, evidently, the far left is no longer convinced that all babies are created equal, but the rest of us are still pretty fond of that principle.

My colleagues across the aisle need to decide where they will take their cues on these moral questions. On the one hand, there are a few extreme voices who have decided that some newborn lives are more disposable than others. On the other side is the entire rest of the country.

I would urge my colleagues: Let’s listen to the voices of the American people. Let’s reaffirm that when we say every life is created equal, we actually mean it. Let’s vote to advance the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act later today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the day be suspended in order to advance the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

The clerk then called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Ernst). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before Congress went out of session 2 weeks ago, President Trump announced that he was declaring a national emergency to redirect funds to the construction of a border wall. It was a lawless act, a gross abuse of power, and an attempt by the President to distract from the fact that he broke his core promise to have Mexico pay for the wall.

Let me give a few reasons why the President’s emergency is so wrong.

First, there is no evidence of an emergency at the border. Illegal border crossings have been declining for 20 years. Just this morning, a group of 58 former senior national security figures, including Chuck Hagel and Madeleine Albright, released a statement saying: ‘‘Unprecedented no plausible assessment of the evidence is there a national emergency today that entitles the president to tap into funds appropriated for other purposes to build a wall at the southern border.’’

I ask unanimous consent that the full statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT DECLARATION OF FORMER UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

We, the undersigned, declare as follows:

1. We are former officials in the U.S. government who have worked on national security and homeland security issues from the White House as well as agencies across the Executive Branch. We have held leadership roles in administrations of both major political parties, and collectively we have devoted a great many decades to protecting the security of the United States. We have held the highest security clearances, and we have participated in the highest levels of policy deliberations on a broad range of issues. These include: immigration, border security, counterterrorism, military operations, and our nation’s relationships with other countries, including threats from our borders.

a. Madeleine K. Albright served as Secretary of State from 1997 to 2001. A refugee and naturalized American citizen, she served as Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1993 to 1997. She has also been a member of the Central Intelligence Agency External Advisory Board since 2009 and of the Defense Policy Board since 2011, in which capacities she has received assessments of threats facing the United States.

b. Madeleine K. Albright served as Secretary of State from 1997 to 2001. A refugee and naturalized American citizen, she served as Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1993 to 1997. She has also been a member of the Central Intelligence Agency External Advisory Board since 2009 and of the Defense Policy Board since 2011, in which capacities she has received assessments of threats facing the United States.

c. John G. R. Nicholas Burns served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2005 to 2009. He previously served as Senior Associate Coordinator and Legal Adviser to the National Security Council from 2001 to 2005.

d. Daniel Benjamin served as Ambassador-at-Large for Counterterrorism at the U.S. Department of State from 2009 to 2012.

e. Antony Blinken served as Deputy Secretary of State from 2013 to 2015. He previously served as Deputy National Security Advisor to the President from 2013 to 2015.

f. John S. Brennan served as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2013 to 2017. He previously served as Deputy National Security Advisor for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism and Assistant to the President from 2009 to 2013.

g. R. Nicholas Burns served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2005 to 2009. He previously served as U.S. Ambassador to NATO and as U.S. Ambassador to Greece.

h. William J. Burns served as Deputy Secretary of State from 2015 to 2017. He previously served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2008 to 2011, as U.S. Ambassador to Russia from 2005 to 2008, as Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs from 2001 to 2005, and as U.S. Ambassador to Jordan from 1998 to 2001.
l. James Clapper served as U.S. Director of National Intelligence from 2010 to 2017.
l. David S. Cohen served as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence from 2011 to 2015, and as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2015 to 2017.
l. Thomas Donilon served as National Security Advisor to the President from 2010 to 2013.
l. Jen Easterly served as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Cybersecurity from 2013 to 2016.
l. Nancy Ely-Raphael served as Senior Adviser to the Secretary of State and Director of the Office of International Narcotics and Criminal Trafficking in Persons from 2001 to 2003. She previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to Slovenia from 1998 to 2001.
l. Jen Psaki served as Special Adviser for Western Hemisphere Affairs to the Vice President from 2015 to 2017, and as Senior Advisor for Western Hemisphere Affairs at the U.S. Department of State from 2010 to 2015.
l. John D. Feeley served as U.S. Ambassador to Panama from 2015 to 2018. He served as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Western Hemisphere Affairs at the U.S. Department of State from 2012 to 2015.
l. Daniel F. Feldman served as Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan at the U.S. Department of State from 2014 to 2015.
l. Jonathan Fainer served as Chief of Staff to the Secretary of State from 2015 to 2017, and Director of the Policy Planning Staff at the U.S. Department of State from 2016 to 2017.
l. Jendayi Frazer served as Special Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2005 to 2009. She served as U.S. Ambassador to South Africa from 2004 to 2006.
l. Suzy George served as Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff of the National Security Council from 2014 to 2017.
l. Phil Gordon served as Special Assistant to the President and White House Coordinator for the Middle East, North Africa and the Gulf from 2013 to 2015, and Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs from 2009 to 2013.
l. Chuck Hagel served as Secretary of Defense from 2013 to 2015, and previously served as Co-Chairman of the President’s Intelligence Advisory Board. From 1997 to 2009, he served as U.S. Senator for Nebraska, and as a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations and Intelligence Committees.
l. Gil Kerlikowske served as Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection from 2014 to 2017. He previously served as Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy from 2009 to 2014.
l. John F. Kerry was appointed as Special Representative for the President from 2013 to 2017.
l. Prem Kamar served as Senior Director for Afghanistan and the U.S. and Northern Africa at the National Security Council from 2013 to 2015.
l. John E. McLaughlin served as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2004 to 2014. His duties included briefing President-elect Bill Clinton and President George W. Bush.
l. Janet Napolitano served as Secretary of Homeland Security from 2009 to 2013. She served as Governor of Arizona from 2003 to 2009.
l. James C. Sullivan served as Special Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs from 2015 to 2017. He served in the U.S. Department of State from 1994 to 2001, including as Principal Deputy Director of Policy Planning and as Special Presidential Envoy for the Balkans.
l. Matthew G. Olsen served as Director of the National Counterterrorism Center from 2011 to 2014.
l. Leon E. Panetta served as Secretary of Defense from 2011 to 2013. From 2009 to 2011, he served as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.
l. Anne W. Patterson served as Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs from 2013 to 2017. Previously, she served as the U.S. Ambassador to Egypt from 2011 to 2013, as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs from 2009 to 2011.
l. Thomas R. Pickering served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 1997 to 2000, as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 1997 to 2000, as Special Representative to the Secretary of State as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, and as the U.S. Ambassador to Qatar from 2014 to 2017.
l. Amy Pope served as Deputy Homeland Security Advisor and Deputy Assistant to the President from 2015 to 2017.
l. Samantha J. Power served as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 2013 to 2017. From 2009 to 2013, she served as Senior Director for Multilateral and Human Rights at the National Security Council.
l. Jake Sullivan served as National Security Advisor to the Vice President from 2013 to 2014. He previously served as Director of Policy Planning at the U.S. Department of State from 2011 to 2013.
l. Jake Sullivan served as Special Deputy Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2009 to 2011. He previously served as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Inter-African Affairs at the National Security Council from 1999 to 2000, and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Mexican Affairs from 1994 to 1996.
l. Wendy R. Sherman served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2010 to 2013.
l. Vikram Singh served as Deputy Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan from 2010 to 2011 and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Southeast Asia from 2012 to 2014.
l. Dana Shell Smith served as U.S. Ambassador to Qatar from 2017 to 2019. Previously, she served as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs.
l. Jeffrey H. Smith served as General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency from 1995 to 1996. He previously served as General Counsel of the Senate Armed Services Committee.
l. Lisa O. Monaco served as Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of African Affairs from 2013 to 2017. She previously served as U.S. Ambassador to Liberia and Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration from 2001 to 2006.
l. Arturo A. Valenzuela served as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs from 2009 to 2011. He previously served as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Inter-American Affairs at the National Security Council from 1999 to 2000, and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Mexican Affairs from 1994 to 1996.
l. On February 15, 2019, the President declared a “national emergency” for the purpose of diverting appropriated funds from previously designated uses to build a wall along the southern border. We are aware of no emergency that remotely justifies such a step. The President’s actions are at odds with the overwhelming evidence in the public record, including the government’s own data and estimates. We have lived and worked through national emergencies, and we support the President’s power to mobilize the Executive Branch to respond quickly in genuine national emergencies. But under no plausible assessment of the evidence is there a national emergency today that entitles the President to tap into funds appropriated for other purposes to build a wall at the southern border. To our knowledge, the President’s assertion of a national emergency is unprecedented, in that he seeks to address a situation: (1) that has been enduring, rather than one that has arisen suddenly; (2) that in fact has improved over time rather than deteriorated; (3) that requires billions of dollars in funds in the face of clear congressional intent to the contrary; and (4)
with assertions that are rebutted not just by the public record, but by his agencies’ own official data, documents, and statements.

3. Illegal border crossings are near forty-year lows. There is no evidence of a sudden or emergency increase in the number of people seeking to cross the southern border. A review of data from the Department of Homeland Security shows that in 2018, the number of border crossings was lower than at any time in the past five years. The data, the numbers of apprehensions and undetected illegal border crossings at the southern border are near forty-year lows. Although there has been an increase in the number of apprehensions in 2019, this increase is not in the context of a national emergency.

4. There is no documented terrorist or national security emergency at the southern border. There is no reason to believe that there is a threat of terrorism at the southern border that necessitates a repurposing of appropriations to build a border wall.

a. The administration’s own most recent Countering Violent Extremism Report on Terrorism, released only five months ago, found that “there was no credible evidence indicating that international terrorist groups have established bases in the United States, or worked with Mexican cartels, or sent operatives via Mexico into the United States.” Since 1975, there has been only one reported incident in which immigrants who had crossed the southern border illegally attempted to commit a terrorist act. That incident occurred more than two decades ago, and involved three brothers from Macedonia who had been brought into the United States as children more than twenty years earlier.

b. Although the White House has claimed, as an example of a border wall’s effectiveness, that only a small fraction of those who cross the border from Mexico into the United States are caught, the data are problematic. For example, the administration has used a “merging” policy to turn away families fleeing extreme violence and persecution in their home countries, forcing them to wait indefinitely at the border to present their asylum cases, and has adopted a number of other punitive measures to restrict those seeking asylum at the southern border. These actions have especially strained our diplomatic relations with our neighbors to the south, at a moment when we need their help to address a range of Western Hemisphere concerns.

c. Just last month, when asked what the military is doing at the border that couldn’t be done by the Department of Homeland Security if it had the funding for it, a top-level defense official responded, “[n]one of the activities that are being done at the southern border require use of the armed forces.” These individuals do not present a threat that would need to be countered with military force.

d. The situation at the border does not require the use of the armed forces, and a wall is unnecessary and unhelpful.

5. There is no emergency related to violent crime at the southern border. Nor can the administration justify its actions on the grounds that the incidence of violent crime on the southern border constitutes a national emergency. Factual evidence consistently shows that unauthorized immigrants have no special proclivity to engage in criminal activity.

6. There is no human or drug trafficking emergency that can be addressed by a wall at the southern border.

a. The administration’s suggestion that recent crime trends curtail the construction of roads, and renovation of on-base housing. And the proclamation will embolden adversaries to oppose us.

b. Additionally, the administration’s unilateral, provocative actions are heightening tensions with our neighbors to the south, at a moment when we need their help to address the growing tensions with Venezuela. Additionally, the proclamation could well lead to the degradation of the natural environment in a manner that could only contribute to long-term socioeconomic and security challenges.

7. The admission of the President’s proclamation is false. In a briefing before the Senate Intelligence Committee on February 5, 2019, the director of national intelligence testified that the President has made no compelling reason or justification for his decision to reinstate a national emergency.

8. The admission of the President’s proclamation is false. In a briefing before the Senate Intelligence Committee on February 5, 2019, the director of national intelligence testified that the President has made no compelling reason or justification for his decision to reinstate a national emergency.
January 29, 2019, less than one month before the Presidential Proclamation, the Directors of the CIA, DNI, FBI, and NSA testified about numerous serious current threats to U.S. soil but none of the officials identified a security crisis at the U.S.-Mexico border. In a briefing before the House Armed Services Committee the next day, Pentagon officials acknowledged that the 2018 National Defense Strategy does not identify the southern border as a security threat. Leading legislators with access to classified information and the President’s own statements have strongly suggested, if not confirmed, that there is no evidence supporting the administration’s claim of an emergency. And it is reported that the President made the decision to circumvent the provisions process and reprogram money without the Acting Secretary of Defense having even started to consider where the funds might come from, suggesting an absence of consultation and internal deliberations that in our experience are necessary and expected before taking a decision of this magnitude.

11. For all of the foregoing reasons, in our professional opinion, there is no factual basis for the declaration of a national emergency for the purpose of circumventing the appropriations process and reprogramming billions of dollars in funding to construct a wall at the southern border, as directed by the Presidential Proclamation of February 15, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

Signatures:

Madeleine K. Albright, Jeremy B. Bash,
John B. Bellinger III, Daniel Benjamin,
Antony Blinken, John O. Brennan, R. Nicho-
las Burns, William J. Burns, Johnnie Car-
son, James Clapper.

David S. Cohen, Eliot A. Cohen, Ryan
Crocketer, Thomas Donilon, Jen Easterly,
Nancy Ely-Raphel, Daniel P. Eriksen, John
D. Feasley, Daniel F. Feldman, Jonathan
Finger.

Jenifya Frazier, Suzy George, Phil Gordon,
Chuck Hagel, Avril D. Haines, Luke Hartig,
Heather A. Higgensbottom, Roberta Jacobson,
Gil Kerlikowske, John F. Kerry.

Prem Kumar, John E. McLaughlin,
Lisa O. Monaco, Janet Napolitano, James D. Nealon,
James C. O’Brien, Matthew G. Olsen, Leon E.
Panetta, Anne W. Patterson, Thomas R.
Picking.

Amy Pope, Samantha J. Power, Jeffrey
Prescott, Nicholas Rasmussen, Alan Charles
Raul, Dan Restrepo, Susan E. Rice, Anne C.
Richard, Eric P. Schwartz, Andrew J. Sha-
pio.

Wendy R. Sherman, Vikram Singh, Dana
Shell Smith, Jeffrey H. Smith, Jake Sul-
ivan, Strobe Talbott, Linda Thomas-Green-
field, Arturo A. Valenzuela.

Mr. SCHUMER. Even the President himself, who is now declaring an emergency, halfway through his meandering speech proclaiming the emergency, said: “I didn’t need to do this... but I’d rather do it [build the wall] much faster.”

If there was ever a statement that says this is not an emergency, that is it. He said he didn’t need to do this. So, my colleagues, my dear colleagues, if we are to hold the President, on a whim, declare emergencies just because he or she can’t get their way in the Congress, we have fundamentally changed the building blocks, these strong, proud building blocks that the Founding Fathers put into place.

Second, the President’s emergency declaration could cannibalize funding from worthy projects all over the country. We don’t even know yet which projects he is planning to take the funds from. I ask my colleagues to think about that—what important initiatives in your State are on the Trump chopping block? What military projects are at stake? Is it fund to fund the border wall Congress rejected?

Third, and I made this point a little bit at the beginning, but it bears repeating. Far and away most importantly, the President’s emergency declaration is a fundamental distortion of our constitutional order. The Constitution gives Congress the power of the purse, not the President, and congressional intent on the border wall is clear. The President’s wall has been before Congress several times, and not once has it garnered enough votes to merit consideration. In some cases it was with Republican votes. The President said that it was just the Demo-
crats who blocked it. That is not true. There were Republican votes when the wall was on the floor for voting as well.

As the great New Yorker, Justice Jackson from Jamestown, NY, ob-
erved, the President’s legal authority in the realm of emergencies is at its very weakest when it goes against the expressed will of Congress. In case the will of Congress was not already clear, soon it will be made so. The obvious remedy for President Trump’s outrageous and lawless declaration is for Congress to vote to terminate the state of emergency. The House will vote on such a resolution tomorrow, and the Senate will soon follow suit.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle fashion themselves sup-
porters of the military, defenders of property rights, and stewards of the Constitution, as do Democrats. This vote on the resolution to terminate the state of emergency will test our fidelity to those principles.

Congress come together to reject in a bipartisan fashion—we have come together before in bipartisan ways. If ever there were one moment that cries out for bipartisan rejection of an overreach of power, this is it. We should reject this naked power grab, this defacement of constitutional balance of powers, for what seem to be largely political purposes.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the President is on his way to Thailand for a second summit with Chairman Kim of North Korea. It is in all of our interests for the President to achieve a diplomatic resolution with North Korea that achieves a stable peace and the complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Pen-
insula. Failing that, the Congress must continue to pressure a regime that permits gross humanitarian abuses and epidemic repression to the most repressive governments on the globe.

We cannot tolerate the President making concessions without, in ex-
change, receiving verifiable, enduring, and concrete commitments from North Korea to denuclearize.

President Trump’s first summit with Chairman Kim granted his regime the international legitimacy and accept-
ance that Kim has long craved while undermining our policy of maximum pressure and sanctions, seemingly so the President could have a photo op and make a speech.

On the results of that meeting were disappointing. The Presi-
dent claimed, bizarrely and wildly, that North Korea is “no longer a nu-
clear threat” right after the meeting, while the U.S. intelligence community has continually testified before Con-
gress that North Korea has not been denuclearizing and appears unlikely to give up its nuclear weapons. So how can the President say it is no longer a nuclear threat when the same threat existed when he threatened North Korea earlier? When he seemed to make nice to President Kim? Meanwhile, the President suspended joint military readiness drills with the South Koreans—drills we have been conducting for 60 years for the safety of East Asia.

No one wants to see a repeat of the same movie. No one wants another summit that is more about photo ops and optics than progress. We are all rooting for diplomacy to succeed, but the President can’t be too naive or too eager to reach a deal that gives him the photo op again but that doesn’t achieve the complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in a similar vein, on China, President Trump announced he would be delaying the imposition of higher tariffs on March 1, in the hopes of coming to a larger trade agreement. This is all well and good if the Trump administration ultimately achieves a strong deal that makes progress on serious trade policies. But we are not there yet, and my message to President Trump is don’t back down.

The President has shown the right in-
stincts on China many times. I give him credit for that. I have praised him publicly for that, but at other times, I believe his eagerness for the appearance of accomplishment gets the best of him. Recent history has taught us that when President Trump makes unilateral concessions to China—as he did when he interfered in the sanctions against ZTE—China does very little for us in return.

President Trump must not make the same mistake again by inter-
ferring in the U.S. criminal charges brought against Huawei or otherwise decreasing our leverage, until and un-
less China makes meaningful, enforce-
able, and verifiable agreements to end its theft of American intellectual prop-
erty and other trade abuses.

Hopefully, that is where the negotia-
tions are headed. If the President does
a good job. I will be the first to praise him. If he backs off or takes some temporary measure in decreasing the balance of trade but doesn’t change China’s structural rapaciousness against the United States and our intellectual property and our industrial know-how, he will be criticized by me and many others on both sides of the aisle.

S. 311

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, a word on today’s vote on women’s reproductive rights: The bill the Senate will vote on shortly is carefully crafted to target, intimidate, and shut down reproductive healthcare providers. Doctors across this country—Democratic doctors, Republican doctors—are lining up against the bill because it would impose requirements on what type of care doctors must provide in certain circumstances, even if that care is ineffective, contradictory to medical evidence, and against the family’s wishes.

My Republican colleagues have said some incendiary things about opposing this bill. Let me be very clear. Many of these claims are false. It has always been illegal to harm a newborn infant. This vote has nothing—nothing—to do with that. Read the language. We are talking about situations when expectant parents tragically learn their pregnancy is no longer viable, and there is a fatal diagnosis. What happens in those circumstances should be decided between a woman, her family, her minister, priest, rabbi, imam, and her doctor.

It makes no sense for Washington politicians who know nothing about individual circumstances to say they know better than the doctors or the patients and their families. The bill is solely meant to intimidate doctors and restrict patients’ access to care and has nothing—nothing—to do with the children.

Last Friday, the administration announced it was imposing a gag rule on anyone who is providing reproductive healthcare and putting the victims’ compensation fund on sure footing for the foreseeable future.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, to sign on and support this bill. It is important for the foreseeable future.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 311, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 311, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSPE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5:30 p.m. today, including quorum calls, be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

Mr. SASSPE. Madam President, I just listened to the senior Senator from New York and my friend from the gym and the minority leader—deliver some summaries of what he said was in the bill before us, and he implored this body and implored the people watching on C-SPAN to read the bill, stating they would have more of these terrible things in the bill.

I see the minority leader has to leave the floor now, but, humbly, I would urge him to come back and show us where any of what he just said is in this bill. What he said wasn’t true.

I rise today for a simple purpose. I want to ask each and every one of our colleagues whether we are OK with infanticide. This language is sharp, and what we are talking about here today.

Infanticide is what the abortion survivors—born-alive abortion survivors Protection Act is actually about.

Are we a country that protects babies who are alive, born outside the womb after having survived a botched abortion? That is what this is about.

Are we a country that says it is OK to actively allow that baby to die, which is the current position of Federal law? That is the question before us, plain and simple.

Here are the facts. We know that some babies, especially late in gestation, survive attempted abortions. We know, too, that some of these babies are left to die—left to die. No further protections exist today to shield them from this ugly fate, and only some States have protections on their books. The Senate has seen in our course over the last month and a half a few States moving in different ways to undo protections that some of these babies have had at the State level.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is the bill we are discussing. It takes us to a place where any of what he just said is in this bill. Are we a country that says it is OK to pro-life—unapologetically pro-life—but this bill is not about anything that limits abortion. This bill doesn’t have anything to do with Roe v. Wade. This bill is about something else. What this bill does is to try to secure basic rights, equal rights for babies who are born and are outside the womb. That is what we are talking about.

Over the course of the next hour, as this is debated on the floor, people are going to say a whole bunch of other things. I would ask them to please bring the text of the bill to the floor when they do it and show us whether there is anything about limiting abortion in this bill.

This bill is exclusively about protecting babies who have already been born and are outside of the womb. Every baby deserves a fighting chance, whether that 24-week-old baby, fighting for air and fighting for life, having just taken her first breaths, is at an abortion clinic where she survived a botched abortion or she is in a delivery room at the local hospital. Both of those babies are equally deserving of care, protection, and humane treatment. Our job is to make sure both of these human beings as babies because they are babies. They have been born, and they are outside of the womb.
This really should not be controversial. In fact, my colleagues actually talk this way all of the time. This place feels like about one-third of the people here are currently running for President, so I would like to quote a few of them over the course of the last couple months.

We ought to “build a country where no one is forgotten, and no one is left behind.” Amen to that. Amen to that.

“The people in our society who are most often targeted by predators are also often the voiceless and the vulnerable.” That is true.

Another offered a promise to “fight for other people’s kids as hard as I fight for my own kids.”

Last week, our colleague from Vermont announced his campaign by saying: “The mark of a great Nation is... how it treats its most vulnerable people.”

VERMONT ANNOUNCED HIS CAMPAIGN BY FIGHTING FOR MY OWN KIDS. FOR OTHER PEOPLE’S KIDS AS HARD AS I FIGHT FOR MY OWN KIDS.

BERNIE SANDERS was right.

Now, if that is the case, in this body, to make good on that promise. Now is the chance to protect one of the most vulnerable populations on the land imaginable—tiny, defenseless, little babies, just having taken their first breath—or was that claptrap for the campaign trail for people who do not even mean the stuff they say around here?

Let’s put it another way. Today’s vote asks whether or not you want to take the side of people like Virginia’s disgraced Governor Ralph Northam?”

Lately, people are now discussing in his hideous yearbook photo about whether a baby born alive during an abortion could and maybe ought to be killed if that is what the parents and doctors decided they wanted to do after a debate. That was his position: You should make the baby “comfortable,” and then there could be a discussion about whether or not you throw that little baby into the trash can. That is what he actually talked about on the radio for a day and a half last month.

Governor Northam is disgraceful for a whole host of reasons, but unlike some other people, he actually told the truth about what he wants. He wants a society where some people count more than others, and other people are worth less than others. He wants a society where some people can be pushed aside if they are inconvenient. In reality, that is what we are voting on today.

Some of my colleagues want to write into our law a kind of permanent exception: “Every human being should be protected from cruel and inhuman treatment—unless that human being came into this world through a botched abortion.” Then, you can decide later if you want to kill them.

Tonight, what we are going to vote on in the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is a chance to see whether we are serious when people around here say they want to protect the innocent, speak up for the voiceless, and defend the defenseless. Tonight, we are going to have the opportunity to do exactly that. We can come to the aid of innocent, voiceless, defenseless little babies who have just taken their first breaths by protecting him and her from mistreatment and neglect.

This should be, frankly, the easiest vote we ever cast in this body, but the prospect of what we are voting on here is threatening to one of the most powerful interest groups in America. The abortion industry has taken to attacking this bill wildly over the course of the last 2 weeks, even though, as we made clear repeatedly and as the text of this bill makes indisputably clear, this bill has nothing to do with abortion itself. Nothing in this bill changes the slightest letter of Roe v. Wade. Nothing touches abortion access in this bill.

This bill is about living and breathing babies who are alive outside the womb. That is all that the text of this bill does, but Planned Parenthood and NARAL are threatened by a bill to protect alive, out-of-the-womb babies. In other words, unlike this legislation, Planned Parenthood and others refuse to draw any line between abortion and infanticide. That is the difference between these bills that what we have shown. That should tell us something about what these groups are really about. What they are about is a society built on power—the power of some people to decide whether other people get to live or die.

This bill is a stumbling block to anyone who thinks that certain human beings should be disposable. This bill is a stumbling block to anyone who thinks that certain human beings should be disposable. This bill is a stumbling block to anyone who thinks that certain human beings should be disposable. This bill is a stumbling block to anyone who thinks that certain human beings should be disposable. This bill is a stumbling block to anyone who thinks that certain human beings should be disposable. This bill is a stumbling block to anyone who thinks that certain human beings should be disposable.

