United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2019 *No. 34*

House of Representatives

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 JAMIE 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 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.

NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in disappointment that, once again, the Federal Government is nearing another debt limit. Our national debt is a record $22 trillion.

I blame both parties for this reckless and immoral burden that has been placed on our children. We do not have a taxing problem in Congress; we have a spending problem in Congress.

Both parties have lacked fiscal responsibility over the past four decades. Both parties have operated in deficits when they were in power.

Mr. Speaker, it will take both parties working together to control our spending. Our national debt is the single biggest challenge that faces our great country, and, surely, we can make it a bipartisan movement to cut unnecessary and wasteful spending while still funding our most important priorities of Social Security, Medicare, and our national defense.

PENN STATE'S THON 2019

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, thousands of students from my alma mater, Penn State University, participated in a 46-hour dance marathon called THON.

THON is the accumulation of a yearlong 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 6 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 other penalties provided by law, be subject 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 the pirate radio broadcasting identified by enforcement sweeps is continuing to broadcast and whether additional pirate radio broadcasting is occurring.

''(3) NO EFFECT ON REMAINING ENFORCEMENT.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Commission shall not decrease or diminish the regular enforcement efforts targeted to pirate radio broadcast stations for other times of the year.

''(e) STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY.—The Commission may not preempt any State or local law prohibiting pirate radio broadcasting.

''(f) REVISION OF COMMISSION RULES REQUIRED.—The Commission shall revise its rules to require that, absent good cause, in any case alleging a violation of subsection (a) or (b), the Commission shall proceed directly to issue a notice of apparent liability without first issuing a notice of unlicensed operation.

''(g) PIRATE RADIO BROADCASTING DATABASE.—

''(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. The 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 forfeiture order 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 broadcasting' means the transmission of communications on spectrum frequencies between 535 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 their remarks 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.

Mr. Speaker, first, a heartfelt thank you to everyone who has worked on this measure. I thank Representative BILIRAKIS for agreeing to lead this effort with me in this Congress. I thank our 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 actions 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 broadcast associations.

JANUARY 18, 2019.

50 State Broadcasters Associations Urge Passage of the Bipartisan PIRATE Act

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, 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 in all 50 States, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico urge your swift consideration and passage of the Preventing Illegal Radio Abuse Through Enforcement (PIRATE) Act (H.R. 583). The PIRATE Act would provide the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) with critical new enforcement measures to combat pirate radio operations. Last Congress, substantially similar bipartisan legislation (H.R. 5709, 115th) passed the House of Representatives unanimously.

For years unauthorized pirate radio stations have harmed communities across the country by undermining the Emergency Alert System, interfering 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 FCC 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 those entities that have been subject to enforcement actions for illegal operation.

We are reaching the point where illegal pirate 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; 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/D.C./Delaware (MDCD) 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 Bruce, Montana Broadcasters Association; Jim Timm, Nebraska 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; David Donovan, New York State Broadcasters Association; Lisa Reynolds, North Carolina Association of Broadcasters; Beth Helfrich, North Dakota Broadcasters Association; Christine Merritt, Ohio Association of Broadcasters; Vance Harrison, Oklahoma Association of Broadcasters; John Tamerlano, Oregon Association of Broadcasters.

Joe Conti, Pennsylvania Association of Broadcasters; Jose A. Ribas Dominicci, Radio Broadcasters Association of Puerto Rico; Lori Needham, 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 Mays, Vermont Association of Broadcasters; Doug Easter, Virginia Association of Broadcasters; Keith Shipman, Washington State Association of Broadcasters; Michele Crist, 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 the laws that support 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, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise 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 Mr. TONKO and Mr. BILIRAKIS for their bipartisan efforts to combat illegal pirate radio operations.

This bill gives the Federal Communications Commission, along with State and local law enforcement, more tools to go after pirate radio operators. Without the ability to effectively go after illegal transmitters, the FCC and other entities cannot protect the over 240 million Americans who rely on radio broadcasting for vital news and entertainment.

Furthermore, stopping bad actors from pirating our airwaves improves public safety by preventing unlawful broadcasts from interfering with first responders' lifesaving communications and public safety officials' transmission of critical information in an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the PIRATE Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members who choose to speak. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 583, the PIRATE Act, led by Chairman TONKO and Representative BILIRAKIS.

The bipartisan bill takes an important step to protect the vital public safety announcements, news, and educational benefits local broadcasters serve to their communities.

When illegal pirate radio operators interfere with important public safety communications, it can be detrimental to the public. These illegal pirate operators also interfere with critical aviation frequencies, potentially putting lives at risk.

Legitimate, licensed broadcasters who provide the foundation of our Nation's Emergency Alert System must be protected from this type of harmful interference.

H.R. 583 would give the FCC stronger tools to continue their enforcement sweeps and fine violators in order to better protect Americans.

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.

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 (PIRATE) Act, introduced by Reps. PAUL TONKO and GUS BILIRAKIS. I want to thank Rep. CHRIS COLLINS of New York and former Rep. Leonard Lance of New Jersey for leading on this last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I've been around radio for most of my life. From working as a teenage janitor at my dad's radio station to spending more than 20 years as a radio station owner myself; in fact, I'm still a licensed amateur radio operator today. But you don't need that much experience to understand that protecting our public airwaves from illegal pirate radio interference is important for consumers and broadcasters alike.

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 is on the motion offered 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:

H.R. 501

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 ''Poison Center Network Enhancement Act of 2019''.

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 AND ENHANCED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide coordination and assistance to poison control centers for—

''(1) the development, establishment, implementation, and maintenance of a nationwide toll-free phone 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 paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

''(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 $700,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.''.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONWIDE PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CONTROL CENTER UTILIZATION.

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.—In 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 response for the purpose of determining the best and most effective methods for achieving public awareness.

''(c) CONTRACT WITH ENTITY.—The Secretary may carry out subsection (a) by entering into contracts with one or more public or private entities, including nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control and national media firms, for the development and implementation of the awareness campaign under subsection (a), which may include—

''(1) the development and distribution of poisoning and 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.

''(d) 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.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $800,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 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) (or granted a waiver under subsection (d)) and nationally recognized professional organizations in the field of poison control for the purposes of—

''(1) preventing, and providing 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 center under subsection (c).

''(b) ADDITIONAL USES OF FUNDS.—In addition to the purposes described in subsection (a), a poison center or professional organization awarded a grant under such subsection may also use amounts received under such grant—

''(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 and response, and public health emergency, response, and preparedness programs;

''(2) to research, develop, implement, revise, and communicate standard patient management guidelines for commonly encountered toxic exposures;

''(3) to improve national toxic exposure and opioid misuse surveillance by enhancing cooperative activities between poison control centers in the United States and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other governmental agencies;

''(4) to research, improve, and enhance the communications and response capability and capacity of the Nation's network of poison control centers to facilitate increased access to the centers through the integration and modernization of the current poison control centers communications and data system, including enhancing the network's telephony, internet, data, and social networking technologies;

''(5) 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;

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

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

''(8) 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; or

''(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.

''(d) WAIVER OF ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may grant a waiver of the accreditation requirements of subsection (c) with respect to a nonaccredited 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.

''(2) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may renew a waiver under paragraph (1).

''(3) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not, after the date of enactment of the Poison

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 center.

''(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 lifesaving 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 roughly 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 an integral 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, and 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, as well as 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 opioid 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 poisoning 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 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.

□ 1645

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,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH CARE WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE DETECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1128C(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a–7c(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP FOR WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE DETECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Under the program described in paragraph (1), there is established a public-private partnership (in this paragraph referred to as the 'partnership') of health plans, Federal and State agencies, law enforcement agencies, health care anti-fraud organizations, and any other entity determined appropriate by the Secretary (in this paragraph referred to as 'partners') for purposes of detecting and preventing health care waste, fraud, and abuse.

''(B) CONTRACT WITH TRUSTED THIRD 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).

''(C) DUTIES OF PARTNERSHIP.—The partnership shall—

''(i) provide technical and operational support to facilitate data sharing between partners in the partnership;

''(ii) analyze data so shared to identify fraudulent and aberrant billing patterns;

''(iii) conduct aggregate analyses of health care data so shared across Federal, State, and private health plans for purposes of detecting fraud, waste, and abuse schemes;

''(iv) identify outlier trends and potential vulnerabilities of partners in the partnership with respect to such schemes;

''(v) refer specific cases of potential unlawful conduct to appropriate governmental entities;

''(vi) convene, not less than annually, meetings with partners in the partnership for purposes of providing updates on the partnership's work and facilitating information sharing between the partners;

''(vii) enter into data sharing and data use agreements with partners in the partnership in such a manner so as to ensure the partnership has access to data necessary to identify waste, fraud, and abuse while maintaining the confidentiality and integrity of such data;

''(viii) provide partners in the partnership with plan-specific, confidential feedback on any aberrant billing patterns or potential fraud identified by the partnership with respect to such partner;

''(ix) establish a process by which entities described in subparagraph (A) may enter the partnership and requirements such entities must meet to enter the partnership;

''(x) provide appropriate training, outreach, and education to partners based on the results of data analyses described in clauses (ii) and (iii); and

''(xi) perform such other duties as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(D) SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT ANALYSIS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019, the trusted third party with a contract in effect under subparagraph (B) shall perform an analysis of aberrant or fraudulent billing patterns and trends with respect to providers and suppliers of substance use disorder treatments from data shared with the partnership.

''(E) EXECUTIVE BOARD.—

''(i) EXECUTIVE BOARD COMPOSITION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an executive board of the partnership comprised of representatives of the Federal Government and representatives of the private sector selected by the Secretary.

''(II) CHAIRS.—The executive board shall be co-chaired by one Federal Government official and one representative from the private sector.

''(ii) MEETINGS.—The executive board of the partnership shall meet at least once per year.

''(iii) EXECUTIVE BOARD DUTIES.—The duties of the executive board shall include the following:

''(I) Providing strategic direction for the partnership, including membership criteria and a mission statement.

''(II) Communicating with the leadership of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice and the various private health sector associations.

''(F) REPORTS.—Not later than September 30, 2021, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make available on the public website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services 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;

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

''(v) a strategic plan for the 2-year period beginning on the day after the date of the submission of such report, including a description of any emerging fraud and abuse schemes, trends, or practices that the partnership intends to study during such period.

''(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 consistent with this subsection, all functions, personnel, assets, liabilities, and administrative actions applicable on the date before the date of the enactment of this paragraph to the National Fraud Prevention Partnership established on September 17, 2012, by charter of the Secretary shall be transferred to the partnership established under subparagraph (A) as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph.

''(I) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the partnership established by subparagraph (A).

''(J) IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may implement the partnership established by subparagraph (A) by program instruction or otherwise.

''(K) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'trusted third party' means an entity that—

''(i) demonstrates the capability to carry out the duties of the partnership described in subparagraph (C);

''(ii) complies with such conflict of interest standards determined appropriate by the Secretary; and

''(iii) meets such other requirements as the Secretary may prescribe.''.

(b) POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of the partnership (as described in section 1128C(a)(6) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a)) establishing a system to conduct real-time data analysis to proactively identify ongoing as well as emergent fraud trends for the entities participating in the partnership and provide such entities with real-time feedback on potentially fraudulent claims. Such report shall include the estimated cost of and any potential barriers to the partnership establishing such a system.

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. 525.

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 today in support of H.R. 525, the Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019. This bipartisan bill 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.

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 healthcare fraud by facilitating the exchange of data and information between the public and private sectors on fraud trends and successful antifraud practices.

The legislation we are considering today would authorize the partnership, require the partnership to report regularly to Congress, and give the agency new tools to enhance and expand its capabilities.

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

I support this legislation and 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Chairman, Energy and Commerce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE: In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 525, Strengthening the Health Care Fraud Prevention Task Force Act of 2019, the Committee on Ways and Means agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to provisions that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. The Committee also 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 letter 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,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

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 forgoing further 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 and 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 antifraud 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 of 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 root out waste, fraud, and abuse in our healthcare system, 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 bill—which 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 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. 525.

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.

INNOVATORS TO ENTREPRENEURS ACT OF 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move 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 support commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 539

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 ''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 increasing the commercialization of Government-funded research.

(2) I-Corps provides valuable entrepreneurial education to graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and other researchers, 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 based on the early 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 grantees as well as other businesses willing to pay the cost of attending such training.

(6) The success of the I-Corps Program at promoting entrepreneurship within research institutions and encouraging research commercialization has been due in part to the National Science Foundation's efforts to date on building a national network of science entrepreneurs, including convening stakeholders, promoting national I-Corps courses, cataloguing best practices and encourage 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 focus on 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. 1862s–8(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS.—

''(i) 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 technologies, shall provide an option for participation in an I-Corps Teams course by—

''(I) Small Business Innovation Research Program grantees; and

''(II) other entities, as determined appropriate by the Director.

''(ii) COST OF PARTICIPATION.—The cost of participation by a Small Business Innovation Research Program grantee in such course may be provided—

''(I) through I-Corps Teams grants;

''(II) through funds awarded to grantees under the Small Business Innovation Research Program or the Small Business Technology Transfer Program;

''(III) by the grantor Federal agency of the grantee using funds set aside for the Small Business Innovation Research Program under section 9(f)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(f)(1));

''(IV) by the grantor Federal agency of the grantee using funds set aside for the Small Business Technology Transfer Program under section 9(n)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(n)(1)); or

''(V) by the participating teams.''.

SEC. 4. I-CORPS COURSE FOR COMMERCIALIZATION-READY PARTICIPANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the I-Corps program described in section 601(c) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s–8(c)), the Director shall develop an I-Corps course offered by I-Corps regional nodes to support commercialization-ready participants. Such course shall include skills such as attracting investors, scaling up a company, and building a brand.

(b) ENGAGEMENT WITH RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS.—In developing the course under subsection (a), the Director may consult with the heads of such Federal agencies, universities, and public and private entities as the Director determines to be appropriate.