They are not unwanted. There are lots of kids who want to stay in this Union lined up waiting to adopt, including kids who have lots of hard life circumstances. In every State there are waiting lists of people who will take so-called unwanted babies.

America is a country built on a different principle. Ours is a country dedicated to the proposition that all men and women—all boys and girls—are created equal, even the littlest—even if they happen to come into the world with circumstances over which we have no control, even if they are crippled or inconvenient, or, apparently, for a moment, unwanted. Ours is a country that recognizes the fundamental indistinguishable dignity of every human being, regardless of race, or sex, or creed, or ability. As a country, we have struggled for 2 centuries—sometimes at enormous cost—to extend those basic human rights to more and more of our fellow citizens. Today’s vote is simply an opportunity to continue that work.

Let me say by way of closing that despite oppositions and setbacks and despite some strange rhetoric about this bill over the course of the last week, I am hopeful in the long term. Deep down, each of us knows that every member of our human family ought to be protected and deserves to be cherished and loved. The love we see every day in the eyes of moms and dads for their newborn babies is an inescapable reminder of that fundamental truth. Love is stronger than power.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise today, in commemoration of Black History Month, to recognize, honor, and pay tribute to five Pennsylvanians who have committed themselves to creating innovative solutions to our Nation’s most pressing problems.

Today, I am honored to stand on this floor on this Monday, every year, to pay tribute to Pennsylvanians. Sometimes it has been one individual, and sometimes it has been more than one, but today we have five honorees.

Today, we will honor the individual work of the following people. I will list them for you first and then talk about each of them in succession: first, the Reverend Dr. Lorina Marshall-Blake; second, Joan Myers Brown; third, Sulaiman Rahman; fourth, Rakia Reynolds; and fifth, Omar Woodward. You will hear more about each of them in a moment. There is no one way, of course, to make a difference in our society. Today the stories of today’s honorees will help to inspire the next generation of leaders. These honorees are with us here in Washington today, and we are grateful to have the chance to spend a couple of minutes talking about each of them.

Let me start with the Reverend Dr. Lorina Marshall-Blake, someone I have known for a long time. This is the story of a woman who has spent her life working to build healthier communities by advancing the conversation on issues like the opioid crisis and health disparities in our Nation, just to mention two things.

Lorina Marshall-Blake’s life began in West Philadelphia, alongside her sister and three brothers. She excelled in her education, earning degrees from Antioch College and the University of Pennsylvania.

Today, Lorina is vice president of community affairs for Independence Blue Cross and also president of the Independence Blue Cross Foundation. Lorina has spent the better part of 30 years working to improve access and healthcare outcomes for those across
the region of Southeastern Pennsylvania, which is Philadelphia and the counties and communities around the city of Philadelphia. Her faith-driven work continues outside of the office, where she serves as an associate minister at the Vine Memorial Baptist Church.

Lorina is affiliated with over 30 professional and civic organizations. I will just mention a few: The United Negro College Fund, the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, and the Urban Affairs Coalition. While the health and well-being of our Nation is not perfect, it is in great part thanks to women like Lorina Marshall-Blake that the future of healthcare and the future of access to healthcare is only brighter.

The second individual we are honoring is Joan Myers Brown. We all know that art itself has the power to enrich lives and inspire change. At the age of 17, Joan Myers Brown decided she was going to be a professional ballerina. She refused to let pervasive racism and segregation stop her from pursuing her dreams. To that end, in 1960, Joan Myers Brown started her own dance school in West Philadelphia called the Philadelphia School of Dance Arts. Building on that work, she founded the Philadelphia Dance Company in 1962. This dance company was created to provide opportunities for Black dancers who were systemically denied entrance to local schools. The company continues to be recognized across the world for its dancers and for its performances.

Personally, Joan is an industry icon in both the national and international art communities. For example, in 2005, the Kennedy Center honored her as a master of African-American choreography, and in 2009, she received the prestigious Philadelphia Award. In 2012, she received the National Medal of the Arts, the Nation’s highest civic honor for excellence in the arts. The arts have benefited greatly from Joan Myers Brown.

Third is Sulaiman Rahman. No individual's success is achieved alone. We all know that, and many in Philadelphia and beyond owe some of their success to Mr. Rahman. He has dedicated his life to empowering young professionals to personal and professional success.

After graduating from the University of Pennsylvania, Sulaiman started his career as an entrepreneur. He founded a platform for urban professionals to find local Dance company in color. Sulaiman created the Urban Philly Professional Network and, later, DiverseForce, and the DiverseForce on Boards program. Every day he works to empower and connect the diverse leaders from multiple sectors and communities. He creates high-tech solutions to impact a more diverse business culture.

When he is not running DiverseForce, he is serving on a number of boards, including the Community College of Philadelphia Foundation, TeenSHARP, and the Year Up Greater Philadelphia Chapter.

Rakia Reynolds. We know that some of our Nation's successes have been born out of interdisciplinary collaboration. Few in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania know how to bring people together for new opportunities like Rakia Reynolds. From her earliest days as a child reading the book "A Wrinkle in Time," she has always been committed to making things happen.

She is a New Jersey native. She moved to Philadelphia to pursue a degree at Temple University. After working as a television and magazine producer, she started her own company, Skai Blue Media.

Among other ventures, she helped to craft Philadelphia’s Amazon bid and continues to advise and grow small businesses of all types. She gives back to her community as the co-president of the Philadelphia chapter of Women in Film & Television and serves as a board advisor for Fashion Group International, and the National Association for Multi-Ethnicity in Communications.

In addition to her full-time work in multimedia communications, Rakia is a wife to her best friend, her husband, Bram, and mother to her three amazing children.

Finally, our fifth honoree is Omar Woodward. Like many of today’s successful leaders, Omar Woodward understands the importance of social enterprises and knows how to look beyond what meets the eye.

Omar is a Southeastern Pennsylvania native. He is the executive director of the Philadelphia branch of the GreenLight Fund, a nonprofit venture capital firm that invests in evidence-based social innovations focused on ending poverty.

At the GreenLight Fund, Omar is investing millions of dollars to address the needs of many Philadelphians, including bringing formerly incarcerated individuals back into the job market, helping low-income children receive quality care, and ensuring that those who were eligible have access to public assistance programs.

Widely recognized for his expertise in nonprofit board governance, Omar is also a board member of the Philadelphia Therapy Network Greater Philadelphia, the Global Philadelphia Association, the Maternity Care Coalition, and the Girard College Foundation, and he holds multiple degrees from George Washington University.

In closing, these five individuals have overcome significant barriers to become pioneers in their fields and leaders in their communities. Throughout their careers, these innovators have recognized gaps within communities, developed creative ideas, and brought these ideas to life by using their determination, their passion, and their talent. We celebrate Black History Month to commemorate the great leaders of the past but also to celebrate the leaders of today and the leaders of tomorrow—the future.

It is my honor to recognize and to pay tribute to the Rev. Dr. Lorina Marshall-Blake, Joan Myers Brown, Sulaiman Rahman, Rakia Reynolds, and Omar Woodard for their work in creating a stronger, more innovative Philadelphia. I look forward to the work these leaders will continue to do and the impact their work will have on the city of Philadelphia, our Commonwealth, and our Nation.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to voice my full support for the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, offered by my colleague from Nebraska.

Today’s vote on this important bill is going to give every Member of the Senate a chance to show America where one stands on the basic right of care for newborn babies.

Throughout my career in public service, I have been a strong supporter of pro-life policies that show compassion to women and children. During my time in the Nebraska Legislature, we passed the first statewide ban on abortion procedures after 20 weeks. Members from all points of the political spectrum—Republican, Democratic, pro-life, and pro-choice—came together to support that bill. We have the opportunity today to come together—Republicans and Democrats—to stand up for the lives of newborn infants in the U.S. Senate.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act protects the lives of children who survive attempted abortions. Simply put, if a baby survives an abortion, he or she deserves the same medical care as any other child who is born prematurely. Without question, newborns deserve care, attention, and love. This should not be a divisive issue. This is an issue that is fundamental to what it means to be an American citizen and, more so, what it means to be a human being. Our Founding Fathers believed, unequivocally, that every person born in the United States has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act should be, without any doubt, a measure that is passed in the Senate.

Like most Nebraskans, I have been deeply disturbed by the actions in Virginia, New York, and the new extremes that have been pushed in the ensuing national debate that it is OK to deny newborn abortion survivors medical
As we all know, a bill was introduced in the Virginia House of Delegates that would make it easier to get a third-term abortion. When discussing this legislation, the Governor of Virginia recently made extremely disturbing comments in defending the bill and promoting infanticide when he described the process of an abortion procedure taking place while a mother was in labor. These policies and lines of thought fly in the face of our core values, and they have to end.

In recent weeks, we have witnessed the sound policy once more, in light of the extreme political issue. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.

There is simply no excuse for an infant not to receive lifesaving care. We live in a nation that was founded upon the basic rights of dignity, self-worth, and everyone of us is every human being. In 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote; it passed the Senate by unanimous consent; and it was signed into law by President Bush. We currently wait to adopt children—2 million.
Although previous laws were passed that recognize infants born alive during abortion proceedings as legal persons, there still exists a critical loophole that prevents abortionists from being held accountable for failing to follow these very laws.

This legislation closes the gap and ensures that there are concrete enforcement measures to protect children who survive abortion attempts. We know that any child who is born alive, whether through a natural birth or a botched abortion, is a living person, a person who is worthy of the utmost dignity, compassion, and respect. This legislation ensures just that by simply requiring healthcare practitioners to treat those babies who survive an abortion attempt with the same degree of care any other baby born at the same gestational age would receive.

This legislation is not meant to punish women or mothers during an often heart-wrenching and difficult experience. In fact, this legislation specifically prohibits mothers from being prosecuted. Instead, this bill quite simply imposes penalties for the intentional killing of a baby who has been born alive.

Today, we have an opportunity to categorically reject infanticide by ensuring that the laws we have on the books preventing this abhorrent practice are meaningfully enforced and that those who fail to follow such laws can be held accountable.

I urge my colleagues to set aside partisan politics and join this much needed, compassionate solution. We as a nation can do better. We must protect those babies who are born alive.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong opposition to the legislation that the Presiding Officer has authored. It would significantly interfere with the doctor-patient relationship, and it would pose new obstacles to a woman’s constitutionally protected right to make her own decisions about her reproductive health.

Regardless of what the intent of the legislation is, the fact is, the way it is written, it intimidates doctors with the threat of criminal liability for performing safe and legal abortions. It will have a chilling effect on the ability of women to access the services they need in United States.

We must always remember that abortions that are performed later in pregnancy are most often done as the result of severe fetal diagnoses and the serious risks that pregnancy poses to the life of the mother.

And let’s be very clear: This isn’t a decision that any women or family wants to be in a position to make. It is tragic and it is heartbreaking, and efforts to politicize the trauma of women and families have been forced to make this decision are really shameful, and it sets a dangerous precedent for women’s comprehensive healthcare.

By installing new uncertainty and risk of criminal liability into the process for late-term abortions, this legislation increases the risk that women will not be able to get the medical care they need when their pregnancy poses a risk to their lives. This bill ignores the important reality in what appears to be an attempt to score political points with anti-choice groups.

Again and again, at every turn, we have seen this administration and our Republican colleagues push forward policies that threaten access to abortion care. Just last week, the Trump administration cut off critical family planning resources for family planning clinics that offer information and referrals for women seeking to obtain legal abortions. If you want to prevent abortions, you want to make sure families have access to family planning. We know that is an important way to reduce the number of abortions in this country.

So we are right to say that this bill is just another line of attack in the ongoing war on women’s health. Now more than ever, we need to stand up and help protect women’s healthcare and make certain that abortions remain safe and legal.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and its consideration on the Senate floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I would like to first thank Senator MURRAY for her steadfast leadership in the fight to protect women’s healthcare and for arranging this time for us to speak this afternoon.

The legislation we are debating today is just the latest salvo in the far-right attack on women’s constitutionally protected right to an abortion.

With all due respect to my colleague from Nebraska who introduced this legislation, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. Contrary to what the proponents of this bill argue, it is and has always been a crime to harm or kill newborn babies. People guilty of this crime can already be charged and prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Let’s be clear. The Senate isn’t debating this legislation today because there is an epidemic of infanticide in this country. There is not one. There isn’t a problem. And it is really not happening. Therefore, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. Instead, we are indulging the majority’s use of a false premise to inflame the public, shame women, and intimidate healthcare providers.

When you strip away the ultra-conservative rhetoric, you are left with a very simple argument from supporters of this legislation—that the moral judgment of rightwing politicians in Washington, DC, should supersede a medical professional’s judgement and a woman’s decision. Conservative politicians should not be telling doctors how they should care for their patients. Instead, women, in consultation with their families and doctors, are in the best position to determine their best course of care.

In talking to healthcare providers in Hawaii, I have heard how this legislation and other bills like it in States across the country could force them to provide care that is unnecessary or even harmful to patients. The Hawaii Section of the College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists made this point persuasively in testifying to our State legislature’s house committee on health earlier this month. In opposing similar so-called born-alive abortion legislation heard in Hawaii’s State Legislature—which didn’t make it out of committee, by the way—the group of doctors wrote:

We are physicians who provide compassionate, evidence-based care. By criminalizing healthcare providers, this law may actually prohibit mothers from being told about what their values are and what is best for their family; decisions that none of us has a right to make for them or judge them for. What they need in these moments is honest and medically accurate information from healthcare providers free of judgment or politics.

I couldn’t agree more, and that is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

In just a few minutes, I expect the Senate will defeat this bill because it will fail to win the required 60 votes. Nevertheless, the threat to women’s reproductive rights is intensifying in States and courtrooms all across the country. Over the years, States have enacted hundreds—hundreds—of laws that harm women’s health and violate their constitutional right to an abortion.

Mississippi enacted a prohibition on abortion after 15 weeks of pregnancy.

Texas, Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Ohio have passed laws banning dilation and evacuation—D&E—an abortion procedure used usually during the second trimester.

Indiana enacted a bevy of new abortion restrictions, including a law requiring every woman seeking an abortion to have an ultrasound—talk about invasive—and mandated she wait 18 hours after the ultrasound to have an abortion.

Louisiana passed legislation requiring abortion providers to have admitting privileges at local hospitals. This law would result in only one abortion provider in a State of 4.7 million people.

Advocates have recognized the harm these laws would have on women and
have filed suits to block their implementation. Several lower courts have ruled these restrictions unconstitutional, and the cases are moving steadily through the courts of appeals en route to the Supreme Court.

The Fifth Circuit, for example, will hear an appeal of a lower court's decision to block Mississippi's 15-week abortion ban, as well as an appeal from Texas to allow its ban on D&E procedures to go into effect.

The Seventh Circuit upheld a lower court ruling striking down parts of Indiana's mandatory ultrasound and waiting period law. The Indiana attorney general has requested the Supreme Court to review this case.

The Supreme Court temporarily stopped Louisiana's so-called admitting privileges law from taking effect on a 5-to-4 vote. This is the law I talked about before. This law would result in one abortion provider in a State of 4.7 million people.

The Fifth Circuit will now hear an appeal on the merits of the law, which is virtually identical to a Texas law the Supreme Court struck down in 2016—that was only a few short years ago—in the landmark Whole Women's Health case.

The stakes in these court battles and the more than 20 other abortion-related cases making their way through the Federal court are incredibly high. Any one of them could provide the opening for the U.S. Supreme Court to finally fulfill the rightwing goal of overturning Roe v. Wade.

It is with this central goal in mind that Donald Trump, Majority Leader McConnell, and complicit Republicans of Congress have been working to pack our Federal courts with ideologically driven judges groomed and handpicked by ultraconservative organizations like the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation.

Donald Trump has already confirmed 85 judges, including 30 to circuit courts and 2 to the U.S. Supreme Court. These judges comprise one-tenth of the Federal judiciary, with many more to come.

In fact, a few weeks ago, the Senate Judiciary Committee voted 42-42—judicial nominees out of committee in one markup. Those 42 comprise an additional 5 percent of the Federal judiciary.

Less than 2 weeks ago, Justice Kavanaugh issued a strong dissent in the earlier mentioned Supreme Court's 5-to-4 decision to block Louisiana's anti-choice law from taking effect. Using tortured reasoning, Justice Kavanaugh essentially argued that the Supreme Court should disregard its own precedent from only 2 years ago—that is the Whole Women's case I referred to—to allow the Louisiana law to take effect. His dissent signaled his strong antipathy to a woman's right to choose and his willingness to allow the Supreme Court to play favorites, particularly when it comes to women's rights.

In 2016, Hargan did when he was on the DC Circuit. His dissent as a Justice this time demonstrated the emptiness of his promises to uphold Supreme Court precedent during his confirmation hearing.

Justice Kavanaugh's promises then to follow precedent is like that of other Federalist Society-picked Trump nominees now packing our courts, offering little regard to the precedents in fact will set aside their strongly held ideological views to be objective and fair as judges.

Another case likely to make its way through the Federal courts in the months and years ahead is a challenge to the Trump administration's new gag rule. This rule prohibits doctors and other clinicians participating in title X family planning programs from referring patients for, or even speaking about, abortions, even if their patients request such information.

Nearly 20,000 Hawaii residents receive reproductive healthcare through title X. That is roughly the population of the city of Kapolei on Oahu. This attack on title X has resulted in Planned Parenthood being an end-run around Congress after Republicans have tried and failed dozens of times to end funding for Planned Parenthood.

Planned Parenthood provides health care for millions of low-income women, men, and young people under title X. Why then do Republicans persist in trying to cut funding for Planned Parenthood?

The constitutional rights of millions of women across the country are under serious and sustained attack, but even in these not normal times, I do see some hope. As State after State passes laws to limit access for a woman's right to choose, communities like Hawaii's are coming together to protect such access.

Last week, I joined activists and staff from Planned Parenthood of the Great Northwest and the Hawaiian Islands as they opened their new medical center and admitted women downtown Honolulu. I was particularly energized to see how many young people, women and men, were there and engaged in the fight to protect our right to choose.

I have learned over the years that battles we fought so hard to win never stay won. It is up to all of us to stay engaged and keep fighting for our constitutionally protected rights.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to be very clear about the matter that is before the U.S. Senate today. We are not here to debate abortion. That is not what this bill is about that Senator Sasse has introduced. We are here to decide whether it could be legal in the United States of America to kill or neglect an infant who has been born alive after a botched abortion.

This was made very real for me just minutes ago. In fact, Melissa Odom is standing just off the floor of the U.S. Senate, just outside here probably 50 feet from where I am standing. She survived a botched saline-infused abortion in 1977. She was left to die, literally put in the medical waste heap, but thanks to the grace of God and a nurse who saw Melissa, they were able to revive her, and she is a beautiful 41-year-old mom with two children, one being a 15-year-old girl who was born in a hospital where the botched abortion took place. She is from Kansas City, married to Ryan.

We are here to vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. By now, we have all heard the disturbing defense of infanticide offered by the disgraced Governor Northam of Virginia. These babies' only crime was to survive the abortionists' attempts to poison, starve, or tear them apart in Montana, or in Merced.

What this bill is about is when the abortionist wants to “finish the job” as the baby lies helpless on the table of an abortion clinic. Currently, children born into abortion attempts are recognized as persons under the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, but that law is merely definitional because not one person to date has been charged or convicted under it. There is no national law criminalizing the actions of killers, like Dr. Kermit Gosnell, who kill or deny care to babies who survive abortions. Current Federal murder statutes have limited jurisdiction, and the States have a patchwork of different laws for born-alive infants.

The bill we are voting on today would give Federal enforcement teeth nationwide to the 2002 Born-Alive law, so that whether an infant is born alive in Tennessee or Massachusetts, whether in a hospital or an abortion clinic, they would be guaranteed the same protection and level of care. Is that asking too much?

By contrast, consider that Federal law provides criminal penalties of thousands of dollars in fines and even imprisonment if you “harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect” any baby marine turtle, baby bald eagle, or any other baby of an endangered species.

It is absolutely absurd that we are having to decide whether we give human babies the level of protection under Federal law that we give to animals. This is truly an absurd moment on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Have we become so numb as a nation that we cannot realize we are talking about a baby?

Cindy and I became grandparents for the first time on January 23, little Emma Rae Daines, born in Denver. She is now a living, breathing member of the human family. That is what we are talking about here, a living, breathing member of the human family. Is it the position of the Democratic Party that a border wall is immoral but not infanticide?

The phenomenon of infants surviving attempted abortions is very real. These infants are not just statistics. Their lives matter, and their stories deserve to be told, just like the story of Melissa Odom. That is why I am proud of
and grateful to my Senate colleague BEN SASSE, who has introduced the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Infanticide is not and should not be a partisan issue. It is an issue in which there should be a broad middle ground or common ground. A “yes” vote today is to uphold the bare minimum of any civilized society. A “no” vote is to deny protection from barbaric violence to the most vulnerable among us, an innocent, little baby.

You and I can stand with Governor Northam for infanticide or you can protect the most vulnerable among us. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I first thank my colleague from Montana for his powerful message. I can assure him that I believe strongly in the same approach as he does with regard to life. I rise to address an issue of vital importance to our society, and that is the intrinsic value of human life. Very shortly, every Senator will have an opportunity to stand up for human dignity and condemn infanticide when we vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This should not be a difficult vote for any of us. I believe in the value of every innocent human life, beginning at the moment of conception to natural death. Life is a gift from God that should be respected and protected. I imagine the joy, the emotion, and the pain of any baby being killed at any stage, at a bare minimum everyone of us should be able to agree that infanticide—or the killing of a baby after it has been born alive—is unacceptable. This is a separate issue from abortion, which is abortive in itself.

In the history of the world, the true test of a society is how well we treat the most vulnerable among us. That is why we must pass this legislation, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, of which I am an original co-sponsor, and I would like to thank Senator Sasse for bringing this legislation forward.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act simply protects newborns who survive abortions by requiring appropriate care and admission to a hospital. When a failed abortion results in the live birth of an infant, our legislation makes clear that healthcare providers must exercise the same professional skill to protect the newborn child as would be offered to any other child born alive at the same gestational age. A baby who survives an abortion deserves the same rights under the law as any other newborn baby and should receive proper medical care, not to be left to die or be killed.

It is also worth mentioning that President Trump stood up for life during the State of the Union Address earlier this month, calling on Congress to pass legislation to prohibit late-term abortions of children who feel pain in the mother’s womb. President Trump urged:

Let us work together to build a culture that cherishes innocent life. And let us reaffirm a fundamental truth: All children—born and unborn—are made in the holy image of God.

I couldn’t agree more. All life is sacred. We must seek to protect and save the mother, whose life is under a woman’s control, her decision and choice. We must work to improve the quality of life. To protect the newborn child. I urge my colleagues to support the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the floor for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, imagine the joy, the emotion, and the anticipation that comes with being in the third trimester of your pregnancy. Imagine choosing the crib and the mobiles that will hang above it. Imagine telling your toddler that he was getting a little sister to play with. Then, imagine the heartbeat of going to the doctor every day and knowing there is no chance your baby will survive, that there is no hope your baby girl will ever speak her first word or take her first step, or that delivering her would put your own life at risk, leaving you with nothing more than a body and a mother. These are the types of scenarios that lead to the heart-wrenching decision to terminate a pregnancy later on.

As the mom of two little girls—one, age 4, and one, 10 months old—I can’t begin to fathom that kind of pain. Yet today some on the other side of the aisle are trying to use those parents’ suffering for political advantage, making not in fact but lies like these on all the more difficult by pushing a bill aimed to criminalize reproductive care no matter the cost.

If it becomes law, this bill would force doctors to perform ineffective, invasive procedures on fetuses born with fatal abnormalities, even if it is against the best interests of the child, even if it goes against recommended standards of care and they know that it wouldn’t extend or improve the baby’s life, even if it would prolong the suffering of the families, forcing women to endure added lasting trauma, making one of the worst moments of their lives somehow even more painful. If physicians refuse, they would be punished and could be sentenced up to 5 years in prison.

We have seen this kind of political stunt before. We know the partisan extremist playbook it comes out of—one limb at a time—bullying doctors out of giving reproductive care, to scare them out of business—one potential lawsuit or jail sentence at a time—making it ever harder for women and their doctors to provide the care they need when they need it most, as the number of physicians available shrinks.

This is just the latest step in the far right’s long march to strip away women’s rights—a march whose pace has now quickened under our current President, a man who once argued that women should be punished for taking up their right to choose, who has taken pride in trying to put the government between a woman and her doctors, and who just 72 hours ago issued a gag rule that could gut family planning clinics.

I have said this a thousand times before, and I will keep saying it until I go home. A woman’s medical decisions should be between her and her physician and her family and not dictated by some politician in Washington, DC. When lives are on the line, the folks with MDs are the ones who should be deciding what care is appropriate, not those with partisan agendas.

Mothers and doctors know that every pregnancy is different—both of mine
certainly were—and physicians are trained with exactly this in mind.

It is offensive and just plain ignorant for my colleagues to claim they know better than a doctor or an expectant mom. It shows an alarming disrespect for a woman’s moral compass and her ability to make informed decisions.

I can’t begin to conceive of the pain of the mom-to-be who learns that the baby she already loves isn’t viable and that the child whose name she has already chosen and whose life she has already loved never opened their eyes. All this bill would do is to sharpen that family’s suffering. All it would do is to make it harder for the next woman to get the care that could save her life. How dare we think of passing legislation like that. How dare we put extremist politics over empathy, over science, and over women’s health and families’ pain.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against S. 311—a bill that is as heartless as it is dangerous.

Thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on the floor for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. Without objection, it has been interesting to hear the debate today about how heartless it would be to protect the life of a child. The debate from the other side has come out fast and furious, saying that S. 311 is about a child who is not viable and that somehow we are going to put a mom through more torment with a child that is not viable.

The plain text of this bill could not be clearer. This is not about abortion. This is about a child who has been born alive and is a viable child.

Here is the interesting conversation. Many people in this country argue about abortion—rightfully so. We are talking about the life of a child. This, in particular, though, has a clear argument. What if an abortion is botched, and instead of the child being killed in the womb, they are actually delivered? Now a child is on the table who is crying, with pink skin, 10 fingers and toes wiggling, and is reaching out. What happens now? That is the question with this bill.