(c) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—The course developed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) support participants that have completed an I-Corps Teams course;

(2) support participants that have made the decision to take an innovation to market.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing an evaluation of the I-Corps program described in section 601(c) of the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act (42 U.S.C. 1862s–8(c)). Such evaluation shall include an assessment of the effects of I-Corps on—

(1) the commercialization of Federally funded research and development;

(2) the higher education system; and

(3) regional economies and the national economy.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Out of amounts otherwise authorized for the National Science Foundation, there is authorized to be appropriated a total of $5,000,000 for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 to carry out the activities described in section 4 and the amendment made by section 3.

(b) LIMITATION.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

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. 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, it is my pleasure to put before the House today H.R. 539.

The House passed a nearly identical bill, H.R. 5086, in the 115th Congress and, unfortunately, that is as far as the bill got. Hopefully, we can get more movement on it this time around, get it through the Senate, and to the President's desk for his signature.

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 2011.

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 Federal Government 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, developing innovations today 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 offers 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 to date 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 of 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 business startups, 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.

□ 1700

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 bipartisan 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. LUCAS. 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 jobs can be created 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 participants 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, I rise in support of H.R. 539, 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 provides decisionmaking 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.

The bill 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 will all 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 talked 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 this made complete sense to me, to be able to teach 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 I-Corps program has been one of the most successful programs that I have seen during my time 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 innovation. Innovation is the lifeblood of our economy. The job creation and economic 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 the Innovation Corps Program to Small Business Innovation Program grantees. Started at the National Science Foundation, the Innovation Corps program, or I-Corps, helps prepare scientists and engineers to think beyond the university lab and gives them the skills to identify products with commercial potential and to be successful entrepreneurs. The Small Business Innovation Program and Small Business Technology Transfer Program, known as SBIR and STTR, are valuable programs that provide competitive research and development grants and contracts to innovative small businesses.

H.R. 539 also seeks make available specialized I-Corps courses in all aspects of preparing a product to go to market. This is a vital component which can help identify market failures and premature business formation. Unfortunately, too many innovative ideas do not make it to the commercialization phase. This bill will help increase those odds.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 539.

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, H.R. 539.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 STEM 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:

H.R. 425

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:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(2) FOUNDATION.—The term ''Foundation'' means the National Science Foundation.

(3) STEM.—The term ''STEM'' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 6621 note).

(4) VETERAN.—The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING VETERANS IN STEM EDUCATION AND COMPUTER SCIENCE.

(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 Director shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and 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 research and education programs of the Foundation, and describe any barriers to collecting such information.

(c) NATIONAL SCIENCE 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 UPDATE.—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'' at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) higher education programs that serve or support veterans.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(F)—

(A) by striking ''and students'' and inserting '', students''; and

(B) by inserting '', and veterans'' before the period at the end;

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

(4) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting ''and veterans'' before the period at the end.

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

(1) in paragraph (3)(F)—

(A) by striking ''and individuals'' and inserting '', individuals''; and

(B) by inserting '', and veterans'' before the period at the end; and

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

(f) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS UPDATE.—Section 5(a) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and students who are veterans'' after ''these fields''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

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

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

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

''(J) creating opportunities for veterans to transition to careers in computer and network security; and''.

(g) GRADUATE TRAINEESHIPS IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH UPDATE.—Section 5(c)(6)(C) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(c)(6)(C)) is amended by inserting ''or veterans'' after ''disciplines''.

(h) VETERANS AND MILITARY FAMILIES STEM EDUCATION INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an interagency working group to coordinate Federal programs and policies for transitioning and training veterans and military spouses for 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, which shall—

(i) specify and prioritize short- and long-term objectives;

(ii) specify the common metrics that will be used by Federal agencies to assess progress toward achieving such objectives;

(iii) identify barriers veterans face in reentering the workforce, including a lack of formal STEM education, career guidance, and the process of transferring military credits and skills to college credits;

(iv) identify barriers military spouses face in establishing careers in STEM fields;

(v) describe the approaches that each participating agency will take to address administratively the barriers described in clauses (iii) and (iv); and

(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.

(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.

(5) SUNSET.—The interagency working group established under paragraph (1) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date that it is established.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 425, the bill now under consideration.

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 as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 425, the Supporting Veterans in STEM Careers Act.

I want to thank Mr. DUNN and Mr. LAMB for introducing this important legislation.

Now, more than ever, U.S. global competitiveness depends on our ability to grow and sustain a STEM-capable workforce poised to meet the needs of the private sector. With an economy that is rapidly evolving and increasingly reliant on big data automation and advanced technologies, the workforce is struggling to keep up.

Although STEM careers offer good pay and job security, companies across all sectors report having difficulty recruiting workers with the skills that they need.

The good news is veterans and transitioning servicemembers represent a group of highly trained individuals with STEM knowledge base and skill sets employers need. The question is how to get more veterans to produce STEM degrees and join the STEM workforce.

H.R. 425 addresses this question by supporting research to identify and lower barriers for veterans transitioning from military to civilian work environments. The bill directs the National Science Foundation to develop a comprehensive plan for outreach to veterans with the goal of increasing veteran participation in the agency STEM education and research programs.

It also requires NSF, in its biennial Science and Engineering Indicators report, to publish available data on veterans in STEM studies and careers.

Further, the bill adds veterans as a target demographic for outreach under several existing NSF programs, including the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program.

Finally, H.R. 425 creates an interagency committee on veterans in STEM and directs the creation of a strategic plan for transitioning and training veterans and military spouses into STEM careers.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 425 will help us cement our global leadership by ensuring more veterans with the STEM skills we need are able to translate their talent into STEM careers. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Dr. NEAL DUNN and Congressman CONOR LAMB for their work to support our Nation's veterans.

H.R. 425 will help veterans put their training and experience in military service to new and important uses and help America stay competitive in research and innovation on a global scale.

In the last decade alone, jobs requiring some level of STEM expertise have grown by more than 30 percent, including jobs that do not require a bachelor's degree.

Nearly 7 million jobs are unfulfilled in the United States due to a shortage of skilled workers, many in STEM and related fields.

In my State of Oklahoma, our universities estimate we have 2,000 open engineering jobs. At the same time, veterans and transitioning servicemembers represent a valuable, skilled talent pool from which to meet this critical need.

H.R. 425 will improve outreach to veterans through the National Science Foundation's programs to support and train STEM workers. We can serve our veterans and help them translate their experience into meaningful STEM work.

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB).

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support veterans in STEM careers.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, Dr. DUNN, for his leadership in helping connect veterans to these good jobs.

Veterans are working today. Most Americans are working today. The unemployment rate is low. And yet everywhere I go, I meet businesspeople who tell me that they can't find the right workers for the right jobs at the right time. If we could fix this, we would stop being held back by the shortage of workforce that we face, and, most importantly, our families would not be held back by lower paychecks.

But these new jobs in cybersecurity, in medical technology, in advanced manufacturing, they are hard jobs and they require training.

□ 1715

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 in 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. The bill directs the National Science Foundation to develop a veterans outreach plan and publish data 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 to more than 9 million jobs by 2022. Research shows that many military veterans already have 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 it 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 join me in support of this 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, H.R. 425.

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.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENT IN CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ACT

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I move 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.

The Clerk 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,

SECTION 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) CLASSIFIED 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 nonprofit 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 associations.

(iv) Labor organizations.

(v) Educational service agencies.

(vi) Nonprofit entities.

(vii) Parents and students.

(viii) Any other group determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) DEMONSTRATION.—Each Governor of a State who desires individuals in the State to receive recognition under this section shall submit the nominations described in paragraph (1) to the Secretary in such manner as may be required 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 employees' 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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. Is there 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 recognize 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 to promote quality 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 interface directly with 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 may not have been their 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 American 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 invaluable contribution 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. 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 are in 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.

□ 1730

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.''

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 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 those 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—not necessarily 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 TITUS 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 gentlewoman 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MSPB TEMPORARY TERM EXTENSION ACT

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1235) 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, and for other purposes, as amended.

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 MEMBERS: TERM EXTENSION AND LIMITATION ON SERVICE.

The term of office of any member of the Merit Systems Protection Board appointed 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the 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 holdover 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 our colleagues John Dingell and Walter Jones.

We hoped that the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee would take action to address the problem during 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 time runs out 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 related to votes he 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 entering uncharted new territory, and not good territory.

If there is no principal officer to lead the agency, not only is it unclear

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, of 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 doing nothing 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 would 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 the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from those organizations and a coalition of other stakeholders.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, February 22, 2019.

Hon. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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 term of the current and only MSPB member to be extended and avoid having a vacant Board.

An employee may appeal an adverse action to the MSPB, a 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 decision to the full three Member 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. Robbins' original 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.'' would allow for Robbins to 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 upholding 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.

NTEU, THE NATIONAL TREASURY EMPLOYEES UNION,
Washington, DC, February 19, 2019.

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, 1 write to applaud your efforts to support the important work performed by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSBP 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 envisioned in the Civil Service Reform Act. Thank you.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON
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, RANKING MEMBER JORDAN, CHAIRMAN CONNOLLY, AND RANKING MEMBER MEADOWS: On behalf of the undersigned 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 the Board has been unable to issue official reports or studies to Congress and the President during a critical time in which 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 any Senate-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 the holdover period for the Board 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,

FAA Managers Association (FAAMA), Federal Managers Association (FMA), Government Accountability Project (GAP), Tom Devine, Liberty Coalition, National Council of Social Security Management Associations (NCSSMA), National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE), National Taxpayers Union, National Whistleblower Center, Professional Managers Association (PMA), Project on Government Oversight (POGO), Public Citizen, Senior Executives Association (SEA), Taxpayer Protection Alliance, Union of Concerned Scientists, Whistleblowers of America.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1235, a commonsense stopgap measure to prevent serious injury to hardworking civil servants who expect the Merit Systems Protection Board to function.

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 1235, the MSPB Temporary Term Extension Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that I personally am committed to ensuring the successful operation of the Merit Systems Protection Board, also known as MSPB. In fact, last Congress, I introduced H.R. 6391, the MSPB Reauthorization Act of 2018. My bill would have reauthorized the Board and made other vital reforms. The Committee on Oversight

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, become 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, 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.

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

Briefly, in responding to my friend: I agree with him. I think we need a full board. Our problem is the Senate. They didn't get around to acting in a timely fashion, and so we are faced with this.

I think it is also important to note that, although a quorum is necessary for most work of MSPB, it isn't necessary for all of it.

So Mr. Robbins, in a caretaker, interim position, can still do some of the work of the board, including issuing stays, reviewing some of the work, and helping to avoid adding to the backlog.

He can't substitute himself fully, obviously, for a quorum in the board. My colleague is quite right about that.

What we are trying to do here is not to compel him or coerce him to stay against his wishes; it is to try to buy some time and have the board at least do some of its basic functions so that we don't come to a complete standstill. That would not be necessary, frankly, had the Senate acted.

I think my friend is right in suggesting that is the ultimate answer, and I would join him in calling on the Senate to act as swiftly as possible. But I think we have no choice but to act on this bill now.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the 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 Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1235, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended 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.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

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.

INNOVATORS 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 support 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. 88]

YEAS—385

Adams	Cole	Gallego
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Aguilar	Collins (NY)	Garcia (IL)
Allen	Comer	Garcia (TX)
Allred	Conaway	Gianforte
Amodei	Connolly	Gibbs
Armstrong	Cook	Golden
Arrington	Cooper	Gonzalez (OH)
Axne	Correa	Gonzalez (TX)
Bacon	Courtney	Gooden
Baird	Cox (CA)	Gottheimer
Balderson	Craig	Granger
Banks	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Barr	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Barragán	Crist	Graves (MO)
Bass	Crow	Green (TN)
Beatty	Cuellar	Green (TX)
Bera	Cummings	Grijalva
Bergman	Cunningham	Guest
Beyer	Curtis	Guthrie
Bishop (GA)	Davids (KS)	Haaland
Bishop (UT)	Davidson (OH)	Hagedorn
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Harder (CA)
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Bost	Dean	Hartzler
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeGette	Hastings
	DeLauro	Hayes
Brady	DelBene	Heck
Brown (MD)	Delgado	Hice (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Higgins (LA)
Buchanan	DeSaulnier	Higgins (NY)
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Hill (AR)
Budd	Deutch	Hill (CA)
Burchett	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Burgess	Dingell	Holding
Bustos	Doggett	Hollingsworth
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael F.	Horsford
Byrne		Houlahan
Calvert	Duffy	Hoyer
Carbajal	Duncan	Hudson
Cárdenas	Dunn	Huffman
Carson (IN)	Emmer	Huizenga
Carter (GA)	Engel	Hunter
Carter (TX)	Escobar	Hurd (TX)
Cartwright	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Case	Espaillat	Jayapal
Casten (IL)	Estes	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Evans	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Finkenauer	Johnson (LA)
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Cheney	Fleischmann	Johnson (SD)
Chu, Judy	Fletcher	Johnson (TX)
Cicilline	Flores	Jordan
Cisneros	Fortenberry	Joyce (OH)
Clark (MA)	Foster	Joyce (PA)
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kaptur
Clay	Fulcher	Keating
Cleaver	Gabbard	Kelly (IL)
Cloud	Gaetz	Kelly (MS)
Clyburn	Gallagher	Kelly (PA)