Interestingly enough, it is not the first time it has come before the Senate. In 2002, this same issue came before the Senate. The Senate, the House, and the President all agreed that if an abortion was botched and the child was delivered, that child is a child. By definition, that is a child. In 2002, what that bill did not do is define what happens next if the life of that child is then taken. They are born.

This bill wouldn't be an issue because it is clearly defined in law except for the fact that a few weeks ago, the Governor of Virginia made a public statement saying that we need to have a law to say that we could deliver a child, make it comfortable, and then decide what to do with that baby. Suddenly, this becomes a national conversation.

We thought this was a resolved issue in 2002, but now it is still debated from the other side saying: Deliver the child and then decide what to do with the life of that child.

This is not just an issue that has no consequence as well. After that bill was passed in 2002, the CDC started analyzing birth certificates to determine if this happens and how often it happens. It doesn’t happen often, but in a few states, where the CDC gathered information from, it determined there were 143 babies who were born alive after an attempted abortion and who then died with no record of how it happened.

Just in 5 months in 2017, the State of Arizona reported that 10 babies were alive after an attempted abortion. This doesn’t happen often, but it does happen, and the question is, Who are we as a nation and what are we going to do with a child who is in front of us who is alive?

Medical professionals are called to do no harm. The Hippocratic Oath. It is interesting to see medical professionals provide care to every person everywhere they go. If there is a car accident, it doesn’t matter if it is their patient. They pull over and help. Interestingly enough, at the start of the Union Address, just a couple of weeks ago, we had a staff member in the back who passed out, and Members of Congress who are also physicians, who were in their seats, jumped out of their seats to go provide care because that is what physicians do. But in the case of a botched abortion, the child is delivered and then everyone who is a medical professional just steps back and watches the child die and doesn’t provide care, the reverse of the Hippocratic Oath. We need to resolve this in our law.

If I can even make a comparison. We as people, and even soldiers in the field, honor life. Soldiers who were trained to take life still are also trained to honor life.

Article 12 of the Geneva Convention, which we support, says this: “Members of the armed forces and other persons . . . who were wounded, sick . . . shall be respected and protected in all circumstances.” Literally, if you are in the fight of your life on the field, as our Armed Forces are, and you run across a wounded individual in that fight from the other side, we give care to that person, even though they are our enemy on the battlefield. But in an abortion clinic, that child is not given the same care that we are demanded to give on the battlefield.

This is a fascinating dialogue that I have had with my colleagues. For a lot of my colleagues who are pro-abortion and who don’t see that as a life, I will often ask this simple question: When is a life a life? What is your redline? I think that is a fair conversation.

For myself, it is conception. When that child is conceived and they are developing, they have unique DNA. That is a different person. For others, they will say it is when the child is viable. For others, they will say when the child is born.

I just ask a simple question. When the child is born, is that a child? Is your redline birth? This bill affirms that when a child is born, we should at least acknowledge that that is a person.

I am a dad who has cut the umbilical cord of my own daughter before. I would be terrified to say that the child was not a child until I, as the dad, cut the cord—that I could take that life at any moment before that. That is not who we are as Americans.

Let’s pass this. Let’s protect living children.

With that, I yield the floor.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to tonight’s vote to advance S. 311. This legislation would reduce families’ access to reproductive healthcare, interfere in personal medical decisions that should be left between families and their health professionals.

Tonight’s vote is part of a broader strategy by this administration and some in Congress to undermine women’s access to reproductive healthcare, including the constitutional right to an abortion affirmed in Roe v. Wade.

For instance, the administration has already installed two Supreme Court Justices who threaten Roe v. Wade, repeatedly tried to defund Planned Parenthood and cut off family planning grants, and given employers the green light to take away birth control coverage from their employees. In the last Congress alone there were 14 anti-women’s health votes and 34 anti-women’s health bills introduced.

Reproductive health choices are highly personal and deeply sensitive, and they should be left between families and their doctor. S. 311 would effectively overrule these personal decisions by imposing arbitrary standards—based on political ideology, not medical appropriateness—on health professionals.

This bill would effectively criminalize doctors and healthcare clinicians for providing the best plan of care to their patients. It would impose civil and criminal penalties including up to 5 years in prison onto providers if they don’t comply with the bill’s mandates. The bill’s mandates could scare medical professionals away from helping women and families obtain reproductive care, including an abortion, further reducing families’ access to care.

Moreover than 17 of the Nation’s leading medical, public health, and civil rights organizations oppose this bill. The American College of Nurse-Midwives, the American College of Obstetricians...
and Gynecologists, and the American Public Health Association state that the bill “... injects politicians into the patient-provider relationship, disregarding providers’ training and clinical judgement and undermining their ability to the best course of action with their patients.” The American Civil Liberties Union states that the bill “... shows a callous disregard for patients in need of compassionate, evidence-based care when they face difficult decisions.

The majority of Americans want more access to reproductive healthcare, not less. More than 7 in 10 Americans do not want women to lose access to safe, legal abortion. In 1991, a majority of voters in the State of Washington passed the Washington Abortion Rights Initiative, declaring that a woman has a right to an abortion.

Nothing in this bill touches abortion born. Nothing in this bill in the course of this afternoon, we have heard speech after speech after speech about babies who have already been aborted. Nothing in this bill touches abortion access.

Mr. SASSIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for less than 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. SASSIE. Mr. President, over the course of this afternoon, we have heard a whole bunch of things about what is supposedly in this bill. I know that a lot of people who are opposed to this bill, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, sincerely believe the talking points that they read from their staffs, but, humbly, we have heard speech after speech about things that have absolutely nothing to do with what is actually in this bill.

So as you get ready to cast this vote, I urge my colleagues to picture a baby who has already been born, who is outside the womb, and who is gasping for air. That is the only thing that today’s vote is actually about. We are talking about babies who have already been born. Nothing in this bill touches abortion access.

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 reads as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, 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 North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Alabama (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As a reminder, expressions of approval or disapproval are not in order.

On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44.

The three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

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 bill clerk reads 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 nomination of Eric D. Miller of Washington to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.


The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Eric D. Miller of Washington to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, 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 North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46. The motion is agreed to.
EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

s. iii

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am on the floor to talk about a vote that simply should not have taken place this evening. It was a vote on yet another attack from our Republican colleagues on women's health and their right to access safe, legal abortions—this time in the form of an anti-doctor, anti-woman, anti-family piece of legislation that medical experts strongly oppose. Republicans have spread a lot of misinformation about this bill, so let's be clear what it is not about and what it is actually about.

This bill is not about protecting infants, as Republicans have claimed, because that is not up for debate, and it is already the law. This bill is also not at all about ensuring that appropriate medical care is delivered, because it would make it harder for healthcare providers to provide high-quality medical care that their patients need and deserve.

The leading nonpartisan organization of OB/GYNs in our country has said this bill should never become law. It calls it “gross legislative interference into the practice of medicine” and “part of a larger attempt to deny women access to safe, legal, evidence-based abortion care.” In fact, 17 top health professional organizations wrote to Congress to insist that Democrats and Republicans vote this bill down.

Since this bill is not about infants or appropriate medical care, I am sure many people are wondering what exactly it is about. What would this bill really mean for women and families and healthcare providers?

If you are a woman, this bill would mean, if you were one of the very, very few women who needed an abortion late in your pregnancy, you could be legally required to accept inappropriate, medically unnecessary care—care that may directly conflict with your wishes at a deeply personal, often incredibly painful moment in your life—because politicians in Washington decide their beliefs mattered more than yours.

If you are a medical provider, this bill would supersede your years of medical training and your oath to deliver the best possible medical treatment to your patients. It would apply a one-size-fits-all regulation that does not reflect the reality that every pregnancy is different, and it would subject you to criminal penalties if you were to choose to let medical standards, not politics, drive the care you offer to your patients.

For families who struggle with the painful reality that the children they had hoped for could not survive, as is tragically the case in many of the cases we are discussing, this legislation would take precedence over families’ wishes as they grieve.

This bill is government interference in women’s lives, and in medicine on steroids. As I said, it is anti-doctor, anti-woman, and anti-family. It has no place in becoming law. Its proponents claim it would make something illegal that is already illegal. So why are we debating this legislation that would take women backward when there are so many ways we should be advancing medicine, improving women’s healthcare, and supporting families? As far as I can tell, it is again because it is about something that Republicans care about more than almost any other priority; that, unfortunately, is the rolling back of women’s constitutionally protected rights and trying to do it in time before the Roe v. Wade decision.

Since day No. 1 of the Trump-Pence administration, this party has pulled every possible stop to appeal to its extreme anti-abortion base. Just last week, the Trump administration put forward a rule that would prevent healthcare providers at clinics that are funded through the title X family planning program from so much as informing patients about where to get an abortion when doctors are directly asking them for advice. This rule means trusted medical providers across the country may not be able to serve women and men who rely on them for contraception, cancer screenings, and treatment for addictions. Women are determined to make abortion impossible in the United States. That is just one of many examples.

To recap, this bill is completely unnecessary. It would harm families, and it would criminalize doctors. It is intended to do nothing except to help Republicans advance their goal of denying women their constitutionally protected rights. I am against it in the strongest terms. Everybody who cares about women, families, and doctors and about upholding the Constitution should be too, so I am glad the Senate voted tonight to stop this anti-doctor, anti-woman, anti-family bill from going any further.

The next time Republicans want to have a conversation about protecting infants and children, I am happy to talk about the babies and children who have been separated from their parents at the border through improving access to early childhood education or about making sure coverage for maternal healthcare and preexisting conditions is not taken away. These are problems that do exist and that need to be solved, but we are just as ready and willing to work on those as we are to stand up and say “absolutely not!” to this harmful bill.

Mr. President, in the very near future, my Senate colleagues will be asked to take an unprecedented vote—a vote that never should have been scheduled here in the first place. The Republican leaders are demanding that we move ahead and vote on President Trump’s nominee to serve on the Ninth Circuit Court despite the fact that I and my colleague Senator CANTWELL made clear that they have no business on behalf of our constituents in Washington State and despite the fact that the hearing for the nominee was a total sham. This is wrong, and it is a dangerous road for the Senate to go down.

Not only did Republicans schedule this nominee’s confirmation hearing during a recess period when just two Senators—both Republicans—were able to attend, but the hearing included less than 5 minutes of questioning—less questioning for a lifetime appointment than most students face for a book report in school.

Confirming this Ninth Circuit Court nominee without the consent or true input of both home State Senators and the people’s representatives would be a dangerous first for this Senate.

This is not a partisan issue. This is a question of the Senate’s ability and commitment to properly review nominations. Yet here we are on the Senate floor, barreling toward a vote to confirm a flawed nominee, who came to us following a flawed nomination process—all because a handful of my Republican colleagues will apparently stand nothing in the way of President Trump’s extreme conservatives onto our courts, even if that means trampling all over precedent, all over process, or any semblance of our institutional norms.

Maybe Republican leaders are hoping most Americans aren’t paying attention to what is happening right now in the Senate—that somehow tossing out Senate norms in order to move our country’s courts to the far right will go unnoticed.

Well, I am standing here right now to make sure everyone knows because I, for one, fear the short- and long-term consequences of letting any President steamroll the Senate on something as critical as our judicial nominees—the very men and women who are tasked with interpreting our Nation’s laws and making sure they serve justice for all Americans.

Accepting the consequences of abandoning the blue-slip process and, instead, bending to the will of a President who has demonstrated time and again his ignorance and disdain for the Constitution and the rule of law would be a total abdication of our duties as a President whose policies keep testing the limits of law—from a ban on Muslims entering the United States to a family separation policy at our southern border—it is very important, more than ever, that we have well-qualified, consensus judges on the bench.

Let’s be very clear. Trump cannot steamroll the Senate by himself. But in
the Republican leadership, he has found Members willing to throw out every rule, every tradition, every safeguard in the book to give him what he wants.

So this veto, which is happening soon, this new precedent of turning a blind eye to the blue slip should stop every one of my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats—in their tracks because, today, the two home Senators still holding their blue slips are my colleague Senator CANTWELL and me, but in the future, it could be any Member of this body.

I am doing this for very good reasons—reasons very much in line with why the blue-slip process exists in the first place. I am doing this because I don’t believe Mr. Miller has received the necessary scrutiny and vetting to serve on the bench—a lifetime appointment. I believe the people I represent would not want him there, plain and simple.

I want to briefly go into one area that causes particular and very serious concern, and that is what I have heard from my constituents about Mr. Miller’s misunderstanding of Tribal sovereignty and his ability to be impartial and fair-minded when hearing cases involving Tribal rights.

As one Tribal leader from my home State put it, Mr. Miller has built a career out of mounting challenges against Tribes, including their sovereign councils, their lands, their religious freedom, and even the core attributes of Federal recognition.

I want to be very clear because I do not believe that it is wise for Senators to support or oppose nominees only because of their past clients. Our legal system requires talented lawyers on both sides of every case, and sometimes lawyers represent clients who are politically unpopular.

But making a career decision to be one of the top attorneys, in case after case, attacking Tribal sovereignty—that is more than a choice of a client. That is a choice about values, and it is something my colleagues should consider.

There are more than 400 federally recognized Tribes in the Western United States, including Alaska. Every single one could find themselves before the Ninth Circuit and before a judge who spent years fighting for an extremely narrow, directly opposed to their own sovereignty and whose advocacy repeatedly attempted to undermine the rights of Tribal nations everywhere. Particularly at a time when the Supreme Court may demolish important protections for subsistence rights, a circuit nominee opposed to Tribal sovereignty should not be confirmed.

This is a serious matter worthy of true examination. Yet Mr. Miller’s nomination process was inadequate from the start.

Today it is Washington State families who are getting cut out from this important process. Tomorrow, it can be the concerns of any of your constituents and any of your home States that get tossed aside for a President’s crusade to reshape our courts and satisfy a political base—and Senate leaders unwilling to stand up for our norms and our precedents and our constitutional duty.

I urge my colleagues to truly think about what moving ahead with this nomination means and to ask themselves: Are we still able to work together in a bipartisan way and find common ground in the interests of the country and the people we serve? Can we still engage in a bipartisan process to find consensus candidates to serve on our courts? Or will our work here in the U.S. Senate be reduced to partisan extremes and political gamesmanship?

Will Republicans accept simply being a rubberstamp for their leader in the White House, and will my colleagues be complicit in allowing our courts to be taken over by ideology alone, abandoning pragmatism and a commitment to justice for all?

That is the choice every Senator will make with this vote, and I sincerely hope a choice for which every Senator will be held accountable.

To vote yes will be a vote in favor of further eroding the Senate’s commitment to examining nominees for lifetime appointments and its ability to serve as a check on the Executive. To vote yes is to toss away each Senator’s ability to provide guidance on judicial nominees for their State and the families they represent.

To vote no will be a vote to stand up for the Senate’s role in our democracy and to stand up for a process that helps the Senate ensure qualified judges who play such a critically important role in our democracy. To me, the choice is pretty clear.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas rises.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join many of my colleagues in raising our voices on behalf of some of the most vulnerable members of our society.

Recently, a very disturbing and revealing discussion has been taking place in our country that raises serious questions about how much value and worth we ascribe to babies in the womb, especially those who are born despite an attempted abortion procedure.

Before I go any further, let me say this clearly and unequivocally: If we as a nation are to hold any claim to a moral character that deserves to be admired and emulated, then we must be willing to say that the lives of newborn children have inherent value and are worthy of protection. There is simply no way to credibly claim otherwise.

Whether it be legislation introduced or declarations made by our public officials, such as the Governor of Virginia, our country has begun to entertain the idea that the rights and privileges newborn babies possess is an open-ended question.

This is alarming, and the U.S. Senate should go on the record in defense of their right to live instead of being callously discarded or worse—intentionally killed in the name of reproductive freedom. There is no middle ground here.

It is concerning to me that in some corners of this country, and even within in this Congress, there is an utter failure to recognize and affirm the right to life, especially after an infant has already been born.

Throughout my time in elected office, I have found that giving those who disagree with me on any given issue the benefit of the doubt as it relates to their motivations has allowed me to consistently find commonality and reach compromise, even with incredibly unlikely allies and partners. But in this instance, there can be no mistake or ambiguity. The common ground that we all must occupy should be a shared commitment to uphold the basic, fundamental right to protect the lives of every child at the moment of their birth, which brings me to the legislation before the Senate today.

I am a cosponsor of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and I am grateful to each of my colleagues who supported the bill tonight. This legislation would create criminal penalties for doctors who allow infants to die rather than provide medical care after an attempted abortion.

It would also require that born-alive abortion survivors be transported to a hospital for care and treatment rather than being left to languish on the counter of an abortion clinic or—as one former nurse and pro-life activist has shockingly recounted—be discarded along with the biohazard materials.

Even in situations where comfort care could be rendered to born-alive babies, that sometimes amounts to nothing more than keeping a baby warm until it passes away alone. No child should suffer this way.

Under this bill, abortionists who defy these mandates to render care to born-alive survivors would face the justice that they are due instead of being ignored or permitted to continue committing infanticide.

It is time for our country to demand that the victims of this abhorrent, inhumane treatment be afforded their rights and the perpetrators be held accountable.

Speaking with one clear voice, we must say that every human being is made in the image of God and is therefore in possession of dignity and worth that cannot be displaced or disposed of. Anything short of this unambiguous declaration is a demonstrable disservice to our children and fatally undermine the values of our society that we claim to uphold.
While the debate surrounding abortion has engulfed this country for decades, the goalposts are now being shifted. Reproductive autonomy, we are now told, must include the ability and choice to end the life of a baby who survives an attempted abortion.

As a former medical provider, I believe that to end a newborn’s life either by refusing to provide lifesaving care or actively taking that child’s life—as in the case of the infamous abortionist Dr. Kermit Gosnell and others—violates the oath every medical provider takes to do no harm.

As a dad and a grandfather, I know from my own experience just how precious each life is. My daughters and grandchildren are treasured gifts that bring my family and me immeasurable joy. To think that they or any other child might be treated with anything other than the dignity and respect they are entitled to is tragic, heartbreaking, and outrageous.

Providing the necessary medical attention to save the lives of infants who survive an abortion is an imperative that we as a society must embrace if we are to be faithful to the promise our Founders made to the generations of Americans who would succeed them. In declaring the self-evident truth that all men are created equal, surely they intended to extend the same rights and liberties that their countrymen fought and died for to newborn babies who survive without intent.

I am proud to have stood with my colleagues today in support of this legislation that seeks to protect these precious, vulnerable lives. We can and should do this as a reflection of the country we want to be.

Our abortion laws in the United States already situate us among some of the world’s worst human rights abusers, including North Korea and China.

Now is the time for a national conversation about whether to provide children who survive abortions medical attention and care has ensued. It is my hope and prayer that the final word in this discussion will end with a resounding commitment to protect and preserve lives.

I would like to thank the junior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Sasse, for leading on this critical issue and pushing to bring this measure to the floor today.

I would also like to thank the President for his vocal commitment to defending life and protecting the most vulnerable among us.

I feel blessed to stand alongside so many others to raise our voices on behalf of the voiceless.

While I am disappointed with the result of today’s vote, I remain committed to fighting for those who are unable to fight for themselves and will continue working to protect and uphold the sanctity of life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to offer some thoughts regarding the ongoing negotiations with North Korea that began with the Singapore summit between President Trump and Kim Jong Un and will continue in a few days when the two leaders meet again in Vietnam.

I join the chorus of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have expressed concern regarding the outcome of the last summit and the subsequent negotiations. This is not meant as a criticism of the diplomatic process itself. Clearly, we are in a much better place now than 2 years ago, when the President was promising fire and fury for the Korean Peninsula, terrifying our South Korean allies, who stand to lose millions of their citizens in any confrontation with North Korea. Furthermore, if the Singapore summit had resulted in a clear path toward denuclearization, I would be standing here right now recommending these diplomatic efforts.

The maximum pressure campaign, significantly enhanced by this body’s sanctions regime and the United Nations Security Council’s resolutions, brought North Korea to the negotiating table. It was a golden opportunity and, unfortunately, it was squandered by this ill-prepared administration, which seems more concerned with photo ops than with the substance of the negotiations.

The Singapore summit was a loss for the United States and our alliances and a great publicity win for North Korea. The 2005 six-party joint statement contained significantly more commitments from North Korea than the joint statement of the Singapore summit. Given President Trump’s blister and renunciation of the JCPOA, one would have thought that he would leave Singapore with an ironclad commitment for denuclearization. Instead, he got less than in any past negotiation with North Korea.

Most concerning to me is that without obtaining a single concrete concession from North Korea, President Trump undermined our alliance with the Republic of Korea by characterizing our joint exercises as provocative war games. It was a huge propaganda win for North Korea and a huge loss to the readiness and effectiveness of the joint force. The regularly scheduled exercises are very important to troop readiness and our regional security. While I understand the need to create diplomatic space for these negotiations to proceed, we must ensure that we do not sacrifice readiness for empty promises.

While I am pleased with the agreement on the return of prisoners of war and missing-in-action personnel remains, which rightfully continue to be important issues for U.S. families, the Singapore summit was mostly pomp and circumstance that did not advance our national security interests. In fact, it could be said that we are in a worse position than we were before the summit. President Trump undeservedly transformed Kim Jong Un from a ruthless dictator to a world statesman in short order. He has since used his status from the summit to open back-door deals with China and Russia that will be used as leverage against the United States.

The President also confounded legitimacy on a corrupt and morally bankrupt dictator who has imprisoned hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children in political camps under brutal conditions and has committed horrendous crimes against his neighbors and own people. Human rights did not play a prominent role at the summit, and the joint declaration does not include a single reference. If we want to continue to serve as a beacon for human rights, this issue will have to be on the agenda for these negotiations.

There are a number of U.S. sanctions against North Korea because of its human rights record, and this body will not loosen those sanctions until and unless we see progress on the issue. As such, I was dismayed that the President in his State of the Union Address did not call out the North Korean regime’s callous disregard for human rights.

Since the summit, we have seen just how problematic the joint declaration has been as a foundational document for the negotiations. While Secretary Pompeo characterized the first meeting with North Korean negotiators at the summit as “productive,” the North Koreans criticized Secretary Pompeo’s gangster-like demands for denuclearization. The chasm between the two sides was created by the ambiguity of the summit itself and its failure to create an agreed-upon path for both parties. We have not seen a substantial dismantlement of nuclear or missile sites over the last year, and independent news reporting reflects that North Korea continues to develop its nuclear and missile arsenals despite the self-imposed ban on testing.

What should we have gotten from the summit? Since we played our biggest card and gave Kim Jong Un a meeting with the President of the United States, the answer is a lot more than what we did get. First and foremost, we should have gotten a joint declaration that North Korea agrees to complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization. If we were not going to get that commitment, then we should have at least gotten a specific commitment similar to the September 19, 2005, joint statement, where North Korea committed to “abandoning all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs and returning at an early date to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to IAEA safeguards.” Instead, what we got from the summit was that North Korea will “work toward complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.”
Despite the administration’s protestations to the contrary, it is not at all clear that North Korea actually agreed to complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization, generally referred to as CVID. I am concerned, as are others, that “complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization” were used because the North Koreans would not agree to CVID. If that is the case, then, we are starting in a worse place than we were during the 2005 talks.

What words matter? They matter because of the historical context of these negotiations. Without the word “verifiable,” North Korea has not agreed to inspections, and, without inspections, we cannot assess whether North Korea will take the steps necessary to denuclearize. The regime does not have a good track record of living up to its agreements. Without a verification process that includes a robust inspection and verification regime, we will never be sure that North Korea is not reverting to its past tactics and cheating on its commitments.

Even more alarming to those who follow negotiations is that the commitment that did come out of the summit sounds suspiciously like the tack North Korea has taken in past negotiations—that denuclearization of the peninsula will require the United States to remove its nuclear umbrella from its ally, the Republic of Korea, and remove its troops from the peninsula. North Korea has peddled this tit-for-tat denuclearization narrative for years, and this administration must ensure that the outcome of the summit is one that maximizes the likelihood of the upcoming negotiations. These competing narratives should have been reconciled at the summit by the leaders but instead were left for future negotiations.

The administration now has another opportunity in Vietnam to establish some credibility for these negotiations and demand a set of concrete deliverables. We should all recognize that although the last few years have been productive, the work is not done. Despite President Trump’s patently false claim that he has solved the North Korean nuclear threat, that threat is still very real and very dangerous. There are commitments that we need from the other side to gauge whether North Korea is sincere in its intent to denuclearize. We already know that the intelligence community has made the determination that North Korea does not intend to denuclearize. Therefore, the breakthrough we seek from North Korea need to include a verification and inspection scheme that includes a reasonable timeline and is comprehensive enough to include all of its weapons of mass destruction programs and focus on the complete dismantlement of all of its nuclear sites and programs. This declaration of all of its sites and programs needs to be provided to the United States in short order to allow the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA, inspectors to start the inspections process, which will take years. Second, we need North Korea to agree to verifiable denuclearization with IAEA inspections, and that agreement should include a concrete timeline with a step-by-step process. If we are going to continue to scope down our joint exercises for the sake of these negotiations, then, we need to see concrete actions by North Korea in the next few months. It has been almost a year since our war talk, and we have not seen any concrete irreversible actions taken by North Korea on its nuclear program that signify an intent by the regime to give up or significantly curtail its programs.

For example, if the President gets assurances that the Sohae launch facility and the closure and inspections of the Yongbyon nuclear facility, he may think that North Korea has moved the needle on denuclearization, but as the experts agree, there are other nuclear sites that are more critical for the regime’s programs. As recent reports by the Center for Strategic and International Studies have shown, there are many missile sites that have not been declared as critical to the nuclear program. This is why a full declaration is so critical—and so why we need to finquire that we finally have a comprehensive accounting of the nuclear and missile programs that exist. In the meantime, the administration also needs to be vigilant that China and other countries continue to enforce sanctions. President Trump’s assertions that the problem is solved will only go so far and is not a sufficient substitute for inspections. The recent statements from the White House and the rest of the administration that the Singapore summit was the first step and until we see concrete reductions and the abuse of the sanctions regime. Keeping China in line on that front will be a significant challenge, especially given the isolationist bent of this President, who has managed to alienate the very partners we need to cooperate on the sanctions regime.

China does not need to state publicly that it will stop enforcing sanctions. Even low-level cross-border trade can allow the North Korean economy to hobble along for years, and all it will take is an indication from Beijing that sanctions enforcement is no longer a priority.

To me be clear. One of the most important outcomes of this process is also the preservation of our alliances with South Korea and Japan. Even if we were to somehow achieve a CVID deal with North Korea but lose our special relationships with these two nations, we will come out the other side less secure than we are today. While North Korea poses a significant threat to the United States, peace on the peninsula cannot come at the cost of a diminished U.S. presence in Asia. Our alliances and partners in the region are the bulwark of our strength in the region.

Both South Korea and Japan have significant national security interests that will be adjudicated during these negotiations. Neither is at the negotiating table. I am very concerned that Japan in particular is dismayed that there has not been any substantive progress in the negotiations. It is critical that the administration continue to raise issues that are critical to Japan, especially the Japanese citizens who were abducted by North Korea. It is up to this administration to ensure that their interests are voiced and that their security needs are met. That means not only addressing North Korea’s intercontinental ballistic missile program but also its short- and intermediate-range missiles. It means consulting with our allies before significant decisions affect their security are taken, and it means not publicly lamenting about the costs associated with these historic and strategic alliances. We cannot simply put a price tag on our regional security. Losing these alliances will cost us far more in the long run and leave us far less secure than we are today.

We also need to be concerned about the recent deterioration of the relationship between our two critical allies. Trilateral cooperation is only effective if South Korea and Japan can overcome their historical animosities to present a united front against North Korea.

I know there is a lot of discussion today about the possibility of a peace agreement that ends the Korean War. I fear that many see a peace agreement as the precursor for a removal of U.S. forces from the Korean Peninsula. I am concerned that our President does not understand the critical importance of the deployment of U.S. Forces Korea on the peninsula.

Let me be clear. The withdrawal of troops from the peninsula would significantly undermine our ability to fulfill our treaty obligations to South Korea. It should not be a subject of these negotiations with North Korea. The presence of our troops is the cornerstone of our military alliance with South
Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am here to take the opportunity to join my colleagues to speak in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. I thank Senator Sasse for his continued leadership on this issue. I supported the bill when Senator Sasse introduced it last Congress and I was glad to see Senator McCONNELL, our leader, bring this bill to the floor for a vote.

I am astonished—astonished—that we are debating whether it is acceptable to legally inflict an injury on a child born alive at the same gestational age. Any negligence in this regard is subject to criminal and civil punishment, which at present does not exist.

Should anyone think this is some made-up issue—despite the Virginia Attorney General’s decision that this grotesque act happens. Notorious abortion provider Kermit Gosnell is serving life in prison for these very acts.

Closing our eyes to what is obscene does not make it any less real. That it is allegedly “rare” doesn’t make it any less real or abhorrent. One child purposely deprived of healthcare and allowed to die is one too many. It is in-fanticide, which brings us to the crux of this issue. We need to think carefully about the long-term impacts to the definition of healthcare. If Congress refuses to act on this measure, can the guardrails of neonatal health succumb to the belief that infants don’t really count as one of us?

Our society is not one of the ancient Romans or the Aztecs. We don’t sacrifice our children to please an unknown god. In the progress of human history, principles of the enlightenment—also known as the Age of Reason—declared self-evident truths that all humans are created equal and endowed with the inalienable right to life. Although undoubtedly we have our flaws, these enlightenment principles enshrined in our founding documents remain true to who we are as a nation and who we are as human beings. We recoil when we hear of children who are harmed in any manner. Yet today we are faced with a reality where the ability to terminate an unborn child’s life when it is viable outside of the womb is something that is not only tolerated but is passionately defended by the left.

That is bad enough, but to see legislation ensuring that the medical care of born children gets blocked is incomprehensible. The immutable march of progress in human history has met a roadblock today in the U.S. Senate. The Age of Reason seems to have escaped us.

Tonight, the Senate had an opportunity to send a message showing who we are as leaders and as a society as a whole—one that protects the weak and the voiceless instead of one that permits their destruction. I regret and I am saddened that the Senate failed this fundamental test. I am eager to do more to protect innocent life, including the unborn, but the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act provided us an opportunity to affirm the most basic need for healthcare for a vulnerable child who has already beaten the odds to survive. Let’s hope we have another opportunity to give these children the chance at life they so deserve.

I thank you. I yield the floor.

The NOMINATION OF JOHN L. RYDER
Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this week, the Senate may see an extreme example of how the minority can abuse its rights in a way that provokes the majority into an excessive use of power. I come to the floor to offer my Democratic colleagues a way to avoid both mistakes.

Here is the abuse of minority rights: More than a year ago, President Trump nominated John Ryder of Memphis to serve on the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority based on the recommendation that Senator Bob Corker and I made. Finally, this week, the Senate is likely to vote on Mr. Ryder’s nomination.

You might say: Well, there must really be something wrong with Mr. Ryder.

Well, if there is, then all the people who are supposed to find out what is wrong with Mr. Ryder have not found it out. Senator Corker and I know him very well as one of Tennessee’s finest...
attorneys. Senator BLACKBURN agrees. After a hearing at which Mr. Ryder answered questions, Republican and Democratic members of the Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously approved his nomination. No, there is no problem with Mr. Ryder.

You might say: This must be a position of overwhelming complexity and importance that requires a year for all of us to think about it.

TV is the Nation's largest public utility, and it is important to the millions of us in the seven-State region for whom it provides electricity. But this is not a lifetime appointment. It is not a Cabinet position. It is not even a full-time position. This is one of nine part-time board positions whose nominees are usually approved in the Senate by a voice vote.

The problem is not with Mr. Ryder. It is because of the unusual importance of the position. The problem is with the determination of the Democratic minority to make it nearly impossible for President Trump to fill the 1,200 Federal Government positions that require Senate confirmation by the U.S. Senate, as part of our constitutional duty to provide advice and consent.

This is where we are: Democrats have objected to the majority leader's request to vote on Mr. Ryder's nomination. As I mentioned, these are nominations normally approved by a voice vote. So in order to have a vote, the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has filed a cloture petition to cut off debate on Mr. Ryder's nomination.

The cloture process takes at least 3 days. Here is how it works: The first day, you file cloture. That is what Senator B LACKBURN agrees. The second day is a so-called intervening day when no action is happening. On the third day, the Senate votes to invoke cloture, and then there is up to 30 more hours for postcloture debate before the Senate can finally vote on whether to confirm Mr. Ryder. Under these rules, Mr. Ryder is not the only victim of such obstructionism. During the last 2 years, Democrats have done what I just described 128 times. One hundred and twenty-eight times they have required the majority leader to consume up to 3 days to force a vote on a Presidential nominee. By comparison, requiring a cloture vote to advance a nomination happened 12 times during the first 2 years of President Bush; 12 times during President Trump’s 1st 2 years; 4 times during the first 2 years of George W. Bush’s term, compared to President Trump’s 128 times; 12 times during Bill Clinton’s first 2 years, compared to President Trump’s 128 times; 12 times during George H. W. Bush’s first 2 years in office was it necessary for the majority leader to file cloture to cut off debate to advance a Presidential nomination—not once—but it had to be done 128 times in the first 2 years of President Trump’s time.

This unnecessary obstruction has to change. The result of this extraor-
limited postcloture debate on sub-Cabinet positions to 8 hours and on Federal district judges to 2 hours for the 113th Congress. All of these changes took effect immediately over these 60 days.

Let me underscore what I am about to say: did not not insist, in 2011, 2012, and 2013, when Barack Obama was President, that these new rules should be delayed until after the next Presidential election when there might be a Republican President. Republicans supported these changes for the benefit of this institution, even though they would immediately benefit a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate majority.

I propose that we do that again. I invite my Democratic colleagues to join me in demonstrating the same sort of bipartisan respect for the Senate as an institution that Senators Reid and McConnell—the two Senate leaders at that time—Senators Schumer, Barbero, Levin, McCain, Kyi, Cardin, Collins, and I did in 2011, 2012, and 2013, when we worked to change the Senate rules the right way.

Now, 2 weeks ago, the Rules Committee gave us an opportunity to do things again in the right way by reporting out a resolution offered by Senator Lankford and Senator Blunt, the chairman of the Rules Committee. This resolution, which is similar to the standing order that 78 Senators voted for on January 14, 2013, would reduce postcloture debate time for nominations. Remember, that is after day one, the majority leader files cloture; day two, nothing happens; day three, we have a vote on cloture that is by 51 votes, and we would reduce the time for debate on day three. District judges would be debated for 2 hours, the same as the 2013 standing order that 78 Senators voted for. Other sub-Cabinet positions would be subject to 2 hours of postcloture debate as well.

The proposal offered by Senator Lankford and Senator Blunt would not reduce the postcloture debate time for Supreme Court Justices, for Cabinet members, for circuit court or certain Board nominations, like the National Labor Relations Board, but would divide the 30 hours of postcloture debate equally between Republicans and Democrats.

The Lankford-Blunt proposal would put the Senate back where it has historically been on nominations. With rare exceptions, Senate nominations have always been decided by majority vote. Let me say that again. With rare exceptions, Senate nominations have always been decided by majority vote.

President Johnson’s nomination of Abe Fortas as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was the only example of a Supreme Court nominee who was blocked by requiring more than 51 votes.

There has never been, in the history of the Senate, a Cabinet nominee who was blocked by requiring more than 51 votes. There has never been, in the history of the Senate, a Federal district judge whose nomination was blocked by requiring more than 51 votes.

Since 1949, Senate rules have allowed one Senator to insist on a cloture vote; that is, 60 votes, which requires more than a majority to end debate. Even though it was allowed, it just wasn’t done. Even the vote on the acrimonious nomination of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court was decided by a majority vote of 52 to 48. Not one Senator tried to block the nomination by requiring a vote of 60, even though one Senator could have done that.

Only when Democrats began, in 2003, to block President George W. Bush’s nominees by insisting on a 60-vote cloture vote did that tradition change. Then, in 2017, using the Harry Reid precedent, Republicans restored the tradition of requiring a majority vote to approve all Presidential nominees, which, as I have said, has been the tradition throughout the history of the Senate.

Also, until recently, with rare exceptions, nominations have been considered promptly. After all, there are 1,200 of these and the Senate has resolved every one of them, including things besides just being in the personnel business.

For example, last month, I was in Memphis for the investiture of Mark Norris, whose nomination languished for 10 months on the Senate calendar. The evening before, I had dinner with 94-year-old Harry W. Wellford. In November of 1970, Senator Howard Baker of Tennessee had recommended Harry Wellford to be a circuit court judge on the same court where Mark Norris now serves.

By December 11, 1970, 1 month later, President Nixon had nominated Harry Wellford, and the Senate had confirmed him. All this happened in 1 month. Not all nominations have moved that fast. In 1991, a Democratic Senator, using a secret hold, blocked President George H. W. Bush’s nomination of me as U.S. Education Secretary. I waited on the Senate calendar for 10 months on the Senate calendar.

Well, I wonder if Democrats would like to emulate the Supreme Court Justices in respecting and strengthening this institution in which we are privileged to serve. One way to do that is to join together to restore the prompt consideration of any President’s 1,200 nominees and do it in a bipartisan way that shows the American people our written rules mean what they say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO ERNEST MATT HOUSE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, later this week, Leadership Tri-County from Knox, Whitley, and Laurel Counties in my home State will present one of its highest honors: the Leader of the Year award. I was delighted to learn this year’s title will be given to Ernest Matt House, a lifelong resident of London, KY, and a remarkable example of entrepreneurship. I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to Ernest Matt’s many accomplishments in Kentucky.

From an early age, Ernest Matt’s talents were on full display. In high
school, he excelled both in the classroom and on the field, earning 14 varsity letters and a place in the Kentucky High School Athletic Association’s Hall of Fame, but these achievements, of course, were just the beginning. Ernest Matt received a full scholarship to play football at Eastern Kentucky University. There, he was EKU’s starting quarterback for 3 years and lettered all 4. His notable time in the Colonel’s uniform merited inclusion into the school’s athletic hall of fame, and he is among the best quarterbacks in its history.

After his graduation, Ernest Matt returned to Laurel County and began working at his family’s grocery store. Named for both of his grandfathers, he had big shoes to fill in the family business, but it didn’t take long for Ernest Matt to learn the competitive business and set his sights on the future. Although a lot has changed in the grocery business and in the community, Ernest Matt holds onto the tradition of personal service that keeps bringing loyal customers back to the store. Over the next years, his continued entrepreneurial success earned him distinction both in the local community and across the Nation.

Leadership Tri-County was established more than three decades ago to foster and develop emerging local leaders. Its programs in Kentucky invest in the men and women who have spent their lives making their communities a better place to live. This award is given each year to an individual who has contributed to the area’s growth and development, and Ernest Matt clearly fits the bill. Through his business success and service on local, regional, and State board and commissions, Ernest Matt has quite a legacy of achievement.

A man of deep faith, Ernest Matt credits his good works both to Christ and to his loving family, especially his wife Kim. I am sure she, along with his children and grandchildren, are quite proud of him. Kentucky has been made better because of Ernest Matt’s many contributions, and I would like to congratulate him for being named the 2019 Leader of the Year. I encourage my Senate colleagues to join me in recognizing his work.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent that the rules of procedure of the Committee on Appropriations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE RULES—116th CONGRESS 1. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum.

For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of sworn testimony by a Subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

III. PROXIES

Except for the reporting of a bill, votes may be cast by proxy when any member so requests.

IV. ATTENDANCE OF STAFF MEMBERS AT CLOSED SESSIONS

Attendance of staff members at closed sessions of the Committee shall be limited to those members of the Committee staff who have been identified in writing to the Chairman with the matter being considered at such meeting. This rule may be waived by unanimous consent.

V. BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee or any of its subcommittees may permit the photographing and broadcast of open hearings by television and/or radio. However, if any member of a subcommittee objects to the photographing or broadcasting of an open hearing, the question shall be referred to the full Committee for its decision.

VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee’s consideration of said bill and report.

VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by a Senator for further markup shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markup.

VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriations bill is hereby authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriations bill.

IX. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members but shall have no vote in the subcommittee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 116th Congress. Pursuant to rules XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator Brown, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

[Amended February 24, 2009]

RULE 1. REGULAR MEETING DATE FOR COMMITTEE

The regular meeting day for the Committee to transact its business shall be the last Tuesday in each month that the Senate is in session; except that if the Committee has met at any time during the month prior to the last Tuesday of the month, the regular meeting of the Committee may be canceled at the discretion of the Chairman.

RULE 2. COMMITTEE

[a] Investigations. No investigation shall be initiated by the Committee unless the Senate, or the full Committee, or the Chairman and Ranking Member have specifically authorized such investigation.

[b] Hearings. No hearing of the Committee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia except by agreement between the Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

[c] Confidential testimony. No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Committee or any report of the proceedings of such executive session shall be made public either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Committee.

[d] Interrogation of witnesses. Committee interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Committee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Committee.

[e] Prior notice of markup sessions. No session of the Committee or a Subcommittee to consider any measure shall be held unless [1] each member of the Committee or the Subcommittee, as the case may be, has been notified in writing either by personal delivery, hand delivery, mail or paper mail of the date, time, and place of such session and has been furnished a copy of the measure to be considered, in a searchable electronic format, at least 3 business days prior to the commencement of such session, or [2] the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee determines that exigent circumstances exist requiring that the session be held sooner.

[f] Prior notice of first degree amendments. It shall not be in order for the Committee or a Subcommittee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee unless fifteen written copies of such amendment have been delivered to the office of the Committee at least 2 business days prior to the meeting. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Senator to offer a motion by any subcommittee, in part or in whole, or to propose amendments by way of substitute, by change, or in any other manner, to any measure under consideration. Such a motion to strike a section of any measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee is amendable. This section may be waived by a majority of the members of the Committee or Subcommittee voting, or by agreement of the Chairman and Ranking Member. This subsection shall apply only when the conditions of subsection [e][1] have been met.
[g] Cordon rule. Whenever a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall be before the Committee or Subcommittee, from initial consideration to final disposition, and no member of a special meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee designated to consider the bill or joint resolution shall be permitted to be present at any regular or special meeting, by stricken-through type, the part or parts to be omitted, and in italics, the matter proposed to be added. In addition, whenever a member of the Committee or Subcommittee is provided to consider or report any amendment or supplement to a bill or joint resolution found to be necessary to complete the action of a majority of the Committee, it is necessary to expedite the business of the Committee or Subcommittee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEES

[a] Authorization for. A Subcommittee of the Committee may be authorized by the Committee to conduct business.

[b] Membership. No member may be a member of more than one Subcommittee, and no member may chair more than one Subcommittee. No member will receive assignment to a second Subcommittee until, in the opinion of the Committee, either in whole or in part or by way of alternation, the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the Committee shall be satisfied that there is no conflict of interest.

[c] Investigations. No investigation shall be initiated by a Subcommittee unless the Senate Committee has specifically authorized such investigation.

[d] Hearings. No hearing of a Subcommittee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia without the prior consultation with the Chairman and then only by agreement between the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Committee or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

[e] Confidential testimony. Confidential testimony or information, if introduced at an executive session of the Committee or a Subcommittee, or at any hearing, shall be privileged and shall not be disclosed to any person outside the Committee or the Subcommittee, unless the Chairman gives prior approval.

[f] Interrogation of witnesses. Subcommittees shall be authorized to conduct hearings in public or executive sessions, and no witness shall have the privilege of questioning the witness for a 5-minute period per member. This 5-minute period per member shall be in the files of the Committee.

RULE 4. WITNESSES

[a] Filing of statements. Any witness appearing before the Committee or Subcommittee (including any witness representing a Government agency) must file with the Committee or Subcommittee, on the date and hour of the testimony, a copy of the witness’s testimony and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his or her vote to be cast by proxy.

[b] Cordon rule. The witness may affirmatively request that his or her vote be cast by proxy.

[c] Expenses of witnesses. No witness shall be reimbursed for his or her appearance at a public or executive hearing before the Committee or Subcommittee unless such reimbursement is agreed to by the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the Committee.

RULE 5. VOTING

[a] Vote to report a measure or matter. No measure or matter shall be reported by the Committee or a Subcommittee unless a majority of the members of the Committee or a Subcommittee are actually present. The vote of the Committee or a Subcommittee is required to report a measure or matter to the Committee shall be the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Committee voting. On Subcommittee reports, at least two members of the Subcommittee shall vote by proxy. In the event that the witness fails to file a statement or other addenda as the witness feels necessary to present properly his or her views to the Committee or Subcommittee, and the statement or other addenda are not presented to the Committee or Subcommittee, the Chairman may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies shall be kept in the files of the Committee.

[b] Vote on matters other than to report a measure or matter. On Committee matters other than to vote to report a measure or matter, no record vote shall be taken unless a majority of the members of the Committee are actually present. On any such other matter, a member of the Committee may request that his or her vote be cast by proxy.

RULE 6. QUORUM

No executive session of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be called to order unless a majority of the members of the Committee or a Subcommittee, as the case may be, are actually present. Unless the Committee otherwise provides or is required by the Rules of the Senate, any member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence, the swearing in of witnesses, and the taking of testimony.

RULE 7. STAFF PRESENT ON DAI

Only members and the Chair of the Committee shall be permitted on the dais during public or executive hearings, except that a member of the Committee may have one or more staff members accompany him or her during such public or executive hearing on the dais. If a member desires
a second staff person to accompany him or her on the dais he or she must make a request to the Chairman for that purpose.

**RULE 6. CONAIGE LEGISLATION**

At least 67 Senators must cosponsor any gold, silver, or commemorative coin bill or resolution before consideration by the Committee.

**EXTRACTS FROM THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE**

**RULE XXV, STANDING COMMITTEES**

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with the power to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

- Banks, banking, and financial institutions.
- Control of prices of commodities, rents, and services.
- Deposit insurance.
- Economic stabilization and defense production.
- Export and foreign trade promotion.
- Export controls.
- Federal monetary policy, including Federal Reserve System.
- Financial aid to commerce and industry.
- Issuance and redemption of notes.
- Money and credit, including currency and coinage.
- Nursing home construction.
- Public and private housing (including veterans’ housing).
- Renegotiation of Government contracts.
- Urban development and urban mass transit.

2. Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to international economic policy as it affects United States monetary affairs, credit, and financial institutions; economic growth, urban affairs, and credit, and report thereon from time to time.

**COMMITTEE PROCESSES FOR PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES**

Procedures formally adopted by the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, February 4, 1981, establish a uniform notification process for all Presidential nominees whose confirmation hearings come before this Committee.

In addition, the procedures establish that:

1. A confirmation hearing shall normally be held at least 5 days after receipt of the completed questionnaire by the Committee unless waived by a majority vote of the Committee.

2. The Committee shall vote on the confirmation not less than 24 hours after the Committee has received transcripts of the hearing unless waived by unanimous consent.

3. All nominees routinely shall testify under oath at their confirmation hearings.

This questionnaire shall be made a part of the public record except for financial information, which shall be kept confidential.

Nominees are requested to answer all questions, and to add additional pages where necessary.

**DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY**

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask by unanimous consent that the attached letter signed by 58 former national security officials, who served under Republican and Democratic administrations, criticizing President Trump’s declaration of a national emergency to build a wall on our southern border be printed in the RECORD.

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

**JOINT DECLARATION OF FORMER UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS**

We, the undersigned, declare, as follows:

1. We are former officials in the U.S. government who have worked on national security and homeland security issues from the White House to the Executive Branch.

2. We have served in senior leadership roles in administrations of both major political parties, and collectively we have devoted a great many decades to protecting the security interests of the United States. We have held the highest security clearances, and have participated in the highest levels of policy deliberations on a broad range of issues. These include: immigration, border security, counterterrorism, military operations, and our nation’s relationships with countries, including those south of our border.

3. Madeleine K. Albright served as Secretary of State from 1997 to 2001. A refugee and naturalized American citizen, she served as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1993 to 1997. She has also been a member of the Central Intelligence Agency External Advisory Board since 2009 and of the Defense Policy Board since 2011, in which capacities she has received assessments of threats facing the United States.

4. John B. Bellinger III served as the Legal Adviser to the U.S. Department of State from 2005 to 2009. He previously served as Senior Associate Counsel to the President and Legal Adviser to the National Security Council from 2003 to 2005.

5. Daniel J. Benjamin served as Ambassador-at-Large for Counterterrorism at the U.S. Department of State from 2005 to 2009. He previously served as Deputy Secretary of State from 2009 to 2012.

6. Antony B. Blinken served as Deputy Secretary of State from 2015 to 2017. He previously served as Deputy National Security Advisor to the President from 2013 to 2015.

7. John E. Bobbitt served as Assistant Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2013 to 2017. He previously served as Deputy National Security Advisor for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism and Assistant to the President from 2009 to 2013.

8. G. Nicholas Burns served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2005 to 2008. He previously served as U.S. Ambassador to NATO and as U.S. Ambassador to Greece.

9. William J. Burns served as Deputy Secretary of State from 2011 to 2014. He previously served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2008 to 2011, as U.S. Ambassador to Turkey from 2008 to 2009, as Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs from 2001 to 2005, and as U.S. Ambassador to Jordan from 1998 to 2001.

10. John M. deutch served as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2009 to 2013. He previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan from 2004 to 2009. He served as U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan from 2011 to 2012, as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons from 2001 to 2003. She previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to Slovenia from 1998 to 2001.

11. Daniel P. Ethernet served as Special Advisor for Afghanistan and Pakistan at the U.S. Department of State from 2014 to 2016.

12. John D. Feeley served as U.S. Ambassador to Panama from 2015 to 2018. He served as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Western Hemisphere Affairs at the U.S. Department of State from 2013 to 2015.

13. Daniel E. Feldman served as Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan at the U.S. Department of State from 2014 to 2016.

14. Jonathan Finer served as Chief of Staff to the Secretary of State from 2015 to 2017, and Director of the Policy Planning Staff at the U.S. Department of State from 2014 to 2016.

15. Jeni D. Frazer served as Special Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2005 to 2009. She previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to South Africa from 2004 to 2005.

16. Suzy George served as Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff of the National Security Council from 2014 to 2017.

17. Phil Gordon served as Special Assistant to the President and White House Coordinator for the Middle East and the Gulf from 2013 to 2015, and Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs from 2009 to 2013.

18. Chuck Hagel served as Secretary of Defense from 2013 to 2015, and previously served as Co-Chair of the President’s Intelligence Advisory Board. From 1997 to 2009, he served as U.S. Senator for Nebraska, and as a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations and Intelligence Committees.

19. Avril D. Haines served as Deputy National Intelligence Director to the President from 2015 to 2017. From 2013 to 2015, she served as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.


21. Joaquin Quiroga served as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs from 2011 to 2016.

22. Nancy Ely-Raphel served as Senior Advisor to the Secretary of State and Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons from 2001 to 2003. She previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan from 2009 to 2013.