Kennedy	Napolitano	Simpson
Khanna	Neal	Sires
Kildee	Neguse	Slotkin
Kilmer	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Kim	Norcross	Smith (NE)
Kind	Norman	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Nunes	Smucker
Kinzinger	O'Halleran	Soto
Kirkpatrick	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Krishnamoorthi	Olson	Spano
Kuster (NH)	Omar	Speier
Kustoff (TN)	Palazzo	Stanton
LaHood	Pallone	Stauber
LaMalfa	Palmer	Stefanik
Lamb	Panetta	Steil
Lamborn	Pappas	Stevens
Langevin	Pascrell	Stewart
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Stivers
Larson (CT)	Pence	Suozzi
Latta	Perlmutter	Takano
Lawrence	Perry	Taylor
Lee (CA)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lee (NV)	Peterson	Thompson (PA)
Lesko	Phillips	Thornberry
Levin (CA)	Pingree	Timmons
Levin (MI)	Porter	Tipton
Lewis	Posey	Titus
Lieu, Ted	Pressley	Tlaib
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Tonko
Loebsack	Quigley	Torres (CA)
Lofgren	Raskin	Torres Small (NM)
Long	Ratcliffe	Trahan
Loudermilk	Reed	Turner
Lowenthal	Reschenthaler	Underwood
Lucas	Rice (NY)	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Richmond	Van Drew
Luján	Riggleman	Vargas
Luria	Roby	Veasey
Lynch	Rodgers (WA)	Vela
Malinowski	Roe, David P.	Velázquez
Maloney, Carolyn B.	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
Marchant	Rose (NY)	Walberg
Marshall	Rose, John W.	Walden
Mast	Rouda	Walker
McAdams	Rouzer	Walorski
McBath	Roybal-Allard	Waltz
McCarthy	Ruiz	Wasserman Schultz
McCaul	Ruppersberger	Waters
McCollum	Rutherford	Watkins
McEachin	Ryan	Watson Coleman
McGovern	Sánchez	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Sarbanes	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Scalise	Welch
McNerney	Scanlon	Wenstrup
Meadows	Schakowsky	Westerman
Meeks	Schiff	Wexton
Meng	Schneider	Wild
Meuser	Schrier	Williams
Miller	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Mitchell	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Moolenaar	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Mooney (WV)	Scott, David	Womack
Moore	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Moulton	Serrano	Wright
Mucarsel-Powell	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Mullin	Shalala	Young
Murphy	Sherman	Zeldin
Nadler	Sherrill	
	Shimkus	

NAYS—18

Amash	Foxx (NC)	Massie
Biggs	Gohmert	McClintock
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Rice (SC)
Buck	Griffith	Roy
Cline	Grothman	Steube
Ferguson	Hern, Kevin	Yoho

NOT VOTING—28

Abraham	Frankel	Pocan
Babin	Gomez	Rooney (FL)
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Schrader
Brindisi	Katko	Smith (WA)
Brooks (IN)	King (IA)	Swalwell (CA)
Cohen	Lawson (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Costa	Lowey	Trone
Davis, Danny K.	Matsui	
DeFazio	Morelle	

□ 1900

Messrs. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, FERGUSON, RICE of South Carolina, GOSAR, STEUBE, BUCK, GRIFFITH, and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. 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 recorded.

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:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

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

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 renominating 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-DESIGNATE 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.

Throughout her tenure, she served with distinction, working hard to ensure that the Office of the Clerk always acted in a nonpartisan, bipartisan way, which brought credit on this House and great service to every Member.

Thank you for that, Karen.

Many of us serving in the House have known her even longer, going back to her service on the staff of former Speaker Hastert and former Republican Leader Bob Michel.

I might say of the latter, Bob Michel was one of the finest human beings I have ever known and one of the best Members that I have ever served with. Karen was proud to serve with him, and he, I know, was so fond of Karen and her service to him and to the House.

Now, I may not be totally objective. Karen is a native Marylander. Karen is also a graduate of the University of Maryland, so Karen and I share a lot in common. We live in Maryland; we graduated from Maryland; and we love this House.

I offer her the thanks of the House, its Members, and our staff, as she steps down from this position. I am not sure where Karen is going, but I guarantee you, our loss will be somebody else's gain, because she has the kind of talent, commitment, energy, and faithfulness that will make a real difference wherever she goes.

I also congratulate Cheryl Johnson for becoming the 36th Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, Cheryl returns to the House where she served for 20 years with the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as the Committee on House Administration.

She will bring an extraordinary amount of experience to her job as the Clerk of the House. I know she will do an outstanding job, and I welcome her back to this House, which she has served so ably before.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Terrapin from Maryland, for yielding.

I want to say, first, we are going to miss Karen Haas. Karen Haas served this body so well, as the majority leader talked about, and in such a fair way, treating all Members with the dignity and respect that they all deserve as we all carry out the work of the people's House.

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 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 ever had 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. Oftentimes, you won'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, it is my privilege to yield to the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI.

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 Offices 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 advance fairness and respect 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 from abroad to explore and be 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 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. Will 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 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.

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

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

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

committee staff of my father, former Congressman Bill Clay.

She spent 10 years as the chief education and investigative counsel for the Committee on Education and the Workforce where she advanced reforms in elementary and secondary education, juvenile justice, child nutrition, labor issues, and employment and nutrition programs for seniors.

Prior to that, she served as staff director and counsel for the Committee on House Administration's Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials and then Subcommittee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

Ms. Johnson is a distinguished graduate of Howard University Law School and the University of Iowa. She is married to Clarence and has a son, Bradford.

I go back with Cheryl as a friend for 40 years. Our families are close. Growing up around this institution that we all love, I was fortunate to be in the company of and witness the examples set by many great public servants—Members and staff—who devoted themselves to representing their constituents in the true spirit of public service.

Cheryl Johnson exemplifies the highest standards of public service, honor, and integrity that will elevate the 116th Congress. I am pleased to welcome her as our new Clerk, and I am prouder still to call her my good friend. She will be an enormous resource for Members and staff, and I am proud to welcome her home.

Welcome back, Cheryl. Congratulations.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENT IN CLASSIFIED SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERS). 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 read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman 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:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—387

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

NAYS—19

Amash
Biggs
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Davidson (OH)
Gohmert
Gosar
Grothman
Harris
Hice (GA)
Hunter
Massie
Mitchell
Olson
Perry
Rice (SC)
Roy
Weber (TX)
Yoho

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham
Babin
Beyer
Bilirakis
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Cohen
Davis, Danny K.
DeFazio
Frankel
Herrera Beutler
Horn, Kendra S.
Katko
King (IA)
Lawson (FL)
Lowey
Matsui
Morelle
Pocan
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Schrader
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Trone

□ 1930

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CLINE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather in New York and missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 88 regarding the ''Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act of 2019 (H.R. 539)'' and YEA on Roll Call No. 89 regarding the ''Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act (H.R. 276).''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on February 25, 2019 due to inclement weather preventing my scheduled air travel from Iowa to Washington, D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

YES on Roll Call No. 88, and YES on Roll Call No. 89.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 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. 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, 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) H.R. 1029 of the 115th Congress, as passed by the Senate on June 28, 2018, is enacted into law.

(b) In publishing this Act in slip form and in the United States Statutes at Large pursuant to section 112 of title 1, United States Code, the Archivist of the United States shall include after the date of approval at the end an appendix setting forth the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. 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. 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 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''an average amount of $31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023'';

(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 ''$184,800 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(i)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 and ending on September 30, 2025''; and

(2) by inserting after ''registration of a pesticide under this Act'' the following: ''or any other action covered under a table specified in section 33(b)(3),''.

(c) EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION ON TOLERANCE FEES.—Section 408(m)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(m)(3)) is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

SEC. 3. REREGISTRATION AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZED USE OF FUND.—Section 4(k)(2)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''the fund'' and inserting ''the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund'';

(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 of registration review under section 3(g), including the costs associated with any review under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) required as part of the registration review, to offset the costs associated with tracking and implementing registration review decisions, including registration review decisions designed to reduce risk, for the purposes 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 ''3(g);'' 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 ''3(g);'' 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 OF 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 ''personnel and resources—'' and inserting the following: ''For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2023, the Administrator shall use between ⅛ and ⅛ 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)) 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 amounts made available under subparagraph (A) to develop, receive comments with respect to, finalize, and implement the necessary rulemaking and guidance for product performance data requirements to evaluate products claiming efficacy against the following invertebrate pests of significant public health or economic importance (in order of importance):

''(i) Bed bugs.

''(ii) Premise (including crawling insects, flying insects, and baits).

''(iii) Pests of pets (including pet pests controlled by spot-ons, collars, shampoos, powders, or dips).

''(iv) Fire ants.

''(C) DEADLINES FOR GUIDANCE.—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—

''(I) submit draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2018; and

''(II) 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 clauses (iii) and (iv) of such subparagraph—

''(I) submit draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2019; and

''(II) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than March 31, 2021.

''(D) REVISION.—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 regulations prescribing product performance data requirements for any pesticide intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any invertebrate pest of significant public health or economic importance specified in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (B).''.

(d) SET-ASIDE FOR GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—Section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)) 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 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) ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for 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), with respect to laboratory inspections and data audits conducted in support of pesticide product registrations under this Act. As part of such monitoring program, the Administrator shall make available to 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.''; and

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

SEC. 4. EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS FOR PESTICIDES.

Section 5(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136c(a)) 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 in the case of an application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b), not later than the last day of the applicable timeframe for such application specified in such section)'' after ''all required supporting data''.

SEC. 5. PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

(a) EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF FEE AUTHORITY.—Section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''PESTICIDE REGISTRATION''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or for any 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 ''pesticide registration''; and

(ii) by striking ''2015'' each place it appears and inserting ''2021''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''revised registration service fee schedules'' and inserting ''service fee schedules revised pursuant to this paragraph'';

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''covered pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered application''; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that no waiver or fee reduction shall be provided in connection with a request for a letter of certification (commonly referred to as a Gold Seal letter)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(5) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''pesticide registration'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered''; and

(ii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking ''pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered''.

(b) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FUND SET-ASIDES FOR WORKER PROTECTION, PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION.—Section 33(c)(3)(B) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(c)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting '', PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION'' after ''WORKER PROTECTION'';

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following:'', with an emphasis on field-worker populations in the United States'';

(3) in clause (ii), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(4) in clause (iii), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

(c) REFORMS TO REDUCE DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(e) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new sentence: ''Such reforms shall include identifying opportunities for streamlining review processes for applications for a new active ingredient or a new use and providing prompt feedback to applicants during such review process.''.

(d) DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018''; and

(B) by inserting after ''covered pesticide registration actions'' the following: ''or for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3)'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(C) applications for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3).''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) by striking ''a pesticide registration application'' and inserting ''a covered application''; and

(B) by striking ''covered pesticide registration application'' and inserting ''covered application''.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 33(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

''(i) the number of pesticides or pesticide cases reviewed and the number of registration review decisions completed, including—

''(I) the number of cases cancelled;

''(II) the number of cases requiring risk mitigation measures;

''(III) the number of cases removing risk mitigation measures;

''(IV) the number of cases with no risk mitigation needed; and

''(V) the number of cases in which risk mitigation has been fully implemented;'';

(B) in subparagraph (G)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking ''section 4(k)(4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 4(k)''; and

(II) by striking ''that section'' and inserting ''such paragraphs'';

(ii) by striking clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi);

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) implementing enhancements to—

''(I) the electronic tracking of covered applications;

''(II) the electronic tracking of conditional registrations;

''(III) the endangered species database;

''(IV) the electronic review of labels submitted with covered applications; and

''(V) the electronic review and assessment of confidential statements of formula submitted with covered applications; and''; and

(iv) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (iii);

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

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

(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(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—

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

''(II) to award partnership grants under clause (ii) of such subsection; and

''(III) to carry out the pesticide safety education program under clause (iii) of such subsection;

''(ii) an evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the activities, grants, and program described in clause (i);

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

''(iv) 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.—During fiscal year 2018'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2024.—During fiscal year 2024''; and

(ii) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2019.—During fiscal year 2019'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2025.—During fiscal year 2025''; and

(ii) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023'';

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—Effective September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2025.—Effective September 30, 2025''; and

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''2017'' both places it appears and inserting ''2023''.

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

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

(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 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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R130	13	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2) (3)	21	191,444
R140	14	Additional food use; Indoor; food/food handling. (3) (4)	15	44,672
R150	15	First food use. (2)(3)	21	317,104
R155	16 (new)	First food use, Experimental Use Permit application; a.i. registered for non-food outdoor use. (3)(4)	21	264,253
R160	17	First food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	264,253
R170	18	Additional food use. (3) (4)	15	79,349
R175	19	Additional food uses covered within a crop group resulting from the conversion of existing approved crop group(s) to one or more revised crop groups. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R180	20	Additional food use; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R190	21	Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)	15	476,090
R200	22	Additional Food Use; 6 or more submitted in one application; Reduced Risk. (3)(4)	10	396,742
R210	23	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	12	48,986
R220	24	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R230	25	Additional use; non-food; outdoor. (3) (4)	15	31,713
R240	26	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	26,427
R250	27	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R251	28	Experimental Use Permit application which requires no changes to the tolerance(s); non-crop destruct basis. (3)	8	19,838
R260	29	New use; non-food; indoor. (3) (4)	12	15,317
R270	30	New use; non-food; indoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	9	12,764
R271	31	New use; non-food; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	9,725
R273	32	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)	12	50,445
R274	33	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)	12	302,663

(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 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) 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 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.

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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R280	34	Establish import tolerance; new active ingredient or first food use. (2)	21	319,072
R290	35	Establish Import tolerance; Additional new food use.	15	63,816
R291	36	Establish import tolerances; additional food uses; 6 or more crops submitted in one petition.	15	382,886
R292	37	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase) and/or harmonize established tolerances with Codex MRLs; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	45,341
R293	38	Establish tolerance(s) for inadvertent residues in one crop; applicant-initiated.	12	53,483
R294	39	Establish tolerances for inadvertent residues; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; applicant-initiated.	12	320,894
R295	40	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)	15	66,124
R296	41	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)	15	396,742
R297	42	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase) in one petition; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	272,037
R298	43	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	58,565
R299	44	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	285,261

(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 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) 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 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R300	45	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)	4	1,582
R301	46	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)	4	1,897
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 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	10	12,626
R318	50 (new)	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)	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 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	11	17,252

''TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R315	52	New end-use, on-animal product, registered source of active ingredient(s), 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)	9	9,820
R316	53 (new)	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: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 3 and up to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	9	11,301
R317	54 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing 2 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: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • child resistant packaging and/or • pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 7 target pests. (2)(3)	10	15,301
R320	55	New product; new physical form; requires data review in science divisions. (2)(3)	12	13,226
R331	56	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)	3	2,530
R332	57	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)	24	283,215
R333	58	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)	10	19,838
R334	59	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)	11	23,100

(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 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/refined 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), 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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R340	60	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)	4	4,988

''TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R341	61 (New)	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)	6	5,988
R345	62	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)	7	8,820
R350	63	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)	9	13,226
R351	64	Amendment adding a new unregistered source of active ingredient. (2)(3)	8	13,226
R352	65	Amendment adding already approved uses; selective method of support; does not apply if the applicant owns all cited data. (2) (3)	8	13,226
R371	66	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; (does not include extending a permit's time period). (3)	6	10,090

(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/refined 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), 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 6. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
R124	67	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waivers; applicant-initiated.	6	2,530
R272	68	Review of Study Protocol applicant-initiated; excludes DART, pre-registration conference, Rapid Response review, DNT protocol review, protocol needing HSRB review.	3	2,530
R275	69	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
R370	70	Cancer reassessment; applicant-initiated.	18	198,250

(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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A380	71	New Active Ingredient; Indirect Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	137,841
A390	72	New Active Ingredient; Direct Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	229,733

''TABLE 7. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A410	73	New Active Ingredient Non-food use.(2)(3)	21	229,733
A431	74	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; low-risk. (2)(3)	12	80,225

(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 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 8. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A440	75	New Use, Indirect Food Use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	31,910
A441	76	Additional Indirect food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	114,870
A450	77	New use, Direct food use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	95,724
A451	78	Additional Direct food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	182,335
A500	79	New use, non-food. (4)(5)	12	31,910
A501	80	New use, non-food; 6 or more submitted in one application. (4)(5)	15	76,583

(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) 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) 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.

(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 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.

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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A530	81	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)	4	1,278
A531	82	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)	4	1,824
A532	83	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)	5	5,107
A540	84	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; up to 25 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	5	5,107
A541	85 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	7	8,500
A542	86 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)	10	15,000
A550	87	New end-use product; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm); non-FQPA product. (2)(3)(5)	9	13,226
A560	88	New manufacturing use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation. (2)(3)	6	12,596
A565	89 (new)	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)	12	18,234
A570	90	Label amendment requiring data review; up to 25 public health organisms. (3)(4)(5)(6)	4	3,831
A573	91 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	6	6,350
A574	92 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	9	11,000
A572	93	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)	9	13,226

(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 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(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.

(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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
A520	94	Experimental Use Permit application, non-food use. (2)	9	6,383
A521	95	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.	4	4,726
A522	96	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.	12	12,156
A537	97 (new)	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.	18	153,156
A538	98 (new)	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.	18	95,724
A539	99 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Nonfood use. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	15	92,163
A529	100	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; requires data review or risk assessment. (2)	9	11,429
A523	101	Review of protocol other than a public health efficacy study (i.e., Toxicology or Exposure Protocols).	9	12,156
A571	102	Science reassessment: Cancer risk, refined ecological risk, and/or endangered species; applicant-initiated.	18	95,724
A533	103 (new)	Exemption from the requirement of an Experimental Use Permit. (2)	4	2,482
A534	104 (new)	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	4	4,726
A535	105 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waiver or Data Bridging Argument; applicant-initiated.	6	2,409
A536	106 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Direct Food, Indirect Food, Nonfood use determination; applicant-initiated.	4	2,482

(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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B580	107	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(3)	20	51,053
B590	108	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	18	31,910
B600	109	New active ingredient; non-food use. (2)(3)	13	19,146
B610	110	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish a temporary tolerance or temporary tolerance exemption. (3)	10	12,764

''TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B611	111	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish permanent tolerance exemption. (3)	12	12,764
B612	112	New active ingredient; no change to a permanent tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	10	17,550
B613	113	New active ingredient; petition to convert a temporary tolerance or a temporary tolerance exemption to a permanent tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	11	17,550
B620	114	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; non-food use including crop destruct. (3)	7	6,383

(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 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 12. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B630	115	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(4)	13	12,764
B631	116	New food use; petition to amend an established tolerance. (3)(4)	12	12,764
B640	117	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(4)	19	19,146
B643	118	New Food use; petition to amend an established tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	10	12,764
B642	119	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2)(4)	12	31,910
B644	120	New use, no change to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	8	12,764
B650	121	New use; non-food. (3)(4)	7	6,383
B645	122 (new)	New food use; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to amend or add a tolerance exemption. (4)	12	12,764
B646	123 (new)	New use; non-food use including crop destruct; Experimental Use Permit application. (4)	7	6,383

(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) 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 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 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 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B652	124	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)	13	12,764
B660	125	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)	4	1,278
B670	126	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)	7	5,107
B671	127	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)	17	12,764
B672	128	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)	13	9,118
B673	129	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)	10	5,107
B674	130	New product MUP; Repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B675	131	New Product MUP; registered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only. (2)(3)	10	9,118

''TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B676	132	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)	13	9,118
B677	133	New end-use non-food animal product with submission of two or more target animal safety studies; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: • product chemistry and/or • acute toxicity and/or • public health pest efficacy and/or • animal safety studies and/or • child resistant packaging. (2)(3)	10	8,820

(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 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 14. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B621	134	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; no change to an established temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	7	5,107
B622	135	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; petition to amend an established or temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	11	12,764
B641	136	Amendment of an established tolerance or tolerance exemption.	13	12,764
B680	137	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)	5	5,107
B681	138	Amendment; unregistered source of active ingredient(s). Requires data submission. (2)(3)	7	6,079
B683	139	Label amendment; requires review/update of previous risk assessment(s) without data submission (e.g., labeling changes to REI, PPE, PHI). (2)(3)	6	5,107
B684	140	Amending non-food animal product that includes submission of target animal safety data; previously registered. (2)(3)	8	8,820
B685	141 (new)	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)	5	5,107

(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.

''TABLE 15. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — SCLP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B690	142	New active ingredient; food or non-food use. (2)(6)	7	2,554
B700	143	Experimental Use Permit application; new active ingredient or new use. (6)	7	1,278
B701	144	Extend or amend Experimental Use Permit. (6)	4	1,278
B710	145	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no change in an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. 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. (3)(6)	4	1,278
B720	146	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. (3)(6)	5	1,278
B721	147	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient. (3)(6)	7	2,676
B722	148	New use and/or amendment; petition to establish a tolerance or tolerance exemption. (4)(5)(6)	7	2,477
B730	149	Label amendment requiring data submission. (4)(6)	5	1,278

(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) 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(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.

(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 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.

(6) 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 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B614	150	Pre-application; Conditional Ruling on rationales for addressing a data requirement in lieu of data; applicant-initiated; applies to one rationale at a time.	3	2,530

''TABLE 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B615	151	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
B682	152	Protocol review; applicant initiated; excludes time for HSRB review.	3	2,432

(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

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B740	153	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 (12); 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct (12); 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)	6	95,724
B741	154 (new)	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)	12	159,538
B750	155	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)	9	127,630
B770	156	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)	15	191,444
B771	157	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)	10	127,630
B772	158	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; no petition since the established tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient is unaffected. (12)	3	12,764
B773	159	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; with petition to extend a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (12)	5	31,910
B780	160	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed. (12)	12	159,537
B790	161	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed; SAP review. (5)(12)	18	223,351
B800	162	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)	13	172,300
B810	163	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)	19	236,114
B820	164	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. (12)	15	204,208
B840	165	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. SAP review. (5)(12)	21	268,022
B851	166	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)	9	127,630
B870	167	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)	9	38,290

''TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
B880	168	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (6) (7) (12)	9	31,910
B881	169	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). SAP review. (5)(6)(7)(12)	15	95,724
B882	170 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption; SAP Review. (8)(12)	15	191,444
B883	171	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (8) (12)	9	127,630
B884	172	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (8)(12)	12	159,537
B885	173	Registration application; registered (3) PIP, seed increase; breeding stack of previously approved PIPs, same crop; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (9)(12)	6	31,910
B886	174 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. SAP Review. (8) (12)	18	223,351
B890	175	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to commercial registration; no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	63,816
B891	176	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to a commercial registration; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption already established for the active ingredient(s); SAP review. (5)(12)	15	127,630
B900	177	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. (10)(11)(12)	6	12,764
B901	178	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. (10) (11) (12)	12	76,578
B902	179	PIP Protocol review.	3	6,383
B903	180	Inert ingredient tolerance exemption; e.g., a marker such as NPT II; reviewed in BPPD.	6	63,816
B904	181	Import tolerance or tolerance exemption; processed commodities/food only (inert or active ingredient).	9	127,630
B905	182 (new)	SAP Review.	6	63,816
B906	183 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients.	3	31,907
B907	184 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption.	3	12,764
B908	185 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients or inert ingredients.	3	44,671

(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. Their 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. 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 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
I001	186	Approval of new food use inert ingredient. (2)(3)	13	27,000
I002	187	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; new data. (2)	11	7,500
I003	188	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; no new data. (2)	9	3,308
I004	189	Approval of new non-food use inert ingredient. (2)	6	11,025
I005	190	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; new data. (2)	6	5,513
I006	191	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; no new data. (2)	3	3,308
I007	192	Approval of substantially similar non-food use inert ingredients when original inert is compositionally similar with similar use pattern. (2)	4	1,654
I008	193	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, food use. (2)	5	3,749
I009	194	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, non-food use. (2)	4	3,087
I010	195	Petition to amend a single tolerance exemption descriptor, or single non-food use descriptor, to add ≤ 10 CASRNs; no new data. (2)	6	1,654
I011	196 (new)	Approval of new food use safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)(8)	24	597,683
I012	197 (new)	Approval of new non-food use safener. (2)(8)	21	415,241
I013	198 (new)	Approval of additional food use for previously approved safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)	15	62,975
I014	199 (new)	Approval of additional non-food use for previously approved safener. (2)	15	25,168
I015	200 (new)	Approval of new generic data for previously approved food use safener. (2)	24	269,728
I016	201 (new)	Approval of amendment(s) to tolerance and label for previously approved safener. (2)	13	55,776

(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.

(8) If a new safener is submitted in the same package as a new active ingredient, and that new active ingredient is determined to be reduced risk, then the safener would get the same reduced timeframe as the new active ingredient.

''TABLE 19. — EXTERNAL REVIEW AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	Registration Service Fee ($)
M001	202	Study protocol requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M002	203	Completed study requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M003	204	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. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	12	63,945
M004	205	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. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	18	63,945
M005	206	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. (6)(7)	9	22,050
M006	207	Request for up to 5 letters of certification (Gold Seal) for one actively registered product (excludes distributor products). (8)	1	277
M007	208	Request to extend Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(ii).	12	5,513
M008	209	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.	15	1,654
M009	210 (new)	Non-FIFRA Regulated Determination: Applicant initiated, per product.	4	2,363
M010	211 (new)	Conditional ruling on pre-application, product substantial similarity.	4	2,363
M011	212 (new)	Label amendment to add the DfE logo; requires data review; no other label changes. (9)	4	3,648

(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.
(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 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 not considered an Agency endorsement because the ingredients 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

(2) shall not revise or develop revisions to the rules described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Prior to October 1, 2021, the Administrator may propose, and after a notice and public comment period of not less than 90 days, promulgate revisions to the final rule described in subsection (a)(1)(A) addressing application exclusion zones under part 170 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, consistent with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136 et seq.).

(c) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the use of the designated representative, including the effect of that use on the availability of pesticide application and hazard information and worker health and safety; and

(2) not later than October 1, 2021, make publically available a report describing the study under paragraph (1), including any recommendations to prevent the misuse of pesticide application and hazard information, if that misuse is identified.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

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

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

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LIVES LOST TO GUN VIOLENCE IN AURORA, ILLINOIS

(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 unnecessary loss of life from gun violence. Eleven years ago, when I first took office, I inherited a community in mourning: 17 students were injured and 5 were killed in the Cole Hall mass shooting at Northern Illinois University. 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 shooting at 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 Northern Illinois University;

Clayton Parks, Trevor's supervisor and also a graduate of NIU;

Vicente Juarez, a hardworking family man who lived with his wife, daughter, and grandchildren on a quiet street in Oswego;

Russell Beyer, a mold operator and union committee chairman from Machinists 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 also think of the voting card that each of us carries on the House floor and the responsibility that you carry with that card, because this week we will finally be voting on legislation for effective and universal background checks for all gun sales. This is legislation supported by both Republicans and Democrats in Congress and supported by 97 percent of the American people.

So, our hearts go out to the family and friends of the victims left behind, and now I ask that we pause for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members will rise for a moment of silence.

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 neighbors, 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 Georgia and National 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 better place.

It is no understatement that Sheriff Yeager is a pillar of his community and a model public servant. It is a testament 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. Their lives were taken by an unspeakably horrible act, gun violence, which happens heartbreakingly frequently in this country.

As we consider legislation this week that is a critical first step towards preventing 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 Patriots fan.

We remember Clayton Parks, a Northern Illinois University grad whose wife, Abby, describes as an incredible father to their young son, Axel.

We remember Josh Pinkard. ''I want to shout from the rooftops about how amazing Josh was,'' his wife, Terra, wrote about a man who loved God, family, and college football.

We remember Trevor Wehner, a college student at Northern Illinois University, 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 grandfather to eight. His neighbors loved him for his efforts ridding the neighborhood of dandelions each summer.

We will never forget our five neighbors, and we will never forget the bravery of law enforcement and first responders who rushed toward the violence and undoubtedly saved countless lives.