23. Nancy Ely-Raphel served as Senior Advisor to the Secretary of State and Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons from 2001 to 2003. She previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan from 2009 to 2013.

ee. Prem Kumar served as Senior Director for the Middle East and North Africa at the National Security Council from 2013 to 2015.

ff. John E. McLaughlin served as Deputy Director for Intelligence and Analysis at the National Security Council, ultimately serving as Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Senior Director for Multilateral and Homeland Affairs.

gg. Lisa O. Monaco served as Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism and Deputy National Security Advisor with responsibilities for European and Eurasian Affairs from 2011 to 2013.

hh. Susan Rice served as Secretary of Homeland Security from 2009 to 2013. She served as the Governor of Arizona from 2003 to 2009.


jj. James C. O’Brien served as Special Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs from 2015 to 2017. He served in the U.S. Department of State from 2011, including as Principal Deputy Director of Policy Planning and as Special Presidential Envoy for the Balkans.

kk. Matthew G. Olsen served as Director of the National Counterterrorism Center from 2011 to 2014.

ll. Leon Panetta served as Secretary of Defense from 2011 to 2013. From 2009 to 2011, he served as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

mm. Anne W. Patterson served as Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs from 2013 to 2017. Previously, she served as the U.S. Ambassador to Egypt from 2011 to 2013. She served from 2007 to 2010, to Colombia from 2000 to 2005, and to El Salvador from 1997 to 2000.


oo. Amy Pope served as Deputy Homeland Security Advisor and Deputy Assistant to the President from 2015 to 2017.


qq. Jeffrey Prescott served as Deputy National Security Advisor to the Vice President from 2013 to 2015, and as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Iran, Iraq, Syria, and the Gulf States from 2015 to 2017.

rr. Nicholas Rasmussen served as Director of the National Counterterrorism Center from 2014 to 2017.

ss. Alan Charles Raul served as Vice Chairman of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board from 2007 to 2008. He previously served as General Counsel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture from 1989 to 1993, General Counsel of the Office of Management and Budget in the Executive Office of the President from 1988 to 1989, and Associate Counsel to the President from 1986 to 1989.

tt. Dan Restrepo served as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Western Hemisphere Affairs at the National Security Council from 2009 to 2012.

uu. Eric P. Schwartz served as Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration from 2009 to 2011. From 1993 to 2001, he was responsible for refugee and humanitarian affairs at the National Security Council, ultimately serving as Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Senior Director for Multilateral and Homeland Affairs.

vv. Andrew J. Shapiro served as Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs from 2009 to 2013. He previously served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2011 to 2015.

ww. Vikram Singh served as Deputy Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan from 2010 to 2011 and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Southeast Asia from 2012 to 2014.

xx. Dana Shell Smith served as U.S. Ambassador to Qatar from 2014 to 2017. Previously, she served as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs.

yy. Jeffrey H. Smith served as General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency from 1996 to 1998. He previously served as General Counsel of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

zz. Jake Sullivan served as National Security Advisor to Congressman Alan Lowenthal from 2013 to 2014. He previously served as Director of Policy Planning at the U.S. Department of State from 2011 to 2013.

aaa. Jon Wolfsthal served as Assistant Secretary of State from 1994 to 2001.

bbb. Linda Thomas-Greenfield served as Special Assistant to the President for International Engagement at the U.S. Department of State from 1999 to 2001.

ccc. Jake Sullivan served as National Security Advisor to Congressman Alan Lowenthal from 2013 to 2014. He previously served as Director of Policy Planning at the U.S. Department of State from 2011 to 2013.

ddd. Strobe Talbott served as Deputy Secretary of State from 1994 to 2001.

eee. Linda Thomas-Greenfield served as Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of African Affairs from 2013 to 2017. She previously served as U.S. Ambassador to Liberia and Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration from 2004 to 2006.

fff. Arturo A. Valenzuela served as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs from 2009 to 2011. He previously served as Assistant Secretary of State for Mexican Affairs from 1999 to 2000, and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Mexican Affairs from 1994 to 1996.

ggg. On February 15, 2019, the President declared a “national emergency” for the purpose of diverting appropriated funds from previously designated uses to build a wall along the southern border. We are aware of one example of such a step. The President’s actions are at odds with the overwhelming evidence in the public record, including the administration’s own data and estimates. We have lived and worked through national emergencies, and we support the President’s power to mobilize the Executive Branch to respond quickly in the face of imminent danger when under no plausible assessment of the evidence is there a national emergency today that entitles the President to tap into funds appropriated for other purposes to secure a border.

h. Although the White House has claimed, as an argument favoring a wall at the southern border, that almost 4,000 known or suspected terrorists were intercepted at the southern border in a single year, this assertion has since been widely and consistently repudiated, including by this administration’s own Department of Homeland Security.

i. The overwhelming majority of individuals on the terrorist watchlist who were intercepted by U.S. Customs and Border Patrol were attempting to travel to the United States by air; of the individuals from which immigration officials suspected the presence of a terrorist watchlist who were encountered while entering the United States during fiscal year 2017, only 13 percent traveled by land. And for those who have traveled by land, only a small fraction do so at the southern border.

j. Between October 2017 and March 2018, forty-one foreign nationals on the U.S. government’s own terrorist watchlist were intercepted at the northern border. Only six such immigrants were intercepted at the southern border.

k. There is no emergency related to violent crime at the southern border. Nor can the administration justify its actions on the grounds that the incidence of violent crime on the southern border constitutes a national emergency. Factual evidence consistently shows that unauthorized immigrants have no special proclivity to engage in criminal or violent behavior. According to a Cato Institute analysis of criminological data, undocumented immigrants are 44 percent less likely to be incarcerated nationwide than native-born individuals. And data that the administration would cite concerning the number of violent crime committed by unauthorized immigrants were found to have a first-time conviction rate 32 percent below that of native-born Americans; the overwhelming majority of rates of violent crimes committed by unauthorized immigrants were below those of native-born individuals. These rates of violent crimes committed by unauthorized immigrants are below those of native-born individuals.
Americans. Meanwhile, overall rates of violent crime in the United States have declined significantly over the past 25 years, falling 49 percent from 1993 to 2017. And violent crime in the country’s largest cities have decreased on average by 2.7 percent in 2018 alone, further undermining any suggestion that crime is on the rise or that we need the threat of a border wall to prevent crime.

2. The overwhelming majority of opioids that enter the United States across a land border are carried through legal ports of entry. Nonprofits that receive funding from the relevant Department of Justice office are U.S. citizens, and even among non-citizens, most trafficking victims served by non-profit organizations that receive funding from the Department of Justice are not smuggled through unauthorized border crossings. A border wall would not stop these drugs from entering the United States. Nor would it compete with other routes, including smuggling tunnels, which circumvent physical barriers as fences and walls, and international mail (which is how high-purity fentanyl, for example, is usually shipped from China, directly to the United States).

3. Crossings at the southern border are not the principal source of human trafficking victims. About two-thirds of human trafficking victims served by non-profit organizations that receive funding from the relevant Department of Justice office are U.S. citizens, and even among non-citizens, most trafficking victims usually arrive in the country on visas. None of these instances of trafficking could be addressed by a border wall. And the three states with the highest per capita trafficking reporting rates are not even located along the southern border.

4. This proclamation will only exacerbate the humanitarian concerns that do exist at the southern border. There are real humanitarian concerns at the border, but they largely result from the current administration’s own deliberations. Without a border, they would not exist. For example, the administration has used a “metering” policy to turn away families fleeing extreme violence and persecution in their home countries, forcing them to wait indefinitely at the border to present their asylum cases, and has adopted a number of other punitive steps to restrict those seeking asylum at the southern border. These actions have forced asylum-seekers to live on the streets or in makeshift shelters and tent cities with abysmal living conditions, and limited access to basic sanitation has caused outbreaks of disease and death. This state of affairs is a consequence of choices this administration has made, and erecting a wall will do nothing to change the policies of these people.

5. Redirecting funds for the claimed “national emergency” will undermine U.S. national security and cause irreversible damage to other security and national priorities. The overwhelming majority of opioids that enter the United States across a land border are carried through legal ports of entry. Nonprofits that receive funding from the relevant Department of Justice office are U.S. citizens, and even among non-citizens, most trafficking victims served by non-profit organizations that receive funding from the Department of Justice are not smuggled through unauthorized border crossings. A border wall would not stop these drugs from entering the United States. Nor would it compete with other routes, including smuggling tunnels, which circumvent physical barriers as fences and walls, and international mail (which is how high-purity fentanyl, for example, is usually shipped from China, directly to the United States).

6. There is no human or drug trafficking emergency that can be addressed by a wall at the southern border. The administration has claimed that the presence of human and drug trafficking at the border justifies its emergency declaration. There is no evidence of any such sudden crisis at the southern border that necessitates a reprioritization of appropriated funds for a border wall.

7. The situation at the border does not require the use of the armed forces, and a wall is unnecessary to support such use of the armed forces. We understand that the administration is also claiming that the situation at the southern border “requires use of the armed forces,” but the Constitution allows for a military commander to support such use of the armed forces. These claims are implausible.

8. Redirecting funds for the claimed “national emergency” will undermine our ability to assist the Border Patrol when there was an extremely high number of apprehensions, and new trends in the number of Border Patrol agents. But currently, even with retention and recruitment challenges, the Border Patrol is at historically high staffing and funding levels, and apprehensions—measured in both absolute and per-agent terms—are near historic lows.

9. Furthermore, the composition of southern border crossings has shifted such that families and unaccompanied minors now account for the majority of immigrants seeking entry at the southern border; these individuals do not present a threat that would need to be countered with military force.

10. There is no basis for circumventing the appropriations process with a declaration of a national emergency at the southern border. We do not deny that our nation faces real immigration and national security challenges. But as the foregoing demonstrates, these challenges demand a thoughtful, evidence-based strategy, not a manufactured crisis that rests on falsehoods and fearmongering. In a briefing before the Senate Intelligence Committee on January 29, 2019, less than one month before the President invoked the national emergency, the Directors of the CIA, DNI, FBI, and NSA testified about numerous serious current threats to U.S. national security, but none of the officials identified the border as one of them. The border is a risk to national security; a border wall is not.

11. Pentagon officials acknowledged that the 2018 National Defense Strategy does not identify the southern border as a security threat. Leading legislators with access to classified information and the President’s own statements have strongly suggested, if not confirmed, that there is no evidence supporting the administration’s declaration of an emergency. And it is reported that the President made the decision to circumvent the appropriations process and reprogram money with the Acting Secretary of Defense having even started to consider where the funds might come from, suggesting an absence of consultation and internal deliberations.

12. In light of all of the foregoing reasons, in our professional opinion, there is no factual basis for the declaration of a national emergency for the purpose of circumventing the appropriations process and reprogramming billions of dollars in funding to construct a wall at the southern border, as directed by the Presidential Proclamation of February 15, 2019. Respectfully submitted.


Jennday Frazer, Suzy George, Phil Gordon, Chuck Haspel, Avril D. Dharms, Lake Hartig, Heather A. Higginton, Roberta Jacobson, Gil Kerlikowske, John F. Kerry.


Amy Pope, Samantha J. Power, Jeffrey Prescott, Nicholas Rasmussen, Alan Charles Raul, Dan Restrepo, Susan E. Rice, Anne C. Richard, Eric P. Schwartz, Andrew J. Shapiro.

Wendy R. Sherman, Vikram Singh, Dana Shell Smith, Jeffrey H. Smith, Jake Sullivan, John O. Brennan, R. Nicholas Burns, William J. Burns, Johnnie Carson, Clapper.


Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to offer my congratulations to Tom Fontana, special assistant to the CEO for the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, CVCC, on his retirement after 30 years of Federal service.

Tom began his career at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1988. He was responsible for communications for one of the Corps’ largest projects, the construction of the Hoover Dam, in the 1990s. He eventually joined the U.S. Department of Defense, where he continued working to successfully completing the project. Tom was at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, when a plane hijacked by terrorist crashed into the building.

While Tom had just accepted a position with the Architect of the Capitol, AOC, to manage communications for the construction phase of the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, due to the tragedy, he remained in his position at the Pentagon to lend assistance before assuming his role with the CVC in 2001.
Throughout the construction of the CVC, Tom provided countless tours and briefings to Members of Congress, including leadership and their staff. Given his depth of knowledge, responsiveness, and even-handedness through that challenging time, Tom earned great respect from the Members of Congress and the media in Washington.

In 2008, Tom subsequently assumed the role of director of communications and marketing for the U.S. Capitol Visitor Center. Under Tom’s leadership, the communications division expanded from providing the basics of a startup operation, to providing a wide range of communications to help visitors learn about the Capitol and workings of Congress. He has always looked for ways to take advantage of new technologies to engage visitors, students in particular, about Congress’s history. Under his leadership, the first AOC apps were developed, and one of them received a national award for its innovation.

For many Members of Congress, dignitaries, AOC, and CVC staff, Tom is the authoritative voice on the Capitol Visitor Center. He is widely respected for his unique knowledge about the Capitol building and grounds. From presenting inspiring tours to engaging visitors who are simply seeking directions, he personifies an experience all visitors expect when they come to the U.S. Capitol. Tom is an ambassador for the CVC, the Capitol, and Congress without equal.

Tom has also been an incredible asset to me and my office throughout his leadership at the CVC. Every year, I host a unique dinner on Capitol Hill for governmental leaders from all over the continent of Africa, including heads of state, legislators, and cabinet members. Ambassadors and guests who are key leaders in Africa also attend, along with several U.S. legislators. Prior to the dinner, we provide the guests with a tour of the Capitol to learn more about our Capitol building and the workings of Congress. Throughout all of the years I have held the tour and dinner, Tom has gone above and beyond what was required to make our guests feel welcome and to ensure that everything runs smoothly. His role in the success of our event has become so essential that, several years ago, we began inviting Tom to the dinner not only to support it, but to take part in it.

‘Tom leaves big shoes to fill. My Senate colleagues and I appreciate Tom’s hard work and commitment to our Capitol and country. He will be missed, but I wish him all the best in his retirement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING SERGEANT RAMBO
• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today, with a heavy heart, I wish to pay tribute to Sergeant Rambo N557, a medically retired military working dog—MWD—who dedicated his life to the Marine Corps and raising awareness for his fellow retired working dogs. Sadly, Sergeant Rambo passed away earlier this month. He will be remembered for his loving spirit and lifetime of service.

Sergeant Rambo served as an explosive detection MWD based out of MCCS Cherry Point, NC, from January 6, 2011, to April 11, 2012. Throughout his Active Duty, Sergeant Rambo completed 620 statewide and two official state-side missions, and about 1,000 hours of training. Unfortunately, a left shoulder injury prevented him from deploying. Nonetheless, he served valiantly alongside his handler, protecting their base and the community until retirement.

Connecticut native Lisa Phillips, who served in the U.S. Army as a veterinary technician, adopted Sergeant Rambo after his retirement. Despite needing an amputation because of his earlier injury, he remained committed to serving his Nation.

Well loved by people of all ages and capacities, Sergeant Rambo visited summer youth groups and local nursing homes, connecting with and bringing hope to special needs and elderly people suffering from dementia. His joyful and empathetic personality allowed him to bond with people across the Nation.

Sergeant Rambo also used his experiences to localize welfare, military, and veteran issues. He became the mascot for Alamo Honor Flight, accompanying World War II veterans to Washington, DC, and for Gizmo’s Gift, a nonprofit that supports people who have adopted retired working dogs by offering free medical care and other necessary financial support. He and Lisa attended press events with me, helping gain backing for the Canine Members of the Armed Forces Act, which sought to improve care for MWDs once their Active Duty is completed by streamlining the adoption process and establishing a national non-profit to cover the veterinary costs associated with retired working dogs. Several provisions of that act have become law.

In 2015, the American Humane Association named Sergeant Rambo the Military Dog of the Year. He and Lisa used this platform to give a TEDx Talk the next year about MWDs and Gizmo’s Gift. Then, in March 2017, they testified before the Connecticut General Assembly about a bill to establish K-9 Veterans Day in our State.

My wife Cynthia and I extend our deepest sympathies to Lisa during this difficult time. We know without a doubt that Sergeant Rambo’s legacy will leave a positive impact on the lives he touched and causes he championed for years to come.

RECOGNIZING MAGELLAN TRANSPORT LOGISTICS
• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wish to honor and commend one of the dedicated and hard-working small businesses that does so much for the State of Florida. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. Today, it is my distinct pleasure to name Magellan Transport Logistics, of Jacksonville, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Founded in 2006, Magellan Transport Logistics is a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business dedicated to providing its customers with a wide range of transportation needs. Tom Piatak founded Magellan Transport Logistics based on the same qualities that he learned while serving in the U.S. Army. A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, Tom instills into the company the values he learned from West Point, as well as from his service as a combat engineer during Operation Desert Storm.

Today, Tom serves as chief executive officer and chairman of Magellan. Under his guidance, the company has become a leader in supporting the vast transportation needs of its clients. Tom and his team have gained much of their success by recruiting some of the most talented leaders and logistics professionals in the industry. By instituting four core values of entrepreneurship, ownership mentality, innovation, and transparency within the company, Magellan has created a positive culture that has translated into rapid growth and success. In March 2018, Magellan announced the acquisition of a 47,000-square-foot warehouse and the hiring of 100 employees over the next 5 years, furthering its investment in the Jacksonville community.

Magellan is known for its dedication to its employees and as a pillar of the Jacksonville community. The company offers complete logistics and transportation services, both local and international, by truck or airplane, while also providing warehousing services and supply chain management. Magellan has built strong relationships with its clients by embracing the “no man left behind” principle that Tom learned during his time serving our country in the U.S. Army.

As a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business, Magellan is committed to hiring veterans and participating in community service events to benefit America’s veterans. In December, Magellan sponsored 20 wreaths for National Wreaths Across America Day, as well as assisted with unloading and placing the memorial wreaths on the graves of fallen servicemembers. Magellan is a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business of the Week.

In addition to their continued service to our Nation’s veterans, Magellan has also aided the community in disaster relief efforts. Following Hurricane Michael in the fall of 2018, Magellan
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worked directly with FEMA, providing 40 trucks and three staff members as part of the disaster recovery effort. They also partnered with Operation BBQ Relief, a nonprofit organization, to deliver meals and supplies to families throughout impacted areas.

Tom Piatak and Magellan are regularly honored for their success and dedication to the Jacksonville community. During the 2017–2018 NFL football season, the Jacksonville Jaguars honored Magellan as their Veteran Business of the Week. The Jacksonville Business Journal recognized Tom and the team at Magellan for their efforts to hire veterans, and the Wounded Warrior Project awarded the company with the Wounded Warrior Certificate of Recognition in 2017.

Tom Piatak’s work to grow Magellan Transport Logistics while staying committed to his community and veterans represents the dedication to service for which Florida entrepreneurs are well known. Through hard work, Tom and his team at Magellan Transport Logistics have built a successful business grounded in strong values, while serving as an example of superior corporate citizenship. I would like to congratulate Tom and the entire team at Magellan Transport Logistics for being named the Senate Small Business of the Week. I wish them good luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees for consideration.

The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 15, 2019, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution:


The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H.J. Res. 31) making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 15, 2019, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the enrolled joint resolution was signed on February 15, 2019, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mrs. Fischer).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to sections 55090 and 55091 of title 55, United States Code, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. KENNECY of Massachusetts and Mrs. BEATTY of Ohio.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 102(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. BEYER of Virginia, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. TRONE of Maryland, Mrs. BEATTY of Ohio, and Ms. FRANKEL of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 769(a)), amended by Public Law 107–117, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Mr. KENNECY of Massachusetts and Mrs. BEATTY of Ohio.

The message also announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. BOWENOW, Mr. GARBER, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. BALDWIN.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:
Report to accompany S. 168, A bill to prevent catastrophic failure or shutdown of remote diesel power engines due to emission control devices, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–2).

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. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLLEN):
S. 536. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to expand the pilot program to test the waters and confidential draft registration submissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CREAMER, and Ms. BALDWIN):
S. 537. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to hiring veterans who are receiving educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or Defense; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. STA-BENOW, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. COONS):
S. 538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employer–provided worker training; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–344. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting, pursuant to Section 201(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, a biennial report entitled “Recommendations for Improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act,” received in the office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–345. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring a national emergency in order to address the border security and humanitarian crisis that is threatening the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.
S. 539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish Lifelong Learning and Training Account programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 540. A bill to provide minimum standards for transactions secured by a dwelling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOTEIEN, Mr. SASSLE, Mr. VANDERHORST, and Mr. KING):

S. 541. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot program for providing portable benefits to eligible workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUSKIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MEEKERY, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 542. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 543. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to finalize rules to protect consumers from the risks of carbon monoxide poisoning and rollaways from motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. COONS):

S. 544. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a report on the death of Jamal Khashoggi, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 545. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award institutions of higher education grants for teaching English learners; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAH-REHEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKET, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SANTERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COONS, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 546. A bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Justice.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 547. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain reports filed under such Act to include the names of persons who are registered lobbyists under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 548. A bill to reauthorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKET, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 549. A bill to modernize voter registration, to ensure access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 550. A bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters at the time they turn 18 to vote in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 551. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require manufacturers of certain single-dose vial drugs payable under part B of the Medicare program to provide rebates with respect to amounts of such drugs discarded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 73

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 73, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the deduction for advertising for promotional expenses for prescription drugs.

S. 92

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 92, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 164, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 172

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 172, a bill to delay the reimplementation of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2021.

S. 191

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 191, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to include in periodic health assessments, separation history and physical examinations, and other assessments an evaluation of whether a member of the Armed Forces has been exposed to open burn pits or toxic airborne chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) 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. 215

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 215, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 239

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Chris Kyle and Audie Murphy.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 270

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 270, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of wage discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 296, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide a more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 296, supra.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to amend title 18, to increase penalties for voting or attempting to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit, and for other purposes.
At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing coordinated care for children with complex medical conditions through a health home.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, supra.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 320, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require federally licensed firearms importers, manufacturers, and dealers to meet certain requirements with respect to securing their firearms inventory, business records, and business premises.

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognition Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 382, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 383, a bill to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 386, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. REID), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 479, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a deprivation of civil rights, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to support State, Tribal, and local efforts to remove access to firearms from individuals who are a danger to themselves or others pursuant to court orders for this purpose.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 506, a bill to support State, Tribal, and local efforts to remove access to firearms from individuals who are a danger to themselves or others pursuant to court orders for this purpose.

At the request of Mrs. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to clarify that a State may not use an individual’s failure to vote as the basis for initiating the procedures provided under such Act for the removal of the individual from the official list of registered voters in the State on the grounds that the individual has changed residence, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERRKLEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 513, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil forfeitures relating to certain seized animals, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to establish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 525, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 73, a resolution calling on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to immediately release Saudi Women’s Rights activists and respect the fundamental rights of all Saudi citizens.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 74, a resolution marking the fifth anniversary of Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity by honoring the bravery, determination, and sacrifice of the people of Ukraine during and since the Revolution, and condemning continued Russian aggression against Ukraine.
STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 551. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require manufacturers of certain single-dose vial drugs payable under part B of the Medicare program to provide rebates with respect to amounts of such drugs discarded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 551

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 "Recovering Excessive Funds for Unused and Unnecessary Drugs Act of 2019" or the "REFUND Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. REQUIRING MANUFACTURERS OF CERTAIN SINGLE-DOSE VIAL DRUGS PAYABLE UNDER PART B OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM TO PROVIDE REBATES WITH RESPECT TO DISCARDED AMOUNTS OF SUCH DRUGS.

(a) In general.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(w) Rebate for Certain Discarded Single-Dose Vial Drugs.—

"(1) In general.—The manufacturer (as defined in section 1847A(a)(6)(A)) of a rebatable single-dose vial drug furnished in a calendar quarter shall, not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of information described in paragraph (2)(A)(iii) with respect to such quarter, provide to the Secretary a rebate that is equal to the amount specified in paragraph (3) for such drug for such quarter.

"(2) Secretarial duties.—

"(A) In general.—For each calendar quarter, the Secretary shall, with respect to a rebatable single-dose vial drug of a manufacturer furnished during such quarter—

"(i) require, through use of a modifier such as the J-code modifier (as determined by the Secretary) and such other mechanism as the Secretary determines appropriate by the Secretary, an indication on a claim for such drug of the amount of such drug that was discarded after such drug was furnished, if any;

"(ii) determine the rebate amount (as defined in subparagraph (B)) with respect to such drug; and

"(iii) not later than 60 days after the end of such quarter, provide to such manufacturer notice of the rebate amount determined under paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(B) Rebate amount.—The term 'rebate amount' means, with respect to a rebatable single-dose vial drug of a manufacturer furnished during a quarter, 90 percent of the amount (if any) of such drug that was discarded as indicated pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i).

"(3) Rebate amount.—The amount of the rebate specified in this paragraph is, with respect to a rebatable single-dose vial drug of a manufacturer furnished in a calendar quarter, an amount equal to the product of—

"(A) the total number of units of such drug discarded during such quarter as determined under paragraph (2)(A)(i); and

"(B) the lesser of—

"(i) the average sales price (as defined in section 1847A(c)(1)) for a unit of such drug for such quarter calculated by the Secretary under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act, the price for a unit of such drug for such quarter under such agreement; or

"(ii) the wholesale acquisition cost (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(B)) for a unit of such drug.

(b) Rebate deposits.—Amounts paid as rebates pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be deposited into the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1841.

(c) Enforcement.—

"(1) In general.—The Secretary shall impose a civil money penalty on a manufacturer of a rebatable single-dose vial drug who has failed to comply with a requirement under paragraph (1) for such drug for a calendar quarter in an amount the Secretary determines is commensurate with the sum of—

"(I) the amount that the manufacturer would have paid under such paragraph with respect to such drug for such quarter; and

"(II) 25 percent.

"(ii) Application.—The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to civil money penalties under this subsection in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

"(d) Definitions.—In this subsection:

"(1) Rebateable single-dose vial drug.—The term 'rebateable single-dose vial drug' means a single source drug or biological (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(D)) paid for under this part and furnished on or after January 1, 2020, from a single-dose vial.

"(2) Unreimbursed.—The term 'unreimbursed' has the meaning given such term in section 1847A(b)(2)(B).

"(3) Collection of coinsurance only for portion of rebatable single-dose vial drug administered.—Section 1395l of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l) is amended—

"(A) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by inserting subject to subsection (cc), before with respect to; and

"(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(cc) Collection of coinsurance only for portion of rebatable single-dose vial drug administered.—When processing a claim for a rebatable single-dose vial drug (as defined in section 1834(w)(6)(I)), the Secretary, acting through the relevant Medicare administrative contractor with respect to such claim, shall only collect coinsurance from a beneficiary, taking into account any coverage under a Medicare supplemental policy, if the Secretary determines that the benefit is applicable by the Secretary, with respect to the portion of the drug administered (as indicated by the J-portion of the claim for the drug used as of the date of enactment of this subsection, or any successor code that includes such data as determined appropriate by the Secretary), in an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount of payment that would be made if payment for the claim was based only on the portion of the drug administered (as so indicated).