May we honor them with our actions, and may our community come back stronger than ever before.

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—not just to honor our past, but to celebrate our present and prepare for our future.

□ 1945

CONDEMNING THE FEBRUARY 14, 2019, TERRORIST ATTACK IN INDIA

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to condemn the senseless, cowardly, and horrific terrorist attack in India, the deadliest in three decades.

On February 14 of this year, a suicide bomber rammed an explosive-packed vehicle into a convoy, claiming the lives of 40 Indian paramilitary forces and wounding at least 44 others. The Pakistan-based militant group, Jaish-e-Muhammad, later claimed responsibility for the attack.

We mourn the victims of this act of terror and call for continued action against any nation, to include Pakistan, that harbors terrorists and promotes violent extremism.

India has announced its plans to diplomatically isolate Pakistan and cancel its preferential trade status. We support these efforts, Mr. Speaker. This attack only further strengthens our U.S.-India counterterrorism cooperation.

To the nation of India, we mourn with you, we pray for you, and we stand in solidarity with you during this difficult time.

RARE DISEASE WEEK

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Rare Disease Week.

Around 350 million people, worldwide, suffer from a rare disease. That is more than the number of people who live in the United States, alone, and it is particularly alarming when we consider how few resources are available to those battling a rare disease.

In fact, of the 7,000 rare diseases in existence, half of them don't have a designated foundation or research support group, and nearly 90 percent lack an FDA-approved treatment.

As a member of the Rare Disease Congressional Caucus, I urge my colleagues to support measures that would increase funding for research and put our resources into the development and accessibility of lifesaving treatments. Treatments should not be as rare as the diseases they heal.

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. I am one. 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. Not a problem. 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.''

Jennifer, you are wrong. You have done more than anyone else ever could do.

Jennifer is the president of the Cinco Ranch FFA. Her sheep, Lou, won third place at the recent FFA livestock show.

Jennifer, you are awesome. As you go off to the great Aggie school, Texas A&M University, you must change a little bit. You have to say ''howdy,'' ''gig em,'' and ''whoop'' a lot.

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, 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 awry of school laws, regular actions 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 commitment 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 revise 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. Anyone 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—indeed, 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 need to be remodeled. Every facet 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, threatening 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 implausible mandates, 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 anything 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.

As the Senate 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 the Snake Rivers.

Nearly 70 percent of our power comes from hydropower, a clean, renewable, reliable, and affordable source of baseload 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, 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 because we use an all-of-the-above mix of energy sources, but largely 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.''

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 their 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 71 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 their van, powered by reliable, affordable gasoline; go to work, possibly at a mine or a local hospital; drive home again in that same gasoline-powered car; make dinner for their family, using their gas-powered stove; and then wake 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 to run on renewable sources, like solar or wind.

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, but at the same time, not shut out conventional, affordable energy sources on which millions rely.

Do not let the Green New Deal distract from what northern Minnesotans care about: expanding rural broadband for better internet access, bringing good paying jobs back to our communities, and protecting Social Security and Medicare.

With the projected cost of tens of trillions of dollars, the Green New Deal puts all of this at risk.

I will not risk the future of Medicare and Social Security. I will not risk the future of middle-class families.

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 Americans around 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 reliable sources of energy.

From minus 71 to hopefully a little warmer climate, 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 the backbone 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 projects 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, the longest period 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 that have much worse environmental standards. Global greenhouse gas emissions will increase 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.

□ 2015

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's magnitude will occur are 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 good 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 the 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 the plan described in this resolution (important to say so someone else can't claim this mantle).

This is a 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 supporting-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 job with a family-sustaining wage, family and medical leave, vacations, and retirement security

High-quality education, including higher education and trade schools

Clean air and water and access to nature

Healthy food

High-quality health care

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 get to 0 by 2030 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 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 are capable of if we have real leadership

This is massive investment 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 more than $6 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

Nearly every major Democratic Presidential contender say they back the Green New Deal including: Elizabeth Warren, Cory Booker, Kamala Harris, Jeff Merkeley, Julian Castro, Kirsten Gillibrand, Bernie Sanders, Tulsi Gabbard, and Jay Inslee.

45 House Reps and 330+ groups backed the original resolution for a select committee

Over 300 local and state politicians have called for a federal Green New Deal

New Resolution has 20 co-sponsors, about 30 groups (numbers will change by Thursday).

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. Anyone who has read the resolution sees that we spell this out through a plan that calls for eliminating greenhouse gas 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 energy economy as fast as possible. We set a goal to get to 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 ramp up renewable manufacturing and power production, retrofit every building in America, build the smart grid, overhaul transportation and agriculture, plant lots of trees and restore our ecosystem to get to net-zero.

Is nuclear a part of this?

A 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 decommission every nuclear plant within 10 years, but the plan is to transition off of nuclear and all fossil fuels as soon as possible. No one has put the full 10-year plan together yet, and if it is possible to get to 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 created a better, more affordable option. So we're not ruling a carbon tax out, but a carbon tax would be a tiny part of 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 this include cap and trade?

The Green New Deal is about creating the renewable energy economy through a massive investment in our society and economy. Cap and trade assumes the existing market will solve this problem for us, and that's simply not true. While cap and trade may be a tiny part of the larger Green New Deal plan to mobilize our economy, any cap and trade legislation will pale in comparison to the size of the mobilization and must recognize that existing legislation can incentivize companies to create toxic hotspots in frontline communities, so anything here must ensure that frontline communities are prioritized.

Does a GND ban all new fossil fuel infrastructure or nuclear power plants?

The Green New Deal makes new fossil fuel infrastructure or nuclear plants unnecessary. This is a massive mobilization of all our resources into renewable energies. It would simply not make sense to build new fossil fuel infrastructure because we will be creating a plan to reorient our entire economy to work off renewable energy. Simply banning fossil fuels and nuclear plants 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.

Are you for CCUS?

We believe the right way to capture carbon is to plant trees and restore our natural ecosystems. CCUS technology to date has not proven effective.

How will you pay for it?

The same way we paid for the New Deal, the 2008 bank bailout and extended quantitative 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 isn't how will 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? Why can't we just rely on regulations and taxes and the private sector to invest alone such as a carbon tax or a ban on fossil fuels?

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 aggregate value 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 response in the narrow 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 unproven research and technologies; the government, however, has the time horizon to be able to patiently make investments in new tech 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 spurred a boom in the private section 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 new things (like overhauling whole industries or retrofitting all buildings to be energy efficient). Starting to do new things requires some upfront investment. In the same way that a company that is trying to change how it does business may need to make big upfront capital investments today 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 that is trying to change how its economy works will need to make big investments today to jump-start and develop new projects and sectors to power the new economy.

Merely incentivizing the private sector doesn't work—e.g. the tax incentives and subsidies given to wind and solar projects have been a valuable spur to growth in the US renewables industry but, even with such investment-promotion subsidies, the present level of such projects is simply inadequate to transition to a fully greenhouse gas neutral economy as quickly as needed.

Once again, we're not saying that there isn't a role for private sector investments; we're just saying that the level of investment required will need every actor to pitch in and that the government is best placed to be the prime driver.

RESOLUTION SUMMARY

Created in consultation with multiple groups from environmental community, environmental justice community, and labor community

5 goals in 10 years:

Net-zero greenhouse gas emissions through a fair and just transition for all communities and workers

Create millions of high-wage jobs and ensure prosperity and economic security for all

Invest in infrastructure and industry to sustainably meet the challenges of the 21st century

Clean air and water, climate and community resiliency, healthy food, access to nature, and a sustainable environment for all

Promote justice and equity by stopping current, preventing future, and repairing historic oppression of frontline and vulnerable communities

National mobilization our economy through 14 infrastructure and industrial projects. Every project strives to remove greenhouse gas emissions and pollution from every sector of our economy:

Build infrastructure to create resiliency against climate change-related disasters

Repair and upgrade U.S. infrastructure. ASCE estimates this is $4.6 trillion at minimum.

Meet 100% of power demand through clean and renewable energy sources

Build energy-efficient, distributed smart grids and ensure affordable access to electricity

Upgrade or replace every building in US for state-of-the-art energy efficiency

Massively expand clean manufacturing (like solar panel factories, wind turbine factories, battery and storage manufacturing, energy efficient manufacturing components) and remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing

Work with farmers and ranchers to create a sustainable, pollution and greenhouse gas free, food system that ensures universal access to healthy food and expands independent family farming

Totally overhaul transportation by massively expanding electric vehicle manufacturing, build charging stations everywhere, build out high-speed rail at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary, create affordable public transit available to all, with goal to replace every combustion-engine vehicle

Mitigate long-term health effects of climate change and pollution

Remove greenhouse gases from our atmosphere and pollution through afforestation, preservation, and other methods of restoring our natural ecosystems

Restore all our damaged and threatened ecosystems

Clean up all the existing hazardous waste sites and abandoned sites

Identify new emission sources and create solutions to eliminate those emissions

Make the US the leader 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 clean 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

Guarantee a job with family-sustaining wages

Protect right of all workers to unionize and organize

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 unfair 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 other 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 CO_2 emissions by 862 million tons. Today, the U.S. is responsible for only 15 percent of global CO_2 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 a wage. It 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 is 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 only one way that you can implement such an outlandish and reckless idea, and that is to use the awesome, overreaching power of government to not just 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 muscles to mandate activities and forbid other actions in every American's life.

We can't afford this plan. 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 and drastically expands 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, allowing more 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 production 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 extreme disadvantage. This 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. It implements policies that will dramatically increase taxes, burdens, and energy bills for families.

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 toward 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 utilization, 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.

□ 2030

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 off. 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 Texas homes and businesses. It would take 8.4 million solar panels to replace that kind of energy. Even President Obama's Secretary of Energy said, ''It's just impractical.''

We are also home to the leading export energy port in the Nation. We have been a great part in the success of what we have seen as a nation of going from an energy-dependent nation to an energy-dominant nation. And what that new American energy dominance means, it means global stability and peace in the world as our allies are able to buy energy from us rather than from countries who don't have our best intentions in mind.

But as the world's need for energy grows, American companies are more likely to care about being good stewards of our creation compared with those from other energy-producing nations.

The United States cut carbon emissions by 14 percent since 2005 while global emissions rose 26 percent over the same period. Of all the G20 countries, we have the best record recently on carbon emissions and reductions.

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 over more than $200,000 were taxed at 100 percent for 10 years, it would still fall $58 trillion short. So you can just see that this does not work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES), a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

You know, those numbers are just shocking, as you related, in terms of how it would devastate the American economy and American families.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to add my voice in opposition to this so-called Green New Deal.

You know, this outrageous proposal would be a massive government takeover of every facet of our daily lives. From how we eat, to how we travel, this so-called Green New Deal calls to replace every building and car in America within 10 years. It would cost up to $93 trillion. That would cost every American household an extra $65,300 per year.

That might be crumbs in New York and California, but it is not in Kansas, where the average family income is $56,422.

If the crushing tax increase on every family isn't bad enough, the plan also calls for an eventual end to air travel.

As representative of the Air Capital of the World, clearly, this is alarming.

According to the Kansas Department of Transportation, aviation is responsible for 91,300 jobs in Kansas and has an economic impact on our state of $20.6 billion.

Grounding air travel would decimate jobs in Kansas, just as the entire Green New Deal would devastate the economy of our country.

The only thing this proposal accomplishes is exposing the priorities of politicians who are determined to increase taxes and expand government to impose their agenda on every family, farm, and business.

Kansans know how to protect our environment and quality of life without being told to do so by government officials in Washington, D.C., and I stand with them in opposing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman NEWHOUSE for leading this special order.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES). I appreciate very much him sharing his thoughts about the Green New Deal and the impacts it would have on our country—something that we just absolutely cannot afford. So I appreciate very much his time this evening, and I thank him.

Mr. Speaker, I recently read an article from Reuters titled ''Labor Unions fear Democrats' Green New Deal poses job threat.''

I didn't write that title. That is what they did. In it, a spokesman for a major union in this country speaks on the legislation's language, calling for a transition for union jobs. He says, ''We've heard words like 'just transition' before, but what does that really mean? Our Members are worried about putting food on the table.''

Another labor union, the Laborers' International Union of North America states, ''We will never settle for 'just transition' language as a solution to the job losses that will surely come from some of the policies in the resolution.''

Mr. Speaker, hardworking Americans across the country deserve to be heard. Unfortunately, as this article states, neither union was contacted for input before the legislation was released.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from California's First District (Mr. LAMALFA), my good friend and a fellow farmer.

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 67 coauthors on 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 that 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 with 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 America 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. The goal being greenhouse gas reduction, CO_2 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 CO_2 in that amount of time.

We are 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 to 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 CO_2 go up. And then creating jobs in our backyard 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, not 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, no emissions. 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 him sharing his thoughts—and 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 proposal. It seeks the complete 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 LARSEN 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. DEFAZIO, 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 every aspect 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.

□ 2045

This totals 21 times our current Federal budget of $4.4 trillion. That can only mean one thing for the American people: taxes, taxes, and more taxes.

This resolution is so lacking in detail, 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, underscoring 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 look forward to 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 debates on this important topic, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of 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,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

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. §1302(b), I request that this publication be 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 agencies. This landmark 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 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 terms and conditions of employment (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, grievance and disciplinary procedures, protection from discrimination in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave) of employees; and (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 presiding 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 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 legislative branch 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 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 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:

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 330 and H. Res. 630) that require all of its Members, Officers and employees, as well as interns, detailees, and fellows, to complete an anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training program. We are pleased that the CAA Reform Act includes these broader mandates for the congressional workforce at large. Under the new law, employing offices (other than the House of Representatives and the Senate) are also required to develop and implement a program to train and educate covered employees on the rights and protections provided under the CAA, including 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 and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate no later than 45 days after the beginning of each Congress, beginning with the 117th Congress. For the 116th Congress, this report is due 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)

The OCWR stands ready to assist 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.

Adopt All Notice-Posting Requirements that Exist Under the Federal Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Other Workplace Rights Laws Covered Under the CAA

The Board has long been concerned that employees who experience harassment or discrimination in the legislative branch may be deterred from taking action simply due to a lack of awareness of their rights under 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 remain informed about their rights regardless of their location, employee turnover, or other changes in the workplace. The notices also serve as a reminder to employers about their workplace responsibilities and the legal ramifications of violating the law. They are also a visible commitment by Congress to the workplace protections embodied in the CAA. The CAA Reform Act now requires that employing offices post and keep posted in conspicuous places on their premises the notices provided by the OCWR, which must contain information about employees' rights and the OCWR's Administrative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process, along with OCWR contact information. 2 U.S.C. §1362.

Name Change

As the Board advised Congress in 2014, changing the name of the office to ''Office of Congressional Workplace Rights'' would better reflect our mission, raise our public profile in connection with our mandate to educate the legislative branch, and make it easier for employees to identify us when they need assistance. Effective December 21, 2018, the Reform Act renamed the ''Office of Compliance'' as the ''Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.'' This name change notifies legislative branch employees that the Office is tasked with protecting their workplace rights through its programs of dispute resolution, education, and enforcement. As the Office embraces its new name, it remains 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 Detailees

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 all staff, including interns, fellows, and detailees working in any employing office in the legislative branch, regardless of how or whether they are paid. The CAA Reform Act amends section 201 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 Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—to apply the protections and remedies of those laws to current and former ''unpaid staff.'' ''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, and an individual participating in a fellowship program[.]'' These laws apply to unpaid staff ''in the same manner and to the same extent as such subsections apply with respect to a covered employee[.]'' 201(d), 2 U.S.C. §1311(d). The Reform Act thus ensures that unpaid interns, fellows, and detailees 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), and the Board expressed its support for proposals to amend the CAA to include the LOC within the definition of ''employing office,'' thereby extending CAA protections to LOC employees for most purposes. The 2018 omnibus spending bill amended the CAA to bring the LOC and its employees within the OCWR's (then OOC's) jurisdiction. That bill amended 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 to LOC employees a choice on how to pursue complaints of employment discrimination—allowing them to pursue a complaint either with the LOC's Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Programs or with the OCWR. The 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).

Changes 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 law offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace, OCWR Executive Director Susan Tsui Grundmann conveyed the Board of Directors' considered recommendations 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 with the OCWR pursuant to 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 the matter 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 statute, 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 of that decision would 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 often provide covered employees with their first 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 opportunity 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. Rather, 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 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. Mediation can save the parties from burdensome litigation, which can be expensive, time consuming, and a drain on resources and workplace productivity. Mediation also gives the 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 workplace 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 amendments 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 yet been implemented. (see note 1.) We continue to believe that the adoption of these recommendations, discussed below, will best promote a model 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 CHILDS WALLACE,
Chair, Board of Directors.
BARBARA L. CAMENS.
ALAN V. FRIEDMAN.
ROBERTA L. HOLZWARTH.
SUSAN S. ROBFOGEL.

Recommendations for the 116th Congress

Apply the Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act of 2015 to the Legislative Branch (Public Law 114–75)

The Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act, enacted in 2015, affords wounded warriors the flexibility to receive medical care as they transition to serving the nation in a new capacity. Specifically, new federal employees who are also disabled veterans with a 30% or more disability may receive 104 hours of ''wounded warrior leave'' during their first year in the federal workforce so that they may seek medical treatment for their service-connected disabilities without being forced to take unpaid leave or forego their medical appointments. The Act was passed as a way to show gratitude and deep appreciation for the hardship and sacrifices of veterans and, in particular wounded warriors, in service to the United States. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch offer Wounded Warrior Federal Leave, the Board reiterates the recommendation made in its 2016 Section 102(b) Report to extend the benefits of that Act to the legislative branch with enforcement and implementation under the provisions of the CAA.

Approve the Board's Pending Regulations

The CAA directs the OCWR to promulgate regulations implementing the CAA to keep Congress current and accountable to the workplace laws that apply to private and public employers. The Board is required to amend its regulations to achieve parity, unless there is good cause shown to deviate from the private sector or executive branch regulations. The Board recommended in its 2016 section 102(b) Report to the 115th Congress that it approve its pending regulations that would implement the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), ADA titles II and III, and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act (USERRA) in the legislative branch. The Board-adopted regulations ensure that same-sex spouses are recognized under the FMLA, in accordance with Supreme Court rulings, and further extend important protections for military caregivers and service members. The Board's adopted ADA regulations will avoid costly construction and contracting errors that result when there is uncertainty or ambiguity regarding what standards apply, and will improve access to Capitol Hill for visitors and employees with disabilities. The Board of Directors also transmitted to Congress its adopted USERRA regulations on December 3, 2008 and identified ''good cause'' to modify the executive branch regulations to implement more effectively the rights and protections for veterans as applied to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the other employing offices. These rules are necessary to fulfill the commitments set forth 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 the CAA, those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor, 2 U.S.C. §1312(d)(2), except where good cause was shown that a modification would 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 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 (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 existed prior to service and was aggravated in the line of duty on active duty, and extend FMLA military caregiver leave to family members of certain veterans with serious injuries or illnesses. As noted, the FMLA amendments providing additional rights and protections for service members and their families were enacted into law 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 amended FMLA provisions do not ''describe the manner in which the provision of the bill [relating to terms and conditions of employment]... 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 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 apply in 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, the Board makes clear through these regulations that the rights and protections for military servicemembers apply in the legislative branch, and that protections under the CAA are in line with existing public and private sector protections under the FMLA. The Board-adopted FMLA regulations implement leave protections of significant importance to legislative branch employees and employing offices. Accordingly, the Board recommends that Congress approve the Board's adopted FMLA regulations. Second, these regulations set forth the revised definition of ''spouse'' under the FMLA in light of the DOL's February 25, 2015 Final Rule on the definition of spouse, and the United States Supreme Court's decision in Obergefell v. Hodges (see note 4), which requires a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state.

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 its adopted regulations implementing titles II and III of the ADA to Capitol Hill and the district offices. First, the Board's ADA regulations clarify which title II and title III regulations apply to the legislative branch. This knowledge will undoubtedly save taxpayers money by ensuring pre-construction review of construction projects for ADA compliance—rather than providing for only post-construction inspections and costly redos when the access is not adequate. Second, under the regulations adopted by the Board, all leased spaces must meet some basic accessibility requirements that apply to all federal facilities that are leased or constructed. In this way, Congress will remain a model for ADA compliance and public access. Under the authority of the landmark CAA, the OOC has made significant progress towards making Capitol Hill more accessible for persons with disabilities. Our efforts to improve access to the buildings and facilities on the campus are consistent with the priority guidance in the Board's ADA regulations, which it adopted in February 2016. Congressional approval of those regulations would reaffirm its commitment to provide barrier-free 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 care insurance and job 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 veterans' health, welfare, access, and employment status. Approving the USERRA regulations will assist service members in attaining and retaining a job despite the call to duty. The regulations commit to anti-discrimination, anti-retaliation, and 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 below the percentage in the executive branch, or even in the private sector, which is not under a mandate to provide a preference in hiring to veterans. Indeed, many reports have put the level of veteran employees on congressional staffs at 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 legislative work. In addition, the Wounded Warrior Fellowship Program exists in the House Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) where Members can hire veteran fellows for 2-year terms. In 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 protect against discrimination based on military service. Congress can lead by example by applying the USERRA law encompassed in the CAA.

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 1995 with nearly unanimous, bi-cameral, and bipartisan support—but would further help legislative branch

managers effectively implement the laws' protections and benefits on behalf of the workforce.

Protect Employees and Applicants 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 with respect to employment against, a person because that person is or has been a debtor under the bankruptcy statutes. This provision currently does not apply to the legislative branch. Reiterating the recommendations made in the 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2006 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 Discharge of Employees Who Are or Have Been Subject to Garnishment (15 U.S.C. § 1674(A))

Section 1674(a) of title 15 of the U.S. Code prohibits discharge of any employee because his or her earnings ''have been subject to garnishment for any one indebtedness.'' This section is limited to private employers, so it currently has no application to the legislative branch. For the reasons set forth in the 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2006 Section 102(b) Reports, the Board recommends that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to employing offices within the legislative branch.

Provide 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. The OCWR has received a number of inquiries from congressional employees concerned about the lack of whistleblower protections. The absence of specific statutory protection such as that provided under 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8) chills the disclosure of such information. Granting whistleblower protection could significantly improve the rights and protections afforded to legislative branch employees in an area fundamental to the institutional integrity of the legislative branch by uncovering waste and fraud and safeguarding the budget.

The Board has recommended in its previous Section 102(b) reports and continues to recommend that Congress provide whistleblower reprisal protections to legislative branch employees comparable to that provided to executive branch employees under 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8), and 5 U.S.C. § 1221. Additionally, as discussed below, the Board recommends that the Office also be granted investigatory and prosecutorial authority over whistleblower reprisal complaints, by incorporating into the CAA the authority granted to the Office of Special Counsel, which investigates and prosecutes claims of whistleblower reprisal in the executive branch.

Provide Subpoena Authority to Obtain Information Needed for Safety & Health Investigations and Require Records To Be Kept of Workplace Injuries and Illnesses

The CAA applies the broad protections of section 5 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHAct) to the congressional workplace. The OCWR enforces the OSHAct in the legislative branch much in the same way the Secretary of Labor enforces the OSHAct in the private sector. Under the CAA, 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 employing offices with technical assistance to comply with the OSHAct's requirements. But Congress and its agencies are still exempt from critical OSHAct requirements imposed upon American businesses. Under the CAA, employing offices in the legislative branch are not subject to investigative subpoenas to aid in inspections as are private sector employers under the OSHAct. Similarly, 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 employing offices be subject to the investigatory subpoena provisions contained in OSHAct § 8(b) and that legislative branch employing offices 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, including title VII. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch keep personnel 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 also clearly intended to further 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 the OCRW General Counsel should be granted such investigatory and prosecutorial authority. Accordingly, this recommendation is not discussed further below.

2. Pub. L. 110–181, Div. A, Title V § 585(a)(2), (3)(A)–(D) and Pub. L. 111–84, Div. A, Title V § 565(a)(1)(B) and (4).

3. U.S.C. § 1302(3); House Committee on Armed Services, H. Rpt. 110–146 (May 11, 2007), H. Rpt. 111–166 (June 18, 2009)

4. Obergefell v. Hodges, 135 S. Ct. 2584 (2015).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

223. A letter from the Acting Architect, Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol for the period of July 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1868a(a); Public Law 113-76, div. I, title I, Sec. 1301(a); (128 Stat. 428) (H. Doc. No. 116—14); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

224. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting biennial report on recommendations for improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act, pursuant to section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 received February 25, 2019, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1302; jointly to the Committees 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 144. 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 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 (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 severally 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. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. KATKO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COOK, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WILD, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KIM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. REED, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DEAN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COLE, Mr. HURD of Texas, 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.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

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 Mr. TURNER):

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 30-day period preceding release from a public institution; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 1330. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the site known as ''Amache'' in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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. 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, the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, Education and Labor, Rules, the Budget, Armed Services, and 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 Ms. BARRAGÁN:

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, schools, and other buildings that require special protection, and for other purposes; 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 of law 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. DELAURO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1337. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take certain actions 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. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CLINE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BACON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. ESTES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUDD, 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. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BURCHETT, 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. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 1342. A bill to reauthorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove an institutional bias by making permanent the protection for recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

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. CRIST, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend titles XVI, XVIII, 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. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. HASTINGS):

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. LAHOOD (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce tip 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. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 1350. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Green Alert plans throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. COLE, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to secure urgent resources vital to Indian victims of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

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-COLÓN 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 amounts made 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-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

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. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, 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 to provide that 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. 143. 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. GALLEGO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LOFGREN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, 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. JOHNSON 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. CISNEROS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LIPINSKI, 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 the month of September 2019 as ''PCOS Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Res. 147. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 3, 2019, as World Hearing Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1327.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1328.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

Provides Congress with the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises'' in order to ''provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1329.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 1330.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 states, ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .'' This clause allows Congress to create national parks and establish studies to determine the feasibility of designating a study area as a unit of the National Parks System.

By Mrs. CRAIG:

H.R. 1331.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1332.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1333.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1334.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1335.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1336.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1337.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 1338.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1339.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 1340.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 1341.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution [Page H4570]

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1342.

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 Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1343.

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. 1345.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 1346.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1347.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H.R. 1348.

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

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 1349.

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

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 1350.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1351.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 1352.

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

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

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 1353.

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

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

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 1354.

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

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

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1355.

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

Article I, Section 8: 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 of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 49.