Nothing in the preceding sentence shall affect the amount paid to the provider of services or supplier with respect to the drug under publication (as determined based on the total amount of the drug for which the claim was submitted, including the portion of the drug administered and the portion discarded, if any) or any applicable modifier, and the JW modifier, respectively, used as of such date of enactment or any successor codes that include such data as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today’s session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5a, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, February 25, 2019, at 5 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

BIENNIAL REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS


Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY, President Pro Tempore, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR) to biennially submit a report containing recommendations regarding Federal workplace rights, safety and health, and public access laws and regulations that should be made applicable to Congress and its agents. The purpose of this report is to ensure that the rights afforded by the CAA to legislative branch employees and visitors to Capitol Hill and district offices remain equivalent to those in the private sector and the executive branch of the Federal government.

As such, these recommendations support the intent of Congress to keep pace with advances in workplace rights and public access laws.

Accompanying this letter is a copy of our section 102(b) report—titled "Recommendations for Improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act"—for consideration by the 116th Congress. We welcome discussion on these issues and urge that Congress act on these important recommendations.

Your office is receiving this initial copy prior to it being uploaded to our public website. On March 4, 2019, this report will be available to the public on our website. On March 4, 2019, this report will be available to the public on our website. On March 4, 2019, this report will be available to the public on our website.

Sincerely,

SUZAN TSUI GRUNDMANN, Executive Director.
Office of Congressional Workplace Rights—
Board of Directors' Biennial Report required by Title II of the Congressional Accountability Act issued at the conclusion of the 115th Congress (2017–2018) for consideration by the 116th Congress

Statement From the Board of Directors

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) embodies a promise by Congress to the American public that it will hold itself accountable to the same federal workplace protections as Congress’s private sector employers and executive branch agencies. This landmark legislation was also crafted to provide for ongoing review of the federal workplace and access to Congress’s processes that apply to Congress. Section 102(b) of the CAA thus tasks the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (OCWR)—formerly the Office of Compliance—to review legislation and regulations to ensure that workplace protections in the legislative branch are on par with private sector and executive branch agencies. Accordingly, every Congress, the Board reports on: whether or to what degree [provisions of Federal law (including regulations) relating to (A) the employment of legislative branch personnel (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, staff, relocation, travel, and reimbursement of expenses), protection from discrimination in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave]; (B) access to public services and accommodations] ... are applicable or inapplicable to the legislative branch, and ... with respect to provisions inapplicable to the legislative branch, whether such provisions should be made applicable to the legislative branch. This section of the CAA also requires that the pre- siding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate cause our report to be printed in the Congressional Record and refer the report to committees of the House and Senate with jurisdiction.

On December 21, 2018, as we were in the process of finalizing our Section 102(b) Report for the 115th Congress, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-171, 110 Stat. 1274, was signed into law. Not since the passage of the CAA in 1995 has there been a more significant moment in the evolution of legislative workplace rights. The new law focuses on protecting victims, strengthening transparency, holding violators accountable for their personal conduct, and improving the adjudication process.

Some of the changes in the CAA Reform Act are effective immediately, such as the name change of our Office, but most will be effective 180 days from enactment, i.e., on June 21, 2019. The CAA Reform Act incorporates several of the recommendations that the OCWR has made to Congress in past Section 102(b) Reports and in other contexts, such as in testimony before the Committee on House Administration (CHA) as part of that committee’s comprehensive review in 2018 of the protections that the CAA offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace. These changes include the following:

Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Anti-Retaliation Training

The Board has consistently recommended in its past biennial Section 102(b) Reports and in testimony before Congress that anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training, and anti-retaliation training should be mandatory for all Members, officers, employees and staff of Congress and the other employing offices in the legislative branch. Last year, the House and the Senate adopted resolutions (S. Res 330 and H. Res. 630) that require all of its Members and staff, including interns, detailers, and fellows, to complete an anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training program. We are pleased that the CAA Reform Act, as broad as it is, has envisioned in the CAA and the CAA Reform Act.

Extending Coverage to Interns, Fellows, and Detailers

The Board also has consistently recommended in its Section 102(b) Reports that Congress extend the coverage and protections of the anti-discrimination, anti-harassment, and anti-retaliation provisions of the CAA to interns, detailers, and fellows working in any employing office in the legislative branch, regardless of how or whether they are paid. The CAA Reform Act amends section 201(b) of the CAA— which applies title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (outlawing discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin) for internal and external human resources— to extend the protections to interns and detailers. The Board is pleased that the CAA Reform Act extends coverage to LOC employees for most purposes, including the Board’s cases involving the LOC and its employees (e.g.,纵e of the LOC’s affirmative action for LOC employees). The Board has called for the LOC to include the LOC within the definition of “‘covered employee’ under the CAA” to include employees of the LOC, and it added the LOC as an “‘employing office’ for all purposes except the CAA’s labor-management relations provisions. Among other changes, the bill gave the LOC employees a choice on how to pursue complaints of employment discrimination—allowing them to pursue a Board hearing or to file a 2 U.S.C. § 1438(b)(1), (b)(2) complaint with the Office of the Livingston Commissioner for Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Programs or with the OCWR. The CAA Reform Act incorporates these statutory changes and further clarifies the rights of LOC employees in this regard as well as others. Its provisions are effective retroactive to March 23, 2018. 2 U.S.C. § 1401(d)(5).

Champion to the Dispute Resolution Procedures Under the CAA

In testimony before the CHA as part of that committee’s comprehensive review of the CAA and the protections that it offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace, OCWR Executive Director Susan Taul Grumbach conveyed the Board’s constituents’ consideration of “champions” for changes to the ADR procedures set forth in the Act, discussed below.
Pre-Reform Act Procedures Under the CAA

As stated above, the effective date for the new ADR procedures under the Reform Act is June 19, 2019. Currently, prior to filing a complaint, the OCWR pursues mediation under section 405 of the Act or in the U.S. District Court, the CAA requires that an employee satisfy two jurisdictional prerequisites: mandatory counseling and mandatory mediation. If a claim is not resolved during the counseling phase and the employee wishes to pursue the matter, the CAA currently requires the employee to file a request for mediation with the OCWR. When a case proceeds to mediation, the employing office is notified about the claim and the parties attempt to settle their dispute with the assistance of a trained neutral mediator appointed by the OCWR.

If the parties fail to resolve their dispute in mediation, a covered employee may elect to proceed directly to the third step in the process, either by filing an administrative complaint with the OCWR, in which case the complaint would be decided by an OCWR Hearing Officer in a confidential setting, or by filing a lawsuit in a U.S. District Court, in which case the proceedings would be a matter of public record. By way of example, this election—which is the employee’s alone—must occur not later than 90 days, but not sooner than 30 days, after the end of the period of mediation. This statutory timing requirement creates a 30-day period—sometimes referred to as a “cooling off period”—before the employee can proceed. A party dissatisfied with the decision of the Hearing Officer may file a petition for review with the OCWR Board of Directors, and any decision of the Board may be appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. If, instead of filing a request for an administrative hearing, the employee files a civil suit in Federal district court, an appeal must occur not later than 90 days, but not sooner than 30 days, after the end of the period of mediation. This statutory timing requirement creates a 30-day period—sometimes referred to as a “cooling off period”—before the employee can proceed. A party dissatisfied with the decision of the Hearing Officer may file a petition for review with the OCWR Board of Directors, and any decision of the Board may be appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. If, instead of filing a request for an administrative hearing, the employee files a civil suit in Federal district court, an appeal of the decision of the Hearing Officer or the Board may proceed under the rules of the appropriate U.S. Court of Appeals.

As is discussed below, the Board has advocated in the legislative process for several procedural changes now provided for in the Reform Act, which potentially shorten the case handling process without compromising its effectiveness in resolving disputes under the CAA.

Counseling and Mediation Changes

In testimony before the CHA, Executive Director Grundmann explained that counselors viewed their opportunity to discuss their workplace concerns and to learn about their statutory protections under the CAA. She conveyed the Board’s view that, although counseling need not remain mandatory under the CAA, the CAA should not be amended in such a manner as to eliminate the availability of an optional service for employees to voluntarily seek confidential assistance from our office.

Under the new procedures set forth in the CAA Reform Act, counseling will no longer be mandatory. The CAA Reform Act provides for the optional services of a confidential advisor—an attorney who can, among other things, provide information to covered employees, on a privileged and confidential basis, about their rights under the CAA. 2 U.S.C. § 1402(a)(3).

As with counseling, the Executive Director also conveyed to the CHA the Board’s view supporting the elimination of mediation as a mandatory jurisdictional prerequisite to asserting claims under the CAA. The Board noted that mediation remains a valuable option available to those parties who mutually seek to settle their dispute. The OCWR’s experience over many years has been that a large percentage of controversies were successfully resolved without formal adversarial proceedings, due in large part to its mediation processes. Mediation can save the parties from burdensome litigation, which can be expensive, time consuming, and a drain on resources and workplace productivity. Further, mediation also gives the parties an opportunity to explore resolving the dispute themselves without having a result imposed upon them. Furthermore, OCWR Board members are highly skilled professionals who have the sensitivity, expertise, and flexibility to customize the mediation process to meet the concerns of the parties. The Board is committed to support mediation as a tool to resolve workplace disputes cannot be understated. Under the CAA Reform Act, mediation still remains available, but in addition to the jurisdictional prerequisite to asserting claims under the CAA, and it will take place only if requested and only if both parties agree.

“Cooling Off” Period

As stated above, the CAA presently requires an employee to wait 30 days after mediation ends to pursue a formal administrative complaint or a lawsuit in a U.S. District Court. In her testimony before the CHA, Executive Director Grundmann conveyed the Board’s view that, although counseling and mediation can save the parties from burdensome litigation, which can be expensive, time consuming, and a drain on resources and workplace productivity, counseling and mediation changes are needed to give employees greater predictability in the congressional authorization and funding processes for veterans as applied to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the other employing offices. These rules are necessary to address both the concerns raised in USERRA to our nation’s veterans in the legislative branch.

Analysis of Pending FMLA Regulations

On June 22, 2016, the Board of Directors adopted and transmitted to Congress for approval its regulations necessary for implementing the FMLA in the legislative branch. In accordance with Title I, A. these regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor, 2 U.S.C. § 1321(d)(2), except where good cause was found that amendments should be more effective in implementing FMLA rights under the CAA. We seek congressional approval of these important FMLA regulations. The FMLA regulations provide needed clarity on important aspects of the law, including essential requirements for certifying leave and documentation, defining “spouse” to include same-sex spouses as required by the Supreme Court precedent, and adding military caregiver leave. Adoption of these regulations will result in both employing offices and employees and provide greater predictability in the congressional workplace. First, these FMLA regulations address military FMLA for retired military members to include same-sex spouses as required by the FMLA, enacted under the National Defense Authorization Acts (NDAA) for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010 (see note 2), that extend the availability of FMLA leave to family members of the Regular Armed Forces for qualifying exigencies arising out of a service member’s deployment. They also define those deployments covered under these provisions, extend FMLA military caregiver leave for family members of current service members to include an injury or illness that results from a covered service member’s deployment engaged in the line of duty on active duty, and extend FMLA military caregiver leave to family members of certain veterans without in-service injuries or illnesses. In addition, note 2, the FMLA amendments providing additional rights and protections for service members and their families to include same-sex spouses as required by the NDAA for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010. The congressional committee reports that accompany the NDAA for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010 and the implementing FMLA regulations for fiscal years 2008 and 2010—”describe the manner in which the provision of the bill [relating to terms and conditions of employment]... apply to the legislative branch...” We note that in the case of such reasons the provision does not apply to [the legislative branch]” (in the case of a provision...
not applicable to the legislative branch), as required by section 102(b)(3) of the CAA. (see note 3)

Consequently, when the FMLA was amended to add these additional rights and protections, it was not clear whether Congress intended that these additional rights and protections extend to the legislative branch. To the extent that there may be an ambiguity regarding the applicability to the legislative branch of the 2008 and 2010 FMLA amendments, it is clear through these regulations that the rights and protections for military servicemembers apply in the legislative branch, and that protections under the 1996 and 1998 FMLA amendments afford the same protections to the legislative branch. The Board adopted FMLA regulations after the 2008 and 2010 amendments to clarify which FMLA protections apply in the legislative branch. The regulations clarify which title II and title III regulations apply to the legislative branch, and to the extent that there may be an ambiguity regarding the applicability to the legislative branch of the 2008 and 2010 FMLA amendments, it is clear through these regulations that the rights and protections for military servicemembers apply in the legislative branch, and that protections under the 1996 and 1998 FMLA amendments afford the same protections to the legislative branch. The Board adopted FMLA regulations after the 2008 and 2010 amendments to clarify which FMLA protections apply in the legislative branch.

The Board, in several Section 102(b) reports, has recommended that Congress consider and adopt the provisions of the FMLA, including provisions that would protect service members and veterans and provide job protection under USERRA. Approving USERRA regulations would signal congressional encouragement to veterans to seek work in the legislative branch where veteran employment levels have historically been well above the percentage in the executive branch. Congress has often provided greater protections for veterans employed on a temporary basis to two to three percent or less. The Veterans Congressional Fellowship Caucus, started in 2014, has supported efforts to bridge the gap between military service and work in the legislative branch. In addition, the Wounded Warrior Fellowship Program exists in the House Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) where Members can hire veterans to work on Capitol Hill. The Senate, the Armed Forces Internship Program exists to provide on-the-job training for returning veterans with disabilities. An extension of these laudable efforts should include the long-delayed passage of the Board’s adopted USERRA regulations which implement protections for initial hiring and protecting returning veterans with disabilities. An extension of these laudable efforts should include the long-delayed passage of the Board’s adopted USERRA regulations which implement protections for initial hiring and protecting returning veterans with disabilities.

Approving the three sets of Board-adopted regulations outlined above would not only signify a commitment to the laws of the CAA—which passed in 1996 with nearly unanimous, bi-cameral support—but would further help legislative branch managers effectively implement the laws’ protections and benefits on behalf of the workforce.

Provide Whistleblower Protections to the Legislative Branch

The OCWR has received a number of inquiries about the lack of whistleblower protections. An extension of these laudable efforts should include the long-delayed passage of the Board’s adopted USERRA regulations which implement protections for initial hiring and protecting returning veterans with disabilities. An extension of these laudable efforts should include the long-delayed passage of the Board’s adopted USERRA regulations which implement protections for initial hiring and protecting returning veterans with disabilities.

The Board has recommended in its previous Section 102(b) reports and continues to recommend that Congress provide whistleblower protections to legislative branch employees comparable to that provided to executive branch employees under 5 U.S.C. § 1220(a)(9)(B), 19 U.S.C. § 2196, and 29 U.S.C. § 2604. Additionally, as discussed below, the Board recommends that the Office also be granted investigatory subpoena authority and investigative subpoena power to aid in inspections as are private sector employers under the OSHAct. Similary, Congress exempted itself from the OSHAct’s recordkeeping requirements pertaining to workplace injuries and illnesses that apply to the private sector. The Board recommends that legislative branch employees be subject to the investigatory subpoena provisions contained in OSHAct §8(b) and that legislative branch employees be required to keep records of workplace injuries and illnesses under OSHAct §8(c), 29 U.S.C. §657(c).

Adopt Recordkeeping Requirements Under Federal Workplace Rights Laws

The Board, in several Section 102(b) reports, has recommended and continues to recommend that Congress adopt all recordkeeping requirements under Federal workplace rights laws. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch keep personnel records, there are no legal requirements under the CAA to do so.
ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2018

Mr. ALEXANDER. There appears to be no one on the floor who wants to speak. I could go another 4 or 5 hours if the Senate would like to stay in session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following business be allowed for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the consideration of the Miller nomination; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the consideration of the Miller nomination; further, that all time during recess, adjournment, and adjournment, morning business be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Miller nomination; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. 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 postcotte on the Miller nomination.

Is the objection?

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ALEXANDER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:46 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 26, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BRIAN MCGUIRE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE ANDREW K. MALONEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID MICHAEL SATTERFIELD, OF MISSOURI, A CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CHAD F. WOLF, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR POLICY, POLICY, AND PLANS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, (NEW POSITION)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL ERIC WOOTEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE PROCESSING, VICE ANNE E. RENG, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL D. BAUERMAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WILLIAM TRAVIS BROWN, JR., RESIGNED.

WING CHAU, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMES EDWARD CLARK, RESIGNED.

DAVID R. GROENDYK, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE SHARON JEA- NINE SHENK, RESIGNED.

ERIC S. GARTNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DAVID BLAKE WEBB, TERMINED.

NICK EDWARD PROFFITT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT WILLIAM MATTHEWS, TERMINED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

TO BE lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Steven L. Bauman

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES FOR OFFICE IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12208 AND 12212:

TO BE brigadier general

Col. Steven J. Bucow

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

TO BE lieutenant general


IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

TO BE rear admiral

Brig. Adm. (LH) James P. Downey

TO BE vice admiral

Brig. Adm. Ronald A. Boxall

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12208 AND 12212:

TO BE major

Jeremy L. Blackburn

Jeremy S. Caudill

Ara C. Deng

Lucas H. Dalgleish

Manuel D. De Carste

Henry H. Harm

Kennie T. Neal

Jason D. Baines

Robert D. Rose

Joshua D. Kemsly

Darrell L. Schrader

Timothy D. Wenz

Thomas A. Wies

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12208 AND 12212:

TO BE colonel

Thomas D. Cermics

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12208 AND 12212:

TO BE lieutenant colonel

Thomas Joseph Alford

Bradley A. Ames

Graham M. Brenstein

John H. Bone

Bijan Francois Brown

Mark Clifford Shuberg

Brian Charles Call

David A. Call

Jeffrey Allan Davis

Sarah Williams Edmondson

Ryan Allen Epstein

Chad Thomas Evans

Saturna McPherson Gabriel

Jason H. Gertner

Jeffrey Ryan Gabber

Christopher J. Govert

Timothy G. Hackett

Mark Andrew Golden

To be major

To be lieutenant colonel

To be colonel

To be major

To be lieutenant colonel

To be colonel

To be major

To be lieutenant colonel

To be colonel

To be major

To be lieutenant colonel

To be colonel

To be major

To be lieutenant colonel

To be colonel

To be major
Matthew B. Harrison
Joshua D. Hartzell
Guyton J. Hill
Matthew S. Hing
Sean J. Kelly
Michael C. Hjelkrem
Joseph Hudec
Stephan P. Hyland
Yang E. Kao
Kathryn M. Kelly
Daniel R. Kim
Jeffrey S. Kunz
Jason S. Lasham
Matthew A. Lauder
Mark Y. Lee
Erik K. Lundmark
Jan I. Mary
Michael E. Mackins
Katharine W. Marekell
Danika R. Mayes
John J. McPherson
Nia R. Middleton
Giorgio R. Mount
Thorton M. Moulton
Lyon J. Neste
William D. O'Connell
Michael A. Oglesby
Bruce A. Ong
Jonathan R. Parks
Christopher T. Perry
Wylan C. Peterson
Eric Prior
Jason A. Regules
Angel M. Reyes
Jamir C. Hines
Jeffrey L. Robertson
Kimberly C. Salazar
Dennis M. Sambmento
David J. Schurz
Carl G. Skinner
Frederick L. Stephens
Joseph R. Steress
Tohunta Sturbs
Guy R. Talko
Scott A. Trillo
Wedley M. Thibeau
John J. Thomas
Dawn M. Toles
Kyle Walker
Katrina B. Waltz
Jamia A. Watts
Michael A. Wiggins
Joshua A. Will
Gary H. Wynn

P. J. Fox

The following named officer for regular appointment in the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 131.

To be lieutenant colonel

To be captain

To be colonel

To be major

To be commander
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING DR. MARY LACEY

HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable life of Dr. Mary Lacey, a pillar of our community who passed away this month at the age of 80.

Dr. Lacey made an indelible mark on our communities by tirelessly serving those at the margins. Across Lake County, children in need, the homeless, and inmates and their families directly benefited from her generosity and boundless energy.

Dr. Lacey broke multiple barriers throughout her life. She was born to humble beginnings, as one of ten children in rural Mississippi. At age 21 she moved to Florida to further her education, where she met her late husband William, and eventually settled in his hometown of Waukegan. She found work as a contractor at Naval Station Great Lakes as well as handmaking elegant hats.

Never one to rest, she continued to study and was ordained a pastor, became a foster parent, and earned a certificate in social work.

In Waukegan, her memory lives on as the namesake of Mary’s Mission, a homeless shelter she founded that has provided shelter to hundreds of individuals in times of need, and has helped them develop the job training and skills they need to get back on their feet and live independently.

Dr. Lacey was also a fierce advocate for children, bringing joy to young residents during the holidays. She teamed up with the Waukegan police department to start a toy give-away program for children who might not receive a gift during the holidays. I had the privilege to join several of her annual Christmas parades from Mary’s Mission to the Lake County jail, where she handed out turkeys and toys.

Her perseverance in helping vulnerable people, touched and improved the lives of countless Illinoisans. Dr. Lacey truly lived her faith and was an example to all of us.

Dr. Lacey made an indelible mark on our country. She was a remarkable father and mentor to many.

Dr. Lacey is survived by her family and friends who are mourning her passing. I extend my heartfelt condolences to her many loved ones.

CW5 Sefer Steve Imeraj was the 6th Command Chief Warrant Officer (CCWO) for the Colorado Army National Guard, appointed in November 2014. Steve retired after 36 years of service in the active U.S. Army and the Colorado Army National Guard. He graduated from Colorado State University in Ft. Collins with a B.A. in Political Science and a minor in History.

CW5 Sefer Steve Imeraj is a son of Albanian immigrants and enlisted out of Detroit, Michigan into the active US Army in 1982. After serving three years with the 1-29 Field Artillery (Nuclear Surety Cohort) Battalion, he enlisted into the COARNG in 1985 with the 2/157th FA BN in Colorado Springs. In 1988, Steve transferred to HHD Headquarters State Area Command and worked various assignments in the Military Personnel Office until he pinned as an AG Warrant Officer One/HR Tech in February 1992.

Later in his career, CW5 Sefer Steve Imeraj mobilized and deployed to Iraq with the 2/135th GSAB (General Support Aviation Battalion) from March 2006 until September 2007 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. During his combat deployment, he served as the Assistant S1 and was later detailed as the AV Platoon Leader for all combat missions for the COARNG 2/135th GSAB. I am grateful for CW5 Imeraj’s brief service in my office and to the constituents of the 7th Congressional District, but I am most grateful for his service to our country.

Steve is married to Victoria and is a proud father of five sons, and grandfather of three granddaughters. I want to extend my deepest gratitude and congratulations to Command Warrant Officer Five Sefer Steve Imeraj.

NICK GRAY TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nick Gray of Olatho, Colorado, a World War II veteran of Pearl Harbor and Guadalcanal who recently celebrated his 100th birthday.

Nick is the grandson of Judge John Gray, who took up a homestead in the Shavano Valley in 1884, became Mayor of Montrose, and received local acclaim for working to get the Gunnison Tunnel built during his time as a District Judge. Judge Gray’s son, Joe Gray, was Nick’s father. Nick grew up on the family ranch his grandfather built with his mother Addie Hobson, his father, and the rest of his siblings.

In 1940, Nick left his family’s ranch and volunteered to serve in the Army. He was stationed at Pearl Harbor with the 25th Infantry Division when the Japanese attacked on December 7, 1941. While overseas he built roads and bridges on Guadalcanal in the South Pacific and managed a crew of 25 natives who had been bomed out by Japanese forces.

As a small business owner, he built more than 3,000 miles of power line rights-of-way and roads across three states. In 1963, Nick cleared 220 miles for power line structure sites, building sub-station sites and roads from Wyoming to New Mexico. Another one of Nick’s major accomplishments was building the Purgatory Ski Area near Durango, Colorado. Nick built the parking lot, ski course, and by-pass road all the way to Hermosa Park. During the 129-day project, he blasted nearly 40,000 yards of rock.

Nick married his wife Margaret in June 1946, and they had a son, Stephen Gray. Nick and Margaret have two granddaughters, Nicole Lumsden and Lezlee Cox, and six great-grandchildren, Keith Lumsden, Stephen Lumsden, Sarah Lumsden, Talli Lumsden, Caralea Cox, and Kendyl Cox.

As Co-Presidents of the Democratic Freshman Class, Colin and I have bonded during this remarkable time in our lives. Colin’s successes as an athlete, as a civil rights lawyer, and now in Congress have prepared him to be a remarkable father. Colin’s commitment to put others before himself transcends every professional action he has taken. It is my honor and that of our vibrant freshman class to be working by his side at such a special time for his family.

The beauty of life is embodied in Jordan and reminds us of what we’re all here for—to make this country a better place for our next of kin, our loved ones, and our fellow citizens. Let us reflect on this miracle and work to make this country a better country for Jordan.
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HONORING THE KOREAN INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the outstanding achievements of the people of South Korea in their fight for independence. This push for Korean independence from Japan would begin in Seoul on March 1, 1919 and spread throughout the country. Over 100 years ago, the Korean people were inspired by former Governor of New Jersey and United States President Woodrow Wilson’s ideas of self-determination to resist the occupation of Japanese military rule. This revolutionary spirit was aided by release of a Korean Declaration of Independence that was written by 33 core activists in the Samil Movement. The declaration was read by the leaders in the Seoul and in townships throughout Korea by supporters of the movement. Attempts by the Japanese military to suppress the Samil Movement’s peaceful gatherings gave their followers a stronger will to keep demonstrating. It is estimated that approximately two million Koreans participated in more than 1,500 demonstrations for independence. Several thousand were massacred, wounded and arrested by the Japanese police force and army in what is known as the Bloody History of the Korean Independence Movement. These acts became the catalyst for the Korean Independence Movement that would help unify the Korean people in their quest for independence in 1945. Our alliance with the Republic of Korea has always been firm. Korea has remained one of the United States’ closest and most steadfast allies and partners. Our shared belief in self-determination is pivotal to our joint success. I am proud to rise today to honor that history.