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

Article V of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 36: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 40: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 73: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 132: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 141: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 155: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 180: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 197: Ms. PORTER and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 203: Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 211: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 276: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 281: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 291: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. CASE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 299: Mr. HIMES, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 310: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 330: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 369: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 372: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 384: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 385: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 393: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 425: Mr. BABIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 435: Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 481: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 485: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 501: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 510: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 530: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 539: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 540: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 541: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 553: Mr. COHEN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 555: Mr. KEATING, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAMB, and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 569: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 583: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FLORES, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 587: Mr. TONKO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 597: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 601: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 603: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 611: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 613: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PETERSON, and Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 616: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 643: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 647: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 649: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 652: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 656: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 661: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 666: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 668: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 669: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 677: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 678: Ms. HILL of California and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 679: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 688: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 693: Mr. KIM, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROUDA, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 714: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 724: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. LAMB, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MOORE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 728: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 741: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 759: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 768: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 770: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 804: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 806: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 808: Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 824: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 830: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 833: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 850: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 864: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CRIST, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 871: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 872: Ms. DEAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 877: Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 886: Mr. KIM and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 888: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 890: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 891: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 897: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 900: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 915: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 921: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 925: Mr. COOK, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 935: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 945: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 949: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 956: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 961: Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COOPER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 962: Mr. POSEY and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 978: Mr. SIRES, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 996: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1002: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. WILD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1004: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1011: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1012: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1013: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 1019: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CROW, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1029: Ms. HILL of California.
H.R. 1030: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1035: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1042: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1043: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 1044: Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1046: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CLARKe of New York, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1049: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1051: Mr. CLAY and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 1052: Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 1057: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 1058: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1073: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1078: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1094: Mr. SIRES, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1108: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1109: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1126: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1129: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1137: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COX of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1140: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1146: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1155: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1156: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1168: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 1170: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1171: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1186: Mr. BEYER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 1190: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1197: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1201: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. HECK, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1212: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1216: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 1225: Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1227: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1229: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1232: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1234: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1235: Mr. YOUNG, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 1241: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1245: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1246: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1247: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1254: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1255: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1265: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 1277: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1293: Ms. HILL of California.
H.R. 1305: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1320: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. YOHO.
H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.J. Res. 44: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. KIM.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. WOODALL.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TONKO.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. TRONE and Mr. BUCSHON.
H. Con. Res. 12: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Con. Res. 13: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Con. Res. 15: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. REED, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BARR, Mr. BYRNE, and Ms. CHENEY.
H. Res. 33: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KIM, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. BASS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CROW.
H. Res. 40: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 54: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H. Res. 58: Mr. CLEAVER.
H. Res. 60: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. ZELDIN.
H. Res. 72: Mr. GOSAR.
H. Res. 96: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Res. 107: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 109: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BASS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 110: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 114: Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 138: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. NORTON.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2019 *No. 34*

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

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 FAREWELL 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 with 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 passions agitated in every direction were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy 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 a preservation and so prudent a use 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. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts—of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully 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 seamen of the *North*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; 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* derives from 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 tenure 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, proportionably 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 afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient 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, that your 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 speculation 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 on this head. 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 Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a Constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, 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 faction; 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 likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning, 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 unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance 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 institutions, that experience is the surest 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 extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable; liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. 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.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive 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 mind. It exists under different 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 dissension, 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 some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) 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 public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are 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 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 a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be by force of public opinion to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the

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 that love of power and proneness 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 firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

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 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 disbursements to repel it; 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 more or less 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 in making it, 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; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

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 indulges 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 more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in 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 practice the arts of seduction, to mislead 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.

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 baneful foes of republican government. 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 and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

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 stop.

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 it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary 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; when we may take such an attitude 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, humor, 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 the maxim no less applicable 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 a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

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 must pay with a portion 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 reproached with ingratitude 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 control the usual current of the 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 recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your 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 22d 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, uninfluenced 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, had a right to take—and 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, perseverence, 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 unconscious 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 fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object 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 the 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 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 to keep their communities safe. It may be a difficult road to recovery, but Kentuckians are already pitching 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.

Eric 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 need 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 of 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—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.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The 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: ''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.''

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 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 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 relationship with other countries, including those south of our border.

a. 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.

b. Jeremy B. Bash served as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Department of Defense from 2011 to 2013, and as Chief of Staff of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2009 to 2011.

c. 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 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 2015 to 2017. He previously served as Deputy National Security Advisor to the President from 2013 to 2015.

f. John 0. 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 2008. 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 2011 to 2014. 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.

i. Johnnie Carson served as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2009 to 2013. He previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to Kenya from 1999 to 2003, to Zimbabwe from 1995 to 1997, and to Uganda from 1991 to 1994.

j. James Clapper served as U.S. Director of National Intelligence from 2010 to 2017.

k. David S. Cohen served as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence from 2011 to 2015 and as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2015 to 2017.

l. Eliot A. Cohen served as Counselor of the U.S. Department of State from 2007 to 2009.

m. Ryan Crocker served as U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan from 2011 to 2012, as U.S. Ambassador to Iraq from 2007 to 2009, as U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan from 2004 to 2007, as U.S. Ambassador to Syria from 1998 to 2001, as U.S. Ambassador to Kuwait from 1994 to 1997, and U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon from 1990 to 1993.

n. Thomas Donilon served as National Security Advisor to the President from 2010 to 2013.

o. Jen Easterly served as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Counterterrorism from 2013 to 2016.

p. Nancy Ely-Raphel served as Senior Adviser 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.

q. Daniel P. Erikson served as Special Advisor 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.

r. 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.

s. Daniel F. Feldman served as Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan at the U.S. Department of State from 2014 to 2015.

t. 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 2016 to 2017.

u. Jendayi Frazer served as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2005 to 2009. She served as U.S. Ambassador to South Africa from 2004 to 2005.

v. Suzy George served as Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff of the National Security Council from 2014 to 2017.

w. 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.

x. 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.

y. Avril D. Haines served as Deputy National Security Advisor to the President from 2015 to 2017. From 2013 to 2015, she served as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

z. Luke Hartig served as Senior Director for Counterterrorism at the National Security Council from 2014 to 2016.

aa. Heather A. Higginbottom served as Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources from 2013 to 2017.

bb. Roberta Jacobson served as U.S. Ambassador to Mexico from 2016 to 2018. She previously served as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs from 2011 to 2016.

cc. Gil Kerlikowske served as Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection from2014 to 2017. He previously served as Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy from 2009 to 2014.

dd. John F. Kerry served as Secretary of State from 2013 to 2017.

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 of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2000 to 2004 and as Acting Director in 2004. His duties included briefing President-elect Bill Clinton and President George W. Bush.

gg. Lisa O. Monaco served as Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism and Deputy National Security Advisor from 2013 to 2017. Previously, she served as Assistant Attorney General for National Security from 2011 to 2013.

hh. Janet Napolitano served as Secretary of Homeland Security from 2009 to 2013. She served as the Governor of Arizona from 2003 to 2009.

ii. James D. Nealon served as Assistant Secretary for International Engagement at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security from 2017 to 2018. He served as U.S. Ambassador to Honduras from 2014 to 2017.

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 1989 to 2001, 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 E. 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, to Pakistan from 2007 to 2010, to Colombia from 2000 to 2003, and to El Salvador from 1997 to 2000.

nn. Thomas R. Pickering served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 1997 to 2000. He served as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1989 to 1992.

oo. Amy Pope served as Deputy Homeland Security Advisor and Deputy Assistant to the President from 2015 to 2017.

pp. 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.

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 2006 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. Susan E. Rice served as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 2009 to 2013 and as National Security Advisor to the President from 2013 to 2017.

vv. Anne C. Richard served as Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration from 2012 to 2017.

ww. 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 issues at the National Security Council, ultimately serving as Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Senior Director for Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs.

xx. Andrew J. Shapiro served as Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs from 2009 to 2013.

yy. Wendy R. Sherman served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2011 to 2015.

zz. 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.

aaa. 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.

bbb. 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.

ccc. 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.

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 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.

2. 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 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 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 here 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) by reprogramming 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.* At the outset, there is no evidence of a sudden or emergency increase in the number of people seeking to cross the southern border. According to the administration's own data, the numbers of apprehensions and undetected illegal border crossings at the southern border are near forty-year lows. Although there was a modest increase in apprehensions in 2018, that figure is in keeping with the number of apprehensions only two years earlier, and the overall trend indicates a dramatic decline over the last fifteen years in particular. The administration also estimates that ''undetected unlawful entries'' at the southern border ''fell from approximately 851,000 to nearly 62,000'' between fiscal years 2006 to 2016, the most recent years for which data are available. The United States currently hosts what is estimated to be the smallest number of undocumented immigrants since 2004. And in fact, in recent years, the majority of currently undocumented immigrants entered the United States legally, but overstayed their visas, a problem that will not be addressed by the declaration of an emergency along the southern border.

4. *There is no documented terrorist or national security emergency at the southern border.* There is no reason to believe that there is a terrorist or national security emergency at the southern border that could justify the President's proclamation.

a. This administration's own most recent Country Report on Terrorism, released only five months ago, found that ''there was no credible evidence indicating that international terrorist groups have established bases in Mexico, worked with Mexican drug 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 twelve years 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 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. The overwhelming majority of individuals on terrorism watchlists who were intercepted by U.S. Customs and Border Patrol were attempting to travel to the United States by air; of the individuals on the 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 attempted to enter by land, only a small fraction do so at the southern border. Between October 2017 and March 2018, forty-one foreign immigrants on the terrorist watchlist were intercepted at the northern border. Only six such immigrants were intercepted at the southern border.

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 or violent behavior. According to a Cato Institute analysis of criminological data, undocumented immigrants are 44 percent *less likely* to be incarcerated nationwide than are native-born citizens. And in Texas, undocumented immigrants were found to have a first-time conviction rate 32 percent below that of native-born Americans; the conviction rates of unauthorized immigrants for violent crimes such as homicide and sex offenses were also below those of native-born 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 rates in the country's 30 largest cities have decreased on average by 2.7 percent in 2018 alone, further undermining any suggestion that recent crime trends currently warrant the declaration of a national emergency.

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. But there is no evidence of any such sudden crisis at the southern border that necessitates a reprogramming of appropriations to build a border wall.

a. The overwhelming majority of opioids that enter the United States across a land border are carried through legal ports of entry in personal or commercial vehicles, not smuggled through unauthorized border crossings. A border wall would not stop these drugs from entering the United States. Nor would a wall stop drugs from entering via other routes, including smuggling tunnels, which circumvent such 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).

b. Likewise, illegal crossings at the southern border are not the principal source of human trafficking victims. About two-thirds of human trafficking victims served by nonprofit organizations that receive funding from the relevant Department of Justice office are U.S. citizens, and even among noncitizens, most trafficking victims usually arrive in the country on valid 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.

7. *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 deliberate policies towards migrants. 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 ease the suffering of these people.

8. *Redirecting funds for the claimed ''national emergency'' will undermine U.S. national security and foreign policy interests.* In the face of a nonexistent threat, redirecting funds for the construction of a wall along the southern border will *undermine* national security by needlessly pulling resources from Department of Defense programs that are responsible for keeping our troops and our country safe and running effectively.

a. Repurposing funds from the defense construction budget will drain money from critical defense infrastructure projects, possibly including improvement of military hospitals, construction of roads, and renovation of on-base housing. And the proclamation will likely continue to divert those armed forces already deployed at the southern border from their usual training activities or missions, affecting troop readiness.

b. In addition, 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 a range of Western Hemisphere concerns. These actions are placing friendly governments to the south under impossible pressures and driving partners away. They have especially strained our diplomatic relationship with Mexico, a relationship that is vital to regional efforts ranging from critical intelligence and law enforcement partnerships to cooperative efforts 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.

c. Finally, by declaring a national emergency for domestic political reasons with no compelling reason or justification from his senior intelligence and law enforcement officials, the President has further eroded his credibility with foreign leaders, both friend and foe. Should a genuine foreign crisis erupt, this lack of credibility will materially weaken this administration's ability to marshal allies to support the United States, and will embolden adversaries to oppose us.

9. *The situation at the border does not require the use of the armed forces, and a wall is unnecessary to support the 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,'' and that a wall is ''necessary to support such use'' of the armed forces. These claims are implausible.

a. Historically, our country has deployed National Guard troops at the border solely to assist the Border Patrol when there was an extremely high number of apprehensions, together with a particularly low 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.

b. 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.

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 capabilities that we are providing [at the southern border] are combat capabilities. It's not a war zone along the border.'' Finally, it is implausible that hundreds of miles of wall across the southern border are somehow necessary to support the use of armed forces. We are aware of no military- or security-related rationale that could remotely justify such an endeavor.

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 Presidential Proclamation, 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 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 claims of an emergency. And it is reported that the President made the decision to circumvent the appropriations 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,

*Signed/**

Madeleine K. Albright, Jeremy B. Bash, John B. Bellinger III, Daniel Benjamin, Antony Blinken, John O. Brennan, R. Nicholas Burns, William J. Burns, Johnnie Carson, James Clapper.

David S. Cohen, Eliot A. Cohen, Ryan Crocker, Thomas Donilon, Jen Easterly, Nancy Ely-Raphel, Daniel P. Erikson, John D. Feeley, Daniel F. Feldman, Jonathan Finer.

Jendayi Frazer, Suzy George, Phil Gordon, Chuck Hagel, Avril D. Haines, Luke Hartig, Heather A. Higginbottom, 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. Pickering.

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, Strobe Talbott, Linda Thomas-Greenfield, 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 going to let the President, any 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 project will the President cancel 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 Democrats 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, observed, 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 supporters 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 should 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 our 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 Peninsula. Failing that, the Congress must continue to pressure a regime that permits gross humanitarian abuses and remains one of the most repressive governments on the globe.

We cannot tolerate the President making concessions without, in exchange, 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 acceptance 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.

Unsurprisingly, the results of that meeting were disappointing. The President claimed, bizarrely and wildly, that North Korea is ''no longer a nuclear threat'' right after the meeting, while the U.S. intelligence community has continually testified before Congress 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 and after, 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 China's rapacious 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 instincts 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, whether by interfering in the U.S. criminal charges brought against Huawei or otherwise decreasing our leverage, until and unless China makes meaningful, enforceable, and verifiable agreements to end its theft of American intellectual property and other trade abuses.

Hopefully, that is where the negotiations 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, nothing—to do with protecting children.

Last Friday, the administration announced it was imposing a gag rule on U.S. reproductive healthcare providers and trying to restrict access to healthcare clinics that provide reproductive care. So this vote doesn't occur in a vacuum. It is part of a pattern of actions taken by President Trump and congressional Republicans to limit, deny, or circumscribe a woman's right to healthcare.

I urge the American people to do their own research, read the bill, and see what it says. Most of you will agree with it. Pay attention to the facts and not the false rhetoric. This bill is Washington politics at its worst. I will vote no.