I look forward to joining my constituents on February 26, 2019 for a ceremony recognizing the Centennial of the March 1st Movement. I am proud to rise today to honor that history.

Mr. Spernak served 14 years with the Cypress Police Department, and here is where his strong leadership and hard work began to take notice. Mr. Spernak served 14 years with the Cypress Police Department, during this time he was named Officer of the Year in 1988 and received the Medal of Valor in 1993 for rescuing an infant from a burning structure. Officer Spernak was nationally recognized by Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) in 1990 for creating a drunk driving education program for teens, which is still used today. MADD recognized Mr. Spernak as Officer of the Year in 1989 and he has since served as a spokesperson and lecturer for MADD for 24 years. He also created and launched a notable public affairs program related to crime prevention, drunk driving, traffic safety, and neighborhood watch through public appearances and cable TV. Mr. Spernak has also served as an Orange County Sheriff Reserve Deputy.

Outside of law enforcement, Mr. Spernak acted as Executive Assistant and Policy Advisor to Orange County Supervisor Todd Spitzer during his two terms in office. In these roles he aided the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in their efforts to incorporate Rancho Santiago Margarita into cityhood. His successful role led him to serve as Deputy City Manager of this new city in 2000. While serving the Orange County Supervisors, he played a lead role on Supervisor Spitzer’s staff, serving as the Southern California Liaison. In this role he collaborated with anti-airport committees and successfully defeated a plan to build an international airport at El Toro Marine Air Corps Station.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate the distinguished public service career of Mr. Stephen Philip Spernak. Mr. Spernak has dedicated over 20 years to serving and benefitting our community in Orange County. In 1982 Mr. Spernak began working for the Cypress Police Department, and here is where his strong leadership and hard work began to take notice. Mr. Spernak served 14 years with the Cypress Police Department, during this time he was named Officer of the Year in 1988 and received the Medal of Valor in 1993 for rescuing an infant from a burning structure. Officer Spernak was nationally recognized by Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) in 1990 for creating a drunk driving education program for teens, which is still used today. MADD recognized Mr. Spernak as Officer of the Year in 1989 and he has since served as a spokesperson and lecturer for MADD for 24 years. He also created and launched a notable public affairs program related to crime prevention, drunk driving, traffic safety, and neighborhood watch through public appearances and cable TV. Mr. Spernak has also served as an Orange County Sheriff Reserve Deputy.

REMEMBERING THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOHLJALY MASSACRE

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 27th anniversary of the Koijaly Massacre, which took place on February 28, 1992, and remember the 613 men, women, and children who were brutalized during this despicable act of violence. Koijaly, a town in the Republic of Azerbaijan, was home to an unprecedented act of brutality that desecrated the norms and principles of international law, human rights, and freedoms. Armenian forces, with the support of the 366th motorized rifle regiment of the Russian army, stormed the besieged town of Koijaly engaging in acts so violent that their effects are still felt in the community, indeed the entire country, to this day. Madam Speaker, although a ceasefire was achieved in 1994, more than 20 percent of Azerbaijani territory including Nagorno Karabakh remain occupied and more than 1 million Azerbaijanis remain refugees and internally displaced persons. Over the past 20 years, Azerbaijan has spent over 6 billion dollars to ensure the social welfare of the internally displaced. Notably, while providing this crucial and costly support, Azerbaijan has still taken significant and impressive strides to improve economic development in their region.

Indeed the Government of Azerbaijan has not only contributed to regional stability, but has continued to be a reliable ally for the United States in combating terrorism around the world. In the days after September 11, 2001, Azerbaijan quickly conveyed its solidarity with the American people and provided crucial assistance to our fight against terrorism by granting unconditional clearance to our military to use Azerbaijan’s airspace as part of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. This is in addition to the naval and ground routes the country provides for the international coalition’s supplies that are to be delivered to forces in Afghanistan. Madam Speaker, marking the anniversary of a tragedy is always a solemn occasion. However, as a member of the Azerbaijani Caucus, I believe it is important to recognize and remember those whose lives were lost. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering condolences to the people of Azerbaijan.

IN HONOR OF ANTONIO VACCARO’S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Antonio Vaccaro, who celebrated his 100th birthday this past Saturday. A longtime resident of Portsmouth and a communicator like no other, Mr. Vaccaro spent much of his career as chief engineer at the radio station WHRB in Portsmouth. During World War II, Mr. Vaccaro answered the nation’s call and served as a member of
the elite Flying Tigers. As a member of the Flying Tigers, he took charge of communications, using his unique skillset to send many messages, including the first message announcing the end of the war. He is a father, grandfather, great grandfather, and great-great grandfather to a loving family. He worked tirelessly to ensure that Mr. Vaccaro was finally recognized with the Purple Heart more than half a century after his service.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire’s First Congressional District, I want to wish Mr. Vaccaro a very happy birthday. I hope that he had a wonderful celebration with his friends and family, and I want to thank him for his service to our country and his dedication to our community.

Dillon Lesovsky Receives the Young Alumni Hall of Fame Award

HON. PAUL COOK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and commitment of Dillon Lesovsky, who received the Young Alumni Hall of Fame Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 23, 2019.

Dillon is an entrepreneur at heart and has been since he was in his teens. In 2006, Dillon founded and operated a small business for six years which developed video content for the action sports industry as well as corporate projects throughout the U.S. He managed all aspects of production: developed budgets, drafted business proposals, negotiated with distributors, and managed contract staff. In 2013, I hired Dillon to serve as a Field Representative in my Apple Valley District Office, where he worked with federal agencies like Social Security and the Export-Import Bank to answer constituent questions, represented me at events in the High Desert community, and helped manage my social media accounts. In February of 2018, Dillon was recruited and hired by ComAv Asset Management to develop international business relationships within the commercial aircraft industry. Dillon has consistently exceeded his monthly sales quota in his region, and has also developed sales processes for a team of 17 sales staff to help them meet and exceed their sales goals. In his personal life, Dillon has a love of inside jokes and wishes to be a part of one someday.

Dillon was one of the best employees I have had, and it was a pleasure to have him on my staff. On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I congratulate Dillon on his entrepreneurial spirit and his admission to the Young Alumni Hall of Fame.

Honoring William Morin’s Retirement from Applied Materials, Inc.

HON. ZOE LOFGREN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dedication and commitment of William G. Morin as a technology policy leader and champion of the Silicon Valley innovation ecosystem who retired from Applied Materials on February 1, 2019 after representing the company for more than 23 years in Washington, D.C.

With a history degree from Pennsylvania State University, Mr. Morin chose to launch his career in the service of our nation. He trained intensively as an Arabic linguist and intelligence analyst in the U.S. Army and was posted to the Presidio in Monterey. This gave Bill his first taste of California and forged life-long links to the region that would become Silicon Valley. Following four years of service in the military, he joined the National Association of Manufacturers where he worked to create American jobs by advancing intellectual property, trade and technology policy.

In 1996, Bill joined the small team of R. Wayne Sayer and Associates, one of the first Washington firms specializing in issues to support the rapidly expanding U.S. high technology industry and began to represent Applied Materials. In 2002, he opened and led Applied’s first direct office in Washington, D.C. Over the years, he advocated for public policy that would allow high-tech manufacturers like Applied to maintain a strong footprint in the United States while accessing fast-growing overseas markets and reinvesting in the innovation and R&D that would ensure America’s leadership in technology. The policies he advocated for on behalf of Applied Materials helped it develop into a major U.S. manufacturer and exporter, a world leader in materials engineering solutions and a model Silicon Valley corporation.

Madam Speaker, upon Bill’s departure from our nation’s capital, he has wisely chosen to spend his retirement in California, returning to the shores of Monterey Bay where he began his career. I congratulate Bill on his retirement, for his service to our country and for his service to Applied Materials where his contributions helped open the world’s markets to the innovations of Silicon Valley.

Commemorating the Retirement of Dr. Richard H. Pearl

HON. DARIN LaHOOD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, today I would like to congratulate Dr. Richard Pearl on his retirement as the OSF Children’s Hospital Surgeon-in-Chief.

Dr. Pearl has committed his life to the practice and growth of medicine. He studied at Wright State University College of Medicine, where he was first in his class. After his schooling, Dr. Pearl completed his surgical residency at the Harvard Surgical Service at the New England Deaconess Hospital in Boston, Massachusetts.

In his career, Dr. Pearl has made it his priority to do all that he can for others. He served honorably in the U.S. Army, reaching the rank of Colonel, with a distinguished career spanning nearly thirty years. He served his country first as an Army Officer and then as a helicopter pilot. He was given command of a helicopter company in the First Cavalry Division in Vietnam. Dr. Pearl has received numerous Military Honors and awards including three Bronze Stars, the Legion of Merit and The Air Medal for Valor. Dr. Pearl has also devoted a great portion of his time to sharing his knowledge and research. He has published over 85 articles in peer-reviewed journals and 22 book chapters.

During his tenue, the medical community has had no better champion than Dr. Pearl. He has always been a fierce advocate for the advancement of Pediatrics. Central Illinois will forever be grateful for Dr. Pearl’s years of service.

Marfan Awareness Month

HON. THOMAS R. SUOZZI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Americans affected by Marfan syndrome and related connective tissue disorders in observance of February as Marfan Awareness Month.

Marfan syndrome is a rare genetic condition. About 1 in 5,000 Americans carries a mutation in gene called fibrillin which results in an overproduction of a protein called transforming growth factor beta or TGFβ. The increased TGFβ impacts connective tissue and since connective tissue is found throughout the body, Marfan syndrome features can manifest throughout the body. Patients often have disproportionately long limbs, a protruding or indented chest bone, curled spine, and loose joints. However, it is not the outward signs that concern Marfan syndrome patients, but the effects the condition has on internal systems. Most notably, in Marfan patients the large artery, known as the aorta, which carries blood away from the heart is weakened and prone to enlargement and rupture, which can be fatal. It is for this reason that increased awareness of Marfan syndrome can save lives.

I am proud to represent The Marfan Foundation, which is headquartered in Port Washington. The Marfan Foundation is the nation’s foremost organization working to raise awareness of Marfan syndrome and supporting the Marfan community. The Marfan Foundation has worked tirelessly to improve the lives of individuals affected by Marfan syndrome and related connective tissue conditions by advancing research, raising awareness, and providing support.

While there is currently no cure for Marfan syndrome, efforts are underway to enhance our understanding of the condition and improve patient care. I am proud to represent The National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases for their research efforts in this regard. I encourage NIH to expand research efforts in this critical area.

Early diagnosis and proper treatment are the keys to managing Marfan syndrome and living a full life. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting a Marfan education and awareness program at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. We can facilitate these efforts by raising awareness leading to early diagnosis. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing February as Marfan Awareness Month.
Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to honor Mr. Daniel “Danny” M. Barber for his many years of tireless advocacy to improve the lives of Bronx residents. He is a great example of everyday contributions that African-Americans have made in my district in the Bronx and the Nation.

Mr. Barber was born in 1969 to the late Dan Walker and Janie Barber-Walker and is the youngest of five children. He attended the De Witt Clinton High School and was a member of the football team. He began his love for community work when he joined the ranks of the Salvation Army during his early years and went on to excel as Director and afterward became Assistant to the Commanding Officer.

Mr. Barber currently serves as the President of the Andrew Jackson Houses Resident Association, Inc., and is the Founder, Inc. (Save Our Youth). Recently, he was elected to serve as the Chair of the City-Wide Council of Presidents, which oversees all of the NYCHA Resident’s Associations, and also serves as the Chair of the South Bronx Council of Presidents. While serving in these capacities, he also serves on several other agencies and organizations boards giving technical support and principled guidance.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Daniel M. Barber for his steadfast dedication and years of public service to our NYCHA residents, and for his long-standing commitment to improving our community.

TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL CHILDREN’S DENTAL HEALTH MONTH

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, February has been dedicated as the National Children’s Dental Health Month. This is such an important cause and we are glad to bring awareness to promote good oral health for children. Tooth decay is the number one chronic infectious disease among children in the U.S. The impact of not treating decay can lead to other bad outcomes beyond just oral health. The Congressional Oral Health Caucus is pleased to support National Children’s Dental Health Month and any activities taking place throughout the month of February.

Give Kids A Smile, which is sponsored by the ADA Foundation, is at the center of National Children’s Dental Health Month. Give Kids a Smile day is such an important event for all children and dentists throughout the country. Because of this program, the ADA Foundation is able to provide assistance to more than 6,000 dentists and 57,000 dental team members, and other volunteers who proudly give their time and effort to make a difference in the health of children. Since this program has started, volunteers have graciously provided services to over 5.5 million kids across the country, and to all 50 states as well. They have truly made a huge impact in their communities and improved the oral health of so many children.

Throughout National Children’s Dental Health Month, dentists and dental team members across the country will be providing oral health services for children in need, and this will continue throughout the year. These services will include oral health education, screenings, preventive care and restorative services. Some will provide this in their own dental practice, others will go right into schools and the community to reach the kids that need it most. There are also many major events at dental hygiene schools where hundreds of kids may receive oral health services.

Continued public awareness on this issue is so critical. On behalf of the Congressional Oral Health Caucus, I would once again like to state our full endorsement for the month, and push for continued care for good oral health of children.

DR. DEREK KING RECEIVES THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO EDUCATION AWARD

HON. PAUL COOK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and commitment of Dr. Derek King, who received the Distinguished Service to Education Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 23, 2019.

Dr. King currently holds the position of Assistant Superintendent of Student Services for Excelsior Charter Schools and has long been passionate about education and community service. A proud veteran of the U.S. Army, Dr. King began his teaching career with the Department of Defense Dependent Schools in Babenhausen Germany as part of the Troops to Teachers program. As an educator, Dr. King has served as a Teacher, Principal, Assistant Superintendent, Treasurer for the local Association of California School Administrators, and member of the California State School Attendance and Review Board. Dr. King was also elected to the Victor Valley Union High School District Governing Board, where he held the positions of Trustee, Clerk and Vice President. Dr. King has also been a fixture in our local community, and has held positions on the Victorville Military Affairs Committee, the Victor Valley Community Services Council, and served as Director and Chairman of the Board for the Victor Valley Chamber of Commerce.

I think Dr. Derek King for his service to our community and country, and his commitment to educating our next generation. With educators like Dr. King, our local students will be well-equipped as they make their way into adulthood.

RECOGNIZING PATIENT ADVOCATE BILL HAHN AND THE MANY SELFLESS AMERICANS WHO WORK ON BEHALF OF THOSE STRUGGLING WITH KIDNEY DISEASE

HON. BILL POSEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, on March 5, 2019, Citizens from across the country will gather in our nation’s Capital to help raise awareness about kidney disease and advocate for public policy solutions as part of the National Kidney Foundation’s Annual Patient Advocacy Summit. In all my years of service, I have yet to meet more caring and tireless advocates.

Their advocacy is important because of the number of people kidney disease affects—nearly one in three adults are at risk of developing kidney disease. Nearly thirty million Americans have kidney disease and approximately ninety percent don’t even know it. It sneaks up on you and that’s why raising awareness is a key component to combating this disease and ultimately saving lives.

Sadly, on October 10, 2018, we lost one of our great advocates and later a professional surfer with the famous Salick surf team winning numerous awards. A graduate of Florida State University, he owned and operated a successful health fitness business selling exercise equipment in Melbourne, Florida. Even with his dedication to a daily exercise regiment, at the age of twenty-six, Bill was diagnosed with Type 1 Diabetes.

Living with Diabetes can be a difficult struggle, even for someone as physically fit as Bill Hahn. Over time the disease began to take a toll on Bill’s health as he suffered from many of its complications including blindness, nerve damage and even coma. Unfortunately, Bill suffered renal failure at age fifty-one, but his physical routine never stopped. When Bill was on dialysis, he was walking ten miles a day. And because of his fitness level, he was a good candidate for transplant surgery. On November 5, 2008, he received a new kidney and pancreas.

Since his surgery, Bill dedicated his life to helping patients struggling with kidney disease and other serious medical conditions. In 2012 he joined with surfing legend and fellow transplant recipient Rich Salick and co-founded the annual Cocoa Beach “Footprints in the Sand” Kidney Walk. Katie and I have been involved in the Kidney Walk each year and it continues to grow and draw participation from all over Central Florida thanks in large part to Bill’s work and other volunteers from our community.

Bill was a constant advocate for this cause, especially in the last years of his life. And, if you knew Bill Hahn, helping others is what
kept him going. He worked closely with my office on various projects throughout the years and brought to my attention many important pieces of legislation moving through Congress that are critical to winning this battle. In 2017 Bill lead a successful effort to declare May 13th “Living Kidney Donor Day” in the State of Florida. He is also the author of three books including More Than A Conqueror Legacy, a spiritual healing guide for patients; The Silver Lining, a chronicle of Bill’s journey through recovery; and The Window Box, a book of poetry.

I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the efforts of Bill Hahn and the many other Americans who have worked tirelessly to raise awareness about kidney disease and advocate for patients in need.

IN RECOGNITION OF PATRICK MORAN, HIBERNIAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Patrick Moran, who was celebrated as the Hibernian of the Year by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Monsignor Farrell Division on February 23, 2019. The Monsignor Farrell Division No. 2 Chapter of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and its founders exemplify the core principles of charity, concern for our fellow man, and commitment to educating students about the sacrifices and accomplishments of prior generations.

A Carbondale native, Pat was born on August 31, 1953 to Joseph and Margaret Moran. Pat is a graduate of St. Rose High School, Class of 1971. A veteran of the Navy, Pat worked at Tobyhanna Army Depot after discharge. He then moved to the greater Denver Area where he worked for Continental Air Lines before owning and operating his own business.

Upon his retirement in 2012, Pat returned to Northeast Pennsylvania and became active in several local community organizations. Today, he is a member of the Columbia Hose Co. and the American Legion in Carbondale. Pat’s involvement with the AOH began when he joined the organization’s Golf League. He became increasingly involved in volunteer efforts by the AOH. He is currently a member of Ring and Shuffleboard leagues, as well as a volunteer bartender every Monday evening and for many Division functions.

It is an honor to recognize Patrick Moran as he is named Hibernian of the Year by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Monsignor Farrell Division. I thank him for his service to his country in the U.S. Navy and his continued service to our community with the AOH. I congratulate him for receiving such an honor from his fellow brothers in the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

IN HONOR OF ANDREW AND ILA MARTINEZ

HON. KEVIN BRADY
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of Andrew and Ila Martinez of Huntsville, Texas.

Andrew and Ila, beloved parents and life-long Texans, spent their lives in service to others, and today, we remember all that they stood for. Andrew “Andy” Martinez was born in Galveston, Texas and later became a proud member of the Huntsville community. His multifaceted career path included time spent as a proud small business owner of Martinez Tire and Supply, a construction safety supervisor for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), and as an ordained minister. A faithful and steadfast Christian, Andy served as the interim pastor of Faith Memorial Baptist Church, and was an active member of several other churches in the Huntsville area.

Andy’s faithfulness, generosity, and love for those around him was not only evident on Sundays—it was visible every day of his life. Andy served the Huntsville community in a variety of public roles. He was an elected member of the Huntsville City Council, the Director for Trinity River Authority’s Walker County Area, a member of the Board of Trustees for Huntsville ISD, and Chairman of the Republican Party of Walker County. Andy also acted as a Prison Ministry Volunteer in Huntsville— a position he held for over 30 remarkable years. Those who knew Andy will attest to his sincere selflessness. He always worked towards leaving the Huntsville community better than he found it.

Ila Martinez was Andy’s wonderful wife of over 63 years and was not only a devoted partner to him, but was a loving mother and active in the community as well. A leading member of the Republican Party of Walker County, Ila was involved in the Red Hat Ladies and the Calendar Girls, a group of friends from Conroe High School that would meet once a month at lunchtime. Ila had a great love for volunteering and was often working with the Walker County Republican women or at her church library. Ila was a doting grandmother and her greatest pleasure was teaching her beloved granddaughters how to sew and bake.

Andy and Ila had two daughters, Andrea Scott and the late Debbie Martinez, and a son, Russell Martinez. Andy and Ila are survived by Andrea and her husband Wayne; their son, Russell; two beautiful grandchildren, Angela Stacks and husband Jared; Mika Spears and her husband Neal; and three great-grandchildren: Draper Stacks, Megan Anthony, and Trent Spears.

The legacy of Andy and Ila will always be a part of the Huntsville community, kept alive in the hearts of those who knew and loved them. Both were selfless servants dedicated to bettering the lives of those around them, and they will be greatly missed.

COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT OF DR. STEPHEN E. BASH

HON. DARIN LAHOOD
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, today I would like to congratulate Dr. Stephen Bash on his retirement from the University of Illinois College of Medicine at Peoria.

Born in Indianapolis, Indiana, Dr. Bash decided to dedicate his life to medicine at a young age. He attended Indiana University at Bloomington before receiving his MD from Indiana University Medical School at Indianapolis. After his schooling, Dr. Bash served honorably in the U.S. Navy as a Lieutenant Commander.

In his career, Dr. Bash has made Pediatrics a top priority. In private practice and in public service, Dr. Bash has made a lasting impact at every stop. He has held Directorships at both the Regional Sleep Apnea Center and at the Pediatric Cardiac Institute at the Children’s Hospital of Illinois at OSF St. Francis Medical Center in Peoria, Illinois. Dr. Bash has also dedicated time to research. He has been a Principal Investigator for two clinical studies and has been the author of many articles. To give back to his community, Dr. Bash has served on the Board of Directors for the Marvin Hult Health Education Center and Heartland Community Health Center.

During his tenure, the medical community has had no better champion than Dr. Bash. He has always been a strong advocate for the advancement of Pediatrics. Central Illinois will forever be grateful for Dr. Bash’s years of service.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE RESTORING THE PARTNERSHIP FOR COUNTY HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT OF 2019

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, today I rise today to introduce a bill to restore the partnership between the federal government and counties for the health care costs of inmates who have not been convicted of a crime. This legislation will provide some relief to our nation’s local economies, while strengthening the fundamental principles of our justice system.

In almost all states, a person who is incarcerated in a county jail or juvenile detention facility loses their Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP or SSI benefits even if they have not been convicted of a crime. The U.S. Supreme Court’s interpretation of the 8th Amendment requires government entities to provide medical care to all inmates. As a result, local governments are burdened with the expense of providing health care to thousands of men, women, and children currently awaiting trial.

Providing health care for inmates constitutes a major portion of local jail operating costs. Requiring county governments to cover health care costs for inmates who have not yet been convicted of a crime places an unnecessary
burden on local governments, which have their fair share of widespread budget deficits and cuts to safety net programs and other essential services to deal with as it is.

Terminating benefits to inmates who are awaiting trial undermines the presumption of innocence, which is a cornerstone principle of our justice system. The current practice does not distinguish between persons who are awaiting disposition of charges and persons who have been duly convicted and sentenced. Moreover, this reality disproportionately affects low-income and minority populations who are often unable to post bond, which would enable them to continue receiving benefits.

Madam Speaker, my legislation addresses this problem by prohibiting the federal government from stripping individuals of their Medicare, Medicaid, and SSI benefits before the inmate has been convicted of a crime. It preserves the partnership between the federal and local governments and ensures that local governments are not burdened with an unfair share of meeting the constitutional mandate to guarantee medical coverage. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense bill that addresses a problem affecting communities all across the nation.

MONICA MAJOR
HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor Ms. Monica Major for her many years of advocacy and public service in the Bronx. She is a great example of the countless contributions that African Americans make to our Nation every day.

Ms. Major previously served as the Bronx Representative on the Panel for Educational Policy of the New York City Department of Education. In addition, she volunteered for Bronx Community School District 11 for several years, and served as President of the District 11 Community Education Council. One of Ms. Major’s greatest accomplishments has been serving on the Citywide Parent Commission on School Governance as a parent advocate to ensure that the voices of Bronx parents were heard in addressing school governance issues. She is still committed to addressing quality of education throughout the Bronx.

A tireless and dedicated public servant, Ms. Major currently serves as the Director of Education and Youth Services for Bronx Borough President Rubén Diaz, Jr. She is a graduate of Baruch College and is a certified mediator. Ms. Major is also a member of the National Council of Negro Women, North Bronx Section. She is the mother of two and still remains very active in her community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Ms. Monica Major for her strong commitment to students and for her vigorous advocacy on education issues.

COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT OF DR. JITENDRA J. SHAH
HON. DARIN LAHOOD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, today I would like to congratulate Dr. Jitendra Shah on his retirement from the University of Illinois College of Medicine at Peoria.

Originally from India, Dr. Shah decided to dedicate his life to medicine at a young age. He studied Preparatory Science and Pre-Medicine at Maharaja Sayajirao University in Baroda, India, where he also attended Medical College. After his schooling, Dr. Shah made his way to Philadelphia to complete his residency at Philadelphia General Hospital.

In his career, Dr. Shah has made Pediatrics a top priority. While teaching and in practice, Dr. Shah has made a lasting impact at every stop. He has held Directorships at the Pediatric Cardiac Noninvasive Services, Regional Sleep Apnea Center at Pediatric Cardiac Catherization Laboratory at the Children’s Hospital of Illinois at OSF St. Francis Medical Center in Peoria, Illinois. Dr. Shah has also dedicated his life to research. He has received approval for four Medical Grants through the American Heart Association. To recognize his ability, in 1986 and 1992 the Pediatric Residency Physicians at St. Francis Medical Center and University of Illinois College of Medicine at Peoria presented Dr. Shah with awards for his impressive teaching methods.

During his tenure, the medical community has had no better advocate than Dr. Shah. He has always been a fierce advocate for the advancement of Pediatrics. Central Illinois will forever be grateful for Dr. Shah’s years of service.

ROGER WAGNER RECEIVES THE PRESIDENTS’ AWARD
HON. PAUL COOK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and commitment of Roger Wagner, who received the Presidents’ Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 23, 2019.

Roger served as the Victor Valley College Superintendent and President for over four years and officially retired at the end of 2018. Prior to his retirement, he was instrumental in Victor Valley College receiving full accreditation from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Roger has a passion for education and understands the importance of the college providing local students with an affordable and high quality education. Roger was responsible for a number of successes for the college, including hosting the 2017 Youth Poverty Symposium, opening the Automotive and Welding Facility, and developing new programs including Industrial Maintenance and Manufacturing programs.

Roger married his high school sweetheart Stacy and together they have two children.

Before my career in politics, I had the privilege of working with Roger at Copper Mountain College in the Morongo Basin. I can say from experience that Roger is an incredibly intelligent and hard-working individual with a true passion for education, and I can guarantee that he will be sorely missed at Victor Valley College. I congratulate Roger on receiving this award, and wish him all the best as he heads into retirement.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JUDGE RUSSELL B. SUGARMON, JR.
HON. STEVE COHEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Russell B. Sugarmon—a great American jurist, Civil Rights leader, political pioneer and elder statesman from my hometown of Memphis, Tennessee. Judge Sugarmon died Monday after a long illness at the age of 89 but will be remembered forever as a crusading legal scholar who worked to end segregation in the Memphis public schools and for being a political genius who helped behind the scenes to elect the African American and progressive candidates who reshaped Memphis. In 1959, Sugarmon was one of the first African Americans to run for city-wide office when he sought to be commissioner for public works. In 1966, he was elected to become Tennessee’s second African American state representative since Reconstruction and was later elected a General Sessions Court judge after serving as a partner in Memphis’ and Tennessee’s first integrated law firm—Ratner, Sugarmon, Lucas and Willis. Other legendary attorneys such as Bill Caldwell, Irvin Salky, Troy Henderson, Walter Bailey, Jr., Russell X. Thompson and Tom Arnold hung their hats and licenses there. From 1976 to 1987, Judge Sugarmon was a referee in the Memphis Juvenile Court system, stepping down in May 1987 when he was appointed a General Sessions Court Judge. He was elected to the bench in 1998 and was re-elected in 1990 and 1998. Russell Bertram Sugarmon, Jr. graduated from the city’s Booker T. Washington High School in 1946 at the age of 15. Sugarmon spent a year at Morehouse College—in the class a year behind Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—and transferred to Rutgers University, where he received his undergraduate degree in Political Science in 1950. He received his J.D. from Harvard University in 1953 and spent the following two years in the U.S. Army based mainly in Japan. After returning to the United States and further graduate studies at Boston University, then came back to Memphis in 1956 to establish a private legal practice. Judge Sugarmon worked tirelessly even when victory wasn’t in the cards and kept the faith, knowing that it would come in time. He was one of the most learned strategists on politics and history in our community, avoiding the limelight but holding sway as the influential wise man behind the scenes in collaboration with a biracial and tolerant group of progressive leaders. Judge Sugarmon was a mentor, supporter and friend of mine my entire life. I am eternally grateful to have been so fortunate to have shared time with this remarkably knowledgeable, judicious and beloved man. Last year, Congress
REMEMBERING THE KOJALY TRAGEDY

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join with the Republic of Azerbaijan in its commemoration of the Kojaly Tragedy, also known as the Kojaly Massacre.

I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the town and people of Kojaly who died on those fateful days and in offering our deepest condolences to Azerbaijan on this tragic anniversary.

In doing so, we remember the 613 Azeri-bajani men, women, and children killed in Kojaly on February 25 and 26, 1992. The Government of Azerbaijan continues to act as a valuable partner of the United States and serves as a bulwark against America’s adversaries in the region. We solemnly remember this anniversary and honor the lives lost.

ASSISTANT SHERIFF LANA TOMLIN RECEIVES THE ALUMNI HALL OF FAME AWARD

HON. PAUL COOK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and commitment of Assistant Sheriff Lana Tomlin, who received the Alumni Hall of Fame Award from the Victor Valley College foundation on February 23, 2019.

Assistant Sheriff Tomlin is a dedicated public servant who has worked for the San Bernardino County Sheriffs Department for over twenty-nine years. Soon after her graduation from the San Bernardino County Sheriffs Department Training Academy, Assistant Sheriff Tomlin was assigned to the Barstow Station as a patrol deputy where she quickly excelled in her duties while simultaneously attending Victor Valley College. She is the first woman in the history of San Bernardino County to be appointed to Assistant Sheriff and oversees several departments and operations. Locally, Assistant Sheriff Tomlin has served multiple assignments at different High Desert stations, including serving as Captain of the Apple Valley Sheriffs Station. She has also volunteered throughout the community, from coaching the women’s basketball team at Victor Valley College to giving back to our next generation through the Police Activities League program.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representa-
tives, I would like to congratulate Assistant Sheriff Lana Tomlin on this award. Lana is an exemplar law enforcement officer and community leader. I thank her for her years of dedication and service to the people of San Bernardino County.

TRIBUTE TO THE 2018 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

HON. DARIN LAHOOD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2018 recipients of the prestigious Ellis Island Medal of Honor. Presented annually, the Ellis Island Medals of Honor pay tribute to our Nation’s immigrant heritage, as well as individual achievement. The Medals are awarded to U.S. citizens from diverse ethnic backgrounds who exemplify outstanding qualities in both their personal and professional lives, while continuing to preserve the richness of their particular heritage and culture. We honor these outstanding individuals because the important work they do today creates a man or woman for all of us tomorrow. This momentous occasion was celebrated with a patriotic ceremony on Ellis Island and a recommitment by the leaders of the organization to their mission of honoring diversity, fostering tolerance and promoting religious and racial unity among Americans.

Since the Medals’ founding, more than 2,500 American citizens have received the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, including seven American Presidents, numerous United States Senators and Congressmen, two Nobel Laureates, and many athletes, artists, and military leaders. This Medal is not about material success, nor is it about the politics of immigration; it is about the people who have committed themselves to this nation, embraced the opportunities America offers, and most importantly, who have used those opportunities to not only better their own lives but make a difference in our country and in the lives of its people.

Citizens of the United States hail from every nation, every creed, and every culture. The iconic metaphor of this nation as a veritable melting pot of cultures continues to ring true, and it is this diversity that adds to the unique richness of American life. It is the key to why America is the most innovative, progressive and forward thinking country in the world. The Ellis Island Medals of Honor not only celebrate select individuals but also the pluralism and democracy that enabled our forbearers to celebrate their cultural identities while still embracing the American way of life. This award serves to remind us all that with hard work and perseverance anyone can still achieve the American dream. In addition, by honoring these remarkable Americans, we honor all who share their origins and we acknowledge the contributions they have made to America. I commend the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations and its Board of Directors headed by Nasser J. Kazeminy, for honoring these truly outstanding individuals for their tireless efforts to foster dialogue and build bridges between different ethnic groups, as well as to promote unity and a sense of common purpose in our nation.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the good works of NCEO and in congratulating all of the 2018 recipients of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor. I include in the Record the names of this year’s recipients.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. ADAM KINZINGER**

**OF ILLINOIS**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Monday, February 25, 2019**

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, due to my Air National Guard unit being mobilized to assist operations on the southern border, I was unable to be present and cast votes during the week of February 11. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on Roll Call No. 76; “yea” on Roll Call No. 77; “yea” on Roll Call No. 78; “nay” on Roll Call No. 79; “yea” on Roll Call No. 80; “yea” on Roll Call No. 81; “yea” on Roll Call No. 82; “nay” on Roll Call No. 83; “yea” on Roll Call No. 84; “nay” on Roll Call No. 85; “nay” on Roll Call No. 86; and “yea” on Roll Call No. 87.

**HON. JACKIE WALORSKI**

**OF INDIANA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Monday, February 25, 2019**

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Maureen McFadden and congratulate her on a remarkable 40-year career at WNDU-TV. I want to take a moment to honor the iconic legacy Maureen is leaving behind at WNDU-TV and thank her for all she has done for Michiana communities.

A lifelong Hoosier, Maureen has been a fixture in South Bend as a reporter and anchor at WNDU Newscenter 16 for the past four decades. She has played a vital role in making northern Indiana stronger, not only by bringing us the day’s news but by always finding ways to serve her neighbors and give back to the community she loves to call home.

Generations of viewers have gotten to know Maureen as she delivers the local news each night. Her career in journalism began in her hometown of South Bend and through her she will soon anchor her last WNDU-TV newscast, her retirement is far from the end of her positive impact. She displays a strong sense of affection and pride for our community when sharing the stories of our fellow Hoosiers. Her steadfast commitment to shining a light on important issues, encouraging community service, and keeping Hoosiers informed and engaged is why Maureen has become such a beloved household name.

I am grateful to Maureen not only for her excellence in journalism, but also for the incredible example she has set for aspiring journalists and young Hoosier women looking to give back and build a brighter future.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the exceptional character, leadership, and compassion Maureen has demonstrated both on and off the air. I wish Mo the very best.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE SAVING AMERICA’S POLLINATORS ACT**

**HON. EARL BLUMENAUER**

**OF OREGON**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Monday, February 25, 2019**

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the peer-reviewed journal Biological Conservation recently published a scientific analysis that paints a terrifying picture for the future of insects and our planet. This analysis concluded that largely because of intensive agriculture, and specifically heavy use of pesticides, over 40 percent of insect species are threatened with extinction. Furthermore, this analysis found that around 41 percent of all insect species have seen their populations decline over the last 10 years, and that 35 million of the United States honeybee colonies have been lost since 1947.

These alarming statistics foretell a catastrophic collapse of nature’s ecosystems. Already we are seeing the impacts of the climate crisis wreak havoc on our natural world, public health and, importantly, our food system. Pollinators and other insects are vital to our economy and our livelihoods. One of every three bits of food we eat is from a crop pollinated by bees. This analysis is a call to action to do all we can to protect these valuable insects, particularly in the face of climate change.

That’s why today I am introducing the Saving America’s Pollinators Act. This legislation will suspend the use of certain insecticides until they are thoroughly assessed and determined to be safe for pollinators. Furthermore, it establishes a monitoring network for native bees, and clarifies the emergency exemption powers that this Administration is afforded under current law.

This law is much needed, and my hope is that with this new and alarming information, Congress can finally act to adequately protect our future food supply and agricultural and ecological health before it’s too late.
HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. JAMES (JIM) LEON STALLINGS

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. James (Jim) Leon Stallings of Selma, Alabama.

Mr. Stallings was beloved by his community and went out of his way to improve the lives of others. Sadly, Mr. Stallings passed away on Friday, February 15, 2019 at the age of 83.

As a child, Mr. Stallings attended Nash County Training School in Nashville, North Carolina where he stood out as an excellent basketball player and athlete.

After graduating from high school, he attended Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, where he met the love of his life, Betty Bonner.

Mr. Stallings was drawn to a life of service from a young age. He was involved early in life at his church, Mount Vernon Missionary Baptist and, upon graduating from college, enrolled in the United States Army.

Later, Mr. Stallings continued to give back to his community by helping develop the next generation of Alabamians, working as a teacher in the Wilcox County School System at W. J. Jones High School, in Pine Apple, Alabama, and a teacher and basketball coach in the Dallas County Schools System at Tipton High School, in Selma, Alabama.

After many years of service in the Alabama public schools, Mr. Stallings transitioned to a role with the City of Selma, dedicating 27 years as the first African American Director of General Services. In that role, Mr. Stallings opened doors of opportunity for many young men and women to prosper.

One of Mr. Stallings’ passions was DJing at WHBB Radio in Selma where he was fondly known as “Big Jim.” He quickly became known for gracing the airwaves with a variety of musical genres, including spiritual, soft rock and R&B music on his shows, “The Spiritual Hour” and the “Jim Stallings Show.” Mr. Stallings’ music selections helped heal community divisions in the 1960s and laid the pathway for other aspiring African American DJs to enter the local radio scene.

Mr. Stallings’ hobbies did not stop at the radio station, though. He was an honorary member of the Twelve High Club; a member of the Alabama Elks Lodge No. 1170 where he served for several years as the Exalted Ruler; an original member of the Tuesday Night Group; Director of the local Beauty and Talent; and the Alabama State Association of Elks; lead singer for Terry and the Fantastics; and a football announcer for the City of Selma and the Dallas County School systems.

While Mr. Stallings has passed from this life to the next, his legacy lives on in his devoted children, Anthony and Bonnie, his five grandchildren and many grand nieces and nephews, cousins, other relatives and friends.

On behalf of Alabama’s 7th Congressional District and a grateful nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Mr. Stallings’ contributions to bettering the Selma community and our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAHANA HAYES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 2019

Mrs. HAYES, Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present on Thursday, February 11th due to unavoidable travel delays.

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

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 Committee on Environment and Public Works To hold hearings to examine S. 383, to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines.

SD–406 Committee on Veterans’ Affairs To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion.

SD–450 10:15 a.m. Committee on Foreign Relations To hold hearings to examine assessing the role of the United States in the world.

SD–419 2:30 p.m. Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Cybersecurity To receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations.

SVC–217 Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Personnel To hold an oversight hearing to examine military personnel policies and military family readiness.

SR–222 Committee on the Budget To hold hearings to examine the Budget Control Act, focusing on a review of cap-adjusted spending.

SD–608 Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs To hold hearings to examine protecting the electric grid from an electromagnetic pulse or geomagnetic disturbance.

SD–106 Committee on Indian Affairs To hold an oversight hearing to examine the 50th anniversary of the Native American Programs Act and the establishment of the Administration for Native Americans.

SD–628 Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship To hold hearings to examine the future of American industry.

SR–428A 9:30 a.m. Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry To hold hearings to examine implementing the Agriculture Improvement Act.

SR–328A Committee on Armed Services To hold hearings to examine nuclear policy and posture.

SD–650 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 addressing the opioid epidemic in America, focusing on prevention, treatment, and recovery at the state and local level.

SD–124 Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs To hold hearings to examine legislative proposals on capital formation and corporate governance.

SD–538 Committee on Energy and Natural Resources To hold hearings to examine prospects for global energy markets, focusing on the role of the United States and perspectives from the International Energy Agency.

SD–366 Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations To hold hearings to examine China’s impact on the United States education system.

SD–342 Committee on the Judiciary Business meeting to consider the nominations of Neomi J. Rao, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, and Michael H. Park, of New York, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Greg Girard Guidey, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Michael T. Liburdi, to be United States District Judge for the...
District of Arizona, Peter D. Welte, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, and Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, both to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and Drew H. Wrigley, to be United States Attorney for the District of North Dakota, Department of Justice.

SD–226

2 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

MARCH 5
10 a.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety
To hold hearings to examine states’ role in protecting air quality, focusing on principles of cooperative federalism.

SD–406

2 p.m.
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine vaccines, focusing on preventable disease outbreaks.

SD–430

2:30 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights
To hold hearings to examine concentration and competition in the United States economy.

SD–226

MARCH 6
10 a.m.
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs
To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SD–G50

2 p.m.
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs
To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SD–G50

MARCH 12
10 a.m.
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs
To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.

SD–G50

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
HIGHLIGHTS

Senator Fischer delivered Washington’s Farewell Address.

Senate

Chamber Action
Routine Proceedings, pages S1405–S1445
Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills were introduced, as follows: S. 536–551. Pages S1436–37
Measures Reported:
Report to accompany S. 163, to prevent catastrophic failure or shutdown of remote diesel power engines due to emission control devices. (S. Rept. No. 116–2) Page S1436
Measures Considered:
Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 311, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. Pages S1414–1422
During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:
By 53 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 27), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. Page S1422
Washington’s Farewell Address: Senator Fischer performed the traditional reading of Washington’s Farewell Address. Pages S1405–09
Miller Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. Page S1422
During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:
By 51 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 28), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. Page S1422
A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Tuesday, February 26, 2019; and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and Leader remarks count post-cloture on the nomination. Page S1443
Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:
Brian McGuire, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.
David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey.
Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Department of Homeland Security.
Michael Eric Wooten, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.
Michael D. Baughman, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.
William Travis Brown, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.
Gary B. Burman, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.
Wing Chau, of Rhode Island, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island for the term of four years.
Ramona L. Dohman, of Minnesota, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota for the term of four years.
Eric S. Gartner, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.
Nick Edward Proffitt, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years.
2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
1 Army nomination in the rank of general.
4 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.
Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy. Pages S1443–45
Messages from the House: Page S1436
D175
Executive Communications: Page S1436
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S1437–38
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Page S1439
Additional Statements: Pages S1435–36
Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S1439
Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—28) Page S1422
Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 7:46 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, February 26, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1443.)

Committee Meetings
(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Appropriations: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 116th Congress.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 29 public bills, H.R. 1327–1355; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 49; and H. Res. 143, 146–147, were introduced. Pages H2099–H2101

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H2102–03

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:
   H. Res. 144, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019 (H. Rept. 116–13); and
   H. Res. 145, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee (H. Rept. 116–14). Page H2068

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Raskin to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H2049

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote. Pages H2049, H2067–68

Recess: The House recessed at 2:07 p.m. and reconvened at 4:30 p.m. Page H2050

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:
   Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement Act: H.R. 583, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio; Pages H2050–52
   Poison Center Network Enhancement Act of 2019: H.R. 501, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and enhance the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program; Pages H2052–53
   Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019: H.R. 525, to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a public-private partnership for purposes of identifying health care waste, fraud, and abuse; Pages H2053–55
   Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019: H.R. 539, to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I–Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 385 yeas to 18 nays, Roll No. 88; Pages H2055–58, H2064–65
   Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act: H.R. 425, to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research; Pages H2058–60
   Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act: H.R. 276, to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 387 yeas to 19 nays, Roll No. 89; and Pages H2060–62, H2067
   Merit Systems Protection Board Temporary Term Extension Act: H.R. 1235, amended, to provide that the term of office of certain members of the Merit Systems Protection Board shall be extended by a period of 1 year, to limit such members from concurrently holding positions within the Federal Government; Pages H2062–64
Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To provide that the term of office of certain members of the Merit Systems Protection Board shall be extended by a period of 1 year, and for other purposes.”

Recess: The House recessed at 5:46 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

Resignation of the Clerk of the House: Read a letter from Karen L. Haas, in which she announced her resignation as Clerk of the House of Representatives, effective midnight on February 25, 2019.

Electing the Clerk of the House of Representatives: The House agreed to H. Res. 143, electing the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Administration of the Oath of Office to the Clerk of the House: The Speaker administered the Oath of Office to Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Enacting into law a bill by reference: The House agreed to take from the Speaker’s table and pass S. 483, to enact into law a bill by reference, as amended by Representative Peterson.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2064–65 and H2067. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Committee Meetings
RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019; BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019; ENHANCED BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; H.R. 8, the “Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019”; and H.R. 1112, the “Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, and H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–5 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 amendments printed in part A of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. 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 part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Section 2 of the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019, under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–6 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of 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 part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a closed rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all
points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Finally, the rule provides that the provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress to a joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019. Testimony was heard by Chairman Nadler and Representatives Collins, Lesko, Armstrong, Cline, and Gianforte.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D104)


COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Subcommittee on Airland, to receive a closed briefing on the B–21 “Ranger”, 3 p.m., SVC–217.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, both of the Department 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, Spencer Bachus III, of Alabama, and Judith DelZoppo Pryor, of Ohio, both to be a Member of the Board of Directors, and Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President, all of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, and Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, both to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Transportation and Safety, to hold hearings to examine connecting America, focusing on intermodal connections across our surface transportation network, 2:30 p.m., SD–362.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. territories, 10 a.m., SD–366.
Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine drug pricing in America, 10:15 a.m., SD–215.
Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, to hold hearings to examine the 2019 Annual Intellectual Property Report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD–226.
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Public Witness Hearing”, 9 a.m., 2007 Rayburn.
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing entitled “Leveraging Private Capital for Underserved Communities and Individuals: A look into Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs)”, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Architect of the Capitol, 10 a.m., HT–2 Capitol.
Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies oversight hearing on Department of Veterans Affairs, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Congressional Budget Office, 11 a.m., HT–2, The Capitol.
Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness; and Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, joint hearing entitled “Naval Surface Forces Readiness: Are Navy Reforms Adequate?”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.
Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing entitled “Department of Defense Information Technology, Cybersecurity, and Information Assurance”, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.
Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 865, the “Rebuild America’s Schools Act of 2019”; and H.R. 7, the “Paycheck Fairness Act”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “EPA’s Enforcement Program: Taking the Environmental Cop Off the Beat”, 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Who’s Keeping Score? Holding Credit Bureaus Accountable and Repairing a Broken System”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation, hearing entitled “On the Eve of the Summit: Options for U.S. Diplomacy on North Korea”, 10:15 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.


Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1, a bill to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, or a related measure, and for other purposes, 1 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of the Trump Administration’s Family Separation Policy”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.


Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Denial Playbook: How Industries Manipulate Science and Policy from Climate Change to Public Health”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, business meeting to consider A Resolution Offered by Chairman Elijah E. Cummings Authorizing Issuance of Subpoenas Related to Child Separation Policy, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.


Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Examining How Federal Infrastructure Policy Could Help Mitigate and Adapt to Climate Change”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “National Security Implications of the Rise of Authoritarianism Around the World”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of February 26 through March 1, 2019

Senate Chamber

On Tuesday, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, post-cloture.

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 Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: February 28, to hold hearings to examine implementing the Agriculture Improvement Act, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: February 28, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine addressing the opioid epidemic in America, focusing on prevention, treatment, and recovery at the state and local level, 10 a.m., SD–124.


February 26, Subcommittee on Airland, to receive a closed briefing on the B–21 “Raider”, 3 p.m., SVC–217.

February 27, Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold an oversight hearing to examine military personnel policies and military family readiness, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

February 27, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

February 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine nuclear policy and posture, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: February 26, business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, both of the Department 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, Spencer Bachus III, of Alabama, and Judith DelZoppo Pryor, of Ohio, both
to be a Member of the Board of Directors, and Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President, all of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, and Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, both to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Semianual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

February 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine legislative proposals on capital formation and corporate governance, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: February 27, to hold hearings to examine the Budget Control Act, focusing on a review of cap-adjusted spending, 2:30 p.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: February 26, Subcommittee on Transportation and Safety, to hold hearings to examine connecting America, focusing on intermodal connections across our surface transportation network, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

February 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine policy principles for a Federal data privacy framework in the United States, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: February 26, to hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. territories, 10 a.m., SD–366.

February 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine prospects for global energy markets, focusing on the role of the United States and perspectives from the International Energy Agency, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: February 27, to hold hearings to examine S. 383, to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: February 26, to hold hearings to examine drug pricing in America, 10:15 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: February 27, to hold hearings to examine assessing the role of the United States in the world, 10:15 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: February 27, to hold hearings to examine protecting the electric grid from an electromagnetic pulse or geomagnetic disturbance, 2:30 p.m., SD–106.

February 28, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine China’s impact on the United States education system, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: February 27, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the 45th anniversary of the Native American Programs Act and the establishment of the Administration for Native Americans, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Judiciary: February 26, Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, to hold hearings to examine the 2019 Annual Intellectual Property Report to Congress, 10 a.m., SD–226.

February 28, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the nominations of Neomi J. Rao, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, and Michael H. Park, of New York, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Greg Girard Guidry, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Michael T. Liburdi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, Peter D. Welte, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, and Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, both to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and Drew H. Wrigley, to be United States Attorney for the District of North Dakota, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: February 27, to hold hearings to examine the future of American industry, 2:30 p.m., SR–428A.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: February 26, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

February 27, Full Committee, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Select Committee on Intelligence: February 28, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, February 27, Full Committee, business meeting to consider the Budget Views and Estimates Letter of the Committee on Agriculture for the Agencies and Programs under the Jurisdiction of the Committee for Fiscal Year 2020, 9:30 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The State of the Rural Economy”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.


February 27, Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Reviewing the Administration’s Unaccompanied Children Program: State-Sanctioned Child Abuse”, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Government Accountability Office, 10 a.m., HT–2 Capitol.

February 27, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “The President’s 2019 National Emergency Declaration Circumventing Congress to Build a Border Wall and Its Effect on Military Construction and Readiness”, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing entitled “Oversight of U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Programs and Policies”, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Stakeholder Perspectives: Fair Housing”, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.
February 27, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Government Publishing Office, 11 a.m., HT–2 Capitol.

February 27, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, oversight hearing on the Food and Drug Administration, 2 p.m., 2362–A Rayburn.


Committee on Armed Services, February 27, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled “Transgender Service Policy”, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “2017 Tax Law: Impact on the Budget and American Families”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.


February 27, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled “Caring for Our Caregivers: Protecting Health Care and Social Service Workers from Workplace Violence”, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, February 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Confronting a Growing Public Health Threat: Measles Outbreaks in the U.S.”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “Clean Energy Infrastructure and the Workforce to Build It”, 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

February 28, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, hearing entitled “We’ll Always Have Paris: Filling the Leadership Void Caused by Federal Inaction on Climate Change”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion will hold a hearing entitled “An Overview of Diversity Trends in the Financial Services Industry”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Trump Administration’s Foreign Policy: A Mid-Term Assessment”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

February 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “America’s Global Leadership: Why Diplomacy and Development Matter”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, February 27, Full Committee, hearing on “Securing out Nation’s Chemical Facilities: Building on the Progress of the CFATS Program”, 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.


Committee on Natural Resources, February 27, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 560, the “Northern Mariana Islands Residents Relief Act”, 10:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Hearing with Michael Cohen, Former Attorney to President Donald Trump”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

February 28, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Effects of Vacancies at the Merit Systems Protection Board”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, February 27, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “Sea Change: Impacts of Climate Change on Our Oceans and Coasts”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Supporting America’s Startups: Review of SBA Entrepreneurial Development Programs”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, February 27, Full Committee, business meeting on Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Views and Estimates of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and markup on H.Con. Res. 16, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; H.Con. Res. 19, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; H.R. 1318, to direct the Library of Congress to obtain a stain glassed panel depicting the seal of the District of Columbia and install the panel among the stained glass panels depicting the seals of States which overlook the Main Reading Room of the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson Building; H.R. 639, to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that National Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces may include Federal employees, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “VA 2030: A Vision for the Future of VA”, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Ways and Means, February 27, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S.-China Trade”, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: February 26, Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans, 2 p.m., SD–G50.

February 27, Full Committee, to hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion, 10 a.m., SD–G50.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Tuesday, February 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, post-cloture.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Tuesday, February 26

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of H.J. Res. 46—Relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.
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