VICTIMS OF 9/11 COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally—and this time it is finally, I say to my good friend from Nebraska—I turn the attention of my colleagues to a harrowing fact: We are vastly approaching the point where more people will have died from exposure to toxic chemicals on 9/11 than were killed on 9/11 itself. These are the first responders, firefighters, police, and FBI agents who rushed to the towers that fateful day, ran into the fire, smoke, and twisted steel, risking their lives and, later, we learned, risking their health to get people out. These are the union members and construction workers who worked at the pile, breathing in a toxic blend of ash and dust in the days and weeks and months that followed. These are the people, the innocents, who lived downtown when the United States was attacked in the most dastardly attack on American soil.

Right now we have a problem. While these folks are heroes and, sadly, many are suffering—because of the alarming number who are suffering from 9/11-related illnesses, the victim compensation fund is running out of money earlier than expected. The Justice Department recently announced that it might have to cut compensation awards between 50 and 70 percent.

So today I was proud to join Senators GILLIBRAND and GARDNER, as well as a group of our colleagues in the House, to introduce legislation to fix the shortfall of funding and put 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 help us pass this bill and give some hope to the thousands who were brave on 9/11 and who are suffering now.

I yield the floor.

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 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. 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. SASSE. Madam President, I just listened to the senior Senator from New York—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 find that all of these terrible things are 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 blunt. I recognize that, and it is too blunt for many people in this body, but, frankly, that is 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. We have seen in our national discourse 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 trying to right this obvious wrong. The bill's terms are simple: A child born alive during a botched abortion would be given the same level of care that would be provided to any other baby born at that same gestational age. That is it.

This bill isn't about abortion. I am 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 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, and our laws should treat 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.'' BERNIE SANDERS was right.

Now is the chance, 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 or sound-bites? Or do people 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?

Last month, before the news of his hideous yearbook broke, Governor Northam made clear that 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 the 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 and their allies feel 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 what their lobbying the last week has 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 some lives are less valuable than others. 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 we should be able to quietly rid ourselves of little people who were ''inconvenient'' or supposedly ''unwanted.''

They are not unwanted. There are lots of people in every single State 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 under the most horrible circumstances, 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 ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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.

For 13 years, I have stood 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.

While these innovators hail from different backgrounds and have each mastered a different craft, they share one thing in common, and that is a commitment to their communities and to improving the lives of others in groundbreaking ways.

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. I hope 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 touring as a member of dance revues for Cab Calloway, Pearl Bailey, and Sammy Davis, Jr.

After excelling in her own right, she decided she wanted to give opportunity to others. 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 1970. 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 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 social, civic, and business events, and he successfully built an international marketing and distributing business.

With the goal of ending the opportunity gap for people of 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 greatest 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 copresident 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 Philanthropy 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.

S. 311

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

care. 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 leading up to the vote today, critics across the aisle have mounted a campaign of misinformation to try to knock this bill off course. To be clear, this legislation does not set any limits on the rights of one to obtain an abortion or abortion procedures or methods. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act would ensure that if newborns survive abortions, then they would receive the same care and the same attention to their health as would any other newborn. Newborn children should never be treated without basic human rights or the full protection of our laws because they are not wanted, especially when reports have estimated that nearly 2 million couples in the United States are currently waiting 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 equality for 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 have the chance right now to build upon that 2002 consensus that those who survive abortions are, in fact, people and to clarify that they deserve medical care. We can come together today to support this sound policy once more. We can clarify, in light of the extremism we have seen displayed recently, that newborn abortion survivors deserve medical care.

I thank my fellow Nebraskan for his good work on this bill, and I will be voting to affirm that children deserve protection at every stage of life.

I ask all of my colleagues in the Senate to support this measure and to vote in favor of this important bill that is before us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I rise to join Senator MURRAY and my colleagues in standing up for doctors and patients in my home State of Minnesota and across the country.

S. 311 puts Congress in the middle of the important medical decisions that patients and doctors should make together without having political interference. It would compel physicians to provide unnecessary medical care. It would override physicians' professional judgments about what is best for their patients, and it would put physicians in the position of facing criminal penalties if their judgments about what is best for their patients are contrary to what is described in this bill.

Colleagues, let me be clear. For women, this is a healthcare issue, not a political issue, and this bill, I fear, interferes with the doctor-patient relationship, which should worry us all. We can all agree that people deserve the best medical care based on their individual needs and their doctors' best medical advice. This is how our medical system is supposed to work—physicians and patients making decisions together that are based on patients' individual needs.

Everybody is different. For example, any oncologist will tell you that each cancer patient's treatment is different. Treatment plans depend on the type of cancer and how advanced the cancer is. Decisions about cancer treatments also depend on each person's age and lifestyle and individual circumstances. The same is true when it comes to pregnancy. Any obstetrician will tell you that every pregnancy is different and that when complications arise, they can completely change the course of treatment. In that moment, women and their families and their doctors are the only ones who are able to make decisions about what is best for a woman and her pregnancy.

Think about what this means in real life. In August of 2016, Tippy, who is from Minnesota and has agreed for me to share her story, was pregnant and, with her husband, went to their 20-week ultrasound appointment. They were excited because they thought they were about to find out the gender of their new baby, and they had already bought decorations for the gender reveal party. Instead, Tippy and her husband got devastating news from that ultrasound. Their baby, a boy, had stopped developing properly and would not survive. They would never get to meet him and never get to hold him. The ultrasound revealed not only the tragic news about this much wanted child but also showed a dangerous condition that threatened Tippy's own health. Tippy's placenta was enlarged, and to continue her pregnancy would risk the health of her reproductive system and her ability to have future children of her own.

Tippy, with her family and her doctor, made the difficult decision to have an abortion in order to save her reproductive system. Because she was able to make that medical decision, she was able to have another baby a year later. Tippy and her husband are today the proud parents of an 18-month-old child. When Tippy and her husband made their decision, it was based on guidance from her doctor and what was right for them and the family they hoped to have in the future.

They didn't need politicians to be looking over their shoulders in the doctor's office and telling them what to do. None of us in this body should be in the business of interfering in that doctor-patient relationship. We don't tell oncologists how to treat their patients; we don't tell emergency room doctors how to save lives; and we shouldn't tell women's doctors how to take care of their patients.

Colleagues, that is what this bill does. It would give politicians in this room the power to make medical decisions for women and their families. This bill intimidates providers and forces physicians to provide inappropriate medical treatment even when it is not in the best interests of their patients or their families.

Colleagues, we should treat women with respect. Decisions about women's healthcare aren't different from decisions about men's healthcare, so why are we treating women differently? This legislation, if it were to become law, would put doctors in an untenable position: Do they follow the law or do they follow their code of professional ethics?

Colleagues, let's get out of the business of dictating medical care for women. Let's continue to trust women and their doctors. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, this evening, as we debate this very important bill, I am hearing two different strategies, two different discussions, about what is actually on the floor in front of us. You see, my colleagues across the aisle are debating a bill that is not in front of us. They are talking about healthcare for women, which is abortion. That is what they are talking about.

This bill does not address abortion. It does not address women's healthcare issues. What this bill does is address the healthcare of a baby who is born alive after a botched abortion. We are not talking about abortion, folks. We are talking about the life of a child who is born. So, while my colleagues across the aisle are saying this is about abortion, that this is about a mother's healthcare, that is absolutely incorrect. We are talking about a human life.

In recent weeks, we have witnessed the ugly truth about the far-reaching grasp of the abortion industry and its ever-increasingly radicalized political agenda. Some politicians have not only defended aborting a child while a woman is in labor but have gone so far as to support the termination of a child after his birth. This assault on human dignity cannot stand. We can and must do better, and we can as a nation do better to defend and uphold the basic values of compassion and decency that define our very society.

I thank the junior Senator from Nebraska for offering this commonsense legislation that addresses this issue in a compassionate manner and provides critical protections for children who are born alive after surviving abortions.

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 can all agree 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 partisanship and support 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 the 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 who 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 those important realities 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 intended to 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 seeing 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 wing assault on a woman'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 one. I can hardly say it because 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 ultraconservative 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 judgment 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 testimony recently submitted 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 reduce the number of healthcare providers (not just the surgeons, but anesthesiologists, nurses, midwives, office staff) willing to provide this care. But again, that is the actual intent of this bill. Reducing access to safe abortion care would threaten the health of women in Hawaii.
>
> We are the physicians who care for patients when they find out their very wanted, very loved baby has severe fetal anomalies. Families sometimes choose to end the pregnancy and provide their baby with palliative care rather than subject their baby to any suffering or futile efforts at resuscitation. These families face very difficult decisions 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 compassion 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 past few 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 v. Hellerstedt decision.

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 would 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, just as his dissent in Garza v. 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 reassurance that nominees 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 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-funded agencies like Planned Parenthood is an end-run around Congress after Republicans have tried and failed dozens of times to end funding for Planned Parenthood.

Planned Parenthood provides healthcare for millions—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 administrative hub in 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 choice.

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 should 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 Olivia who was born in the same 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 limb from limb while in utero.

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 alive who survive an abortion attempt 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 nationwide Federal 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 Montana or in 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 no middle ground or compromise. 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 can either 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 discuss 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 treated with dignity from the very beginning to the very end.

I have worked to enact pro-life policies throughout my time in public service based upon this principle. While working as Governor, I signed legislation to ban abortions in South Dakota, except when necessary to save a mother's life.

''Humanae Vitae,'' written by Pope Paul IV and later expanded upon in ''Evangelium Vitae,'' written by Saint Pope John Paul II the Great, teaches that there can be no true democracy without a recognition of the dignity of every person. It goes on to teach that respect and dignity must be given to each human life for true peace and freedom to exist.

We must demand respect for the rights of all. This includes those in the womb, as well as mothers carrying a child who are facing difficult challenges. Both deserve our utmost compassion and care. While this should be common sense to everyone, we recognize that in this country there are individuals who are pro-life and individuals who are pro-choice.

While I and millions of other pro-life Americans continue to work to end all abortions and support measures that strengthen the dignity of life, recent actions at the State level have been deeply troubling. Pro-choice individuals are actually now supporting measures that will allow doctors to commit infanticide even after a baby has been born alive. For example, last month, the State of New York repealed section 4164 of the State's public health law which provided protections for an infant born alive after a failed abortion. Subsequently, in Virginia, legislation has been introduced that would legalize abortion up to term and even after the birth has begun. In Rhode Island, the Governor has vowed to sign legislation legalizing abortion even after the child is viable.

These examples of abortion extremism at its worst—radical, abhorrent acts of infanticide—should horrify all of us. While I am troubled by the thought of any baby being killed at any stage, at a bare minimum every one 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 abhorrent 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 cosponsor, 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 degree of 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 lives whenever possible, however possible. 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 heartbreak of going to the doctor one day and learning that 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 your firstborn to grow up without 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 worst-case scenarios like these 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, and 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 based not in fact but in fiction, steeped in ignorance and misogyny. The goal here is obvious: to bully doctors out of giving reproductive care, to scare them out of business—one potential lawsuit or jail sentence at a time—making it even harder for women to get 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 women and their 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 hoarse: 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 sound 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 imagined will never open 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. Mr. President, 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 who 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 after they are born.

This 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 it is not. There is still debate 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 number of 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 born 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 State 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. It is 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 a lot of my colleagues. For a lot of my colleagues who are proabortion 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 doctors, and criminalize doctors and health professionals.

Tonight's vote is part of a broader strategy by this administration and some in Congress to take away 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 de-fund 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. These mandates could scare medical professionals away from helping women and families obtain reproductive care, including an abortion, further reducing families' access to care.

More 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 determine 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.

S. 311 is another misguided attempt to reduce women and families' access to reproductive healthcare. I strongly oppose S. 311 and urge my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. 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. SASSE. 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 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 read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 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.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham, Ben Sasse, Roy Blunt, John Thune, John Boozman, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, James E. Risch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum calls have been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	McSally	Young
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	King	Sinema
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden
Harris	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Cramer	Murkowski	Scott (SC)

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.

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 read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eric D. Miller, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, James M. Inhofe, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham, Roy Blunt, John Thune, John Boozman, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Richard Burr, John Hoeven.

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).

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:

[Rollcall Vote No. 28 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Jones	Shaheen
Brown	Kaine	Sinema
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Cramer	Murkowski	Sanders

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. 311

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 and medical 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 decided 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 set of requirements 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 healthcare, in families' 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 because this bill 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 take us back 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-Pence 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 even if that patient directly asks 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 more—all because Republicans 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 is harmful to women and 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 a single step 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 or about 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 do need to be solved, and 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.

NOMINATION OF ERIC D. MILLER

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.

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 have not returned our blue slips 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 after a sham hearing 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 nominees. 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 stop at nothing to jam 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.

I fear 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.

At a time when we have 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 vote, which is happening soon, and 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 sovereignty, 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 extreme position 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 for the good 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.

S. 311

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 enacted by State legislatures or comments made by 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 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 life of every child, no matter the circumstances of his or her 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 is rendered to these little ones, 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 dispossessed. Anything short of this unambiguous declaration would be a tremendous 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 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 abortions.

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 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 life.

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 commending 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 negotiation.

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 bluster and renouncement of the JCPOA, one would have thought that he would leave Singapore with an ironclad commitment and schedule 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 United States and to the readiness 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 stature from the summit to make closed-door deals with China and Russia that will be used as leverage against the United States.

The President also conferred 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 one 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 demand 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, we got a vague statement 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 the words ''complete 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.

Why do these 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 be sure that 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 past 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 it does not become the narrative 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 CVID will take years to accomplish. 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 concessions 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 facilities and focuses on engagement instead of punishment. We should not use inspections as ''aha'' moments to catch the North Koreans in intentional or unintentional mistakes. Instead, they should be used as the foundation to develop a comprehensive picture of all of North Korea's weapons programs and as the basis for future negotiations.

What would a successful summit in Vietnam look like? We need a declaration from North Korea of all of its nuclear weapons and programs and facilities. Ideally, it would also include a catalog of all of its missiles and missile facilities. 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 the last summit, 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.

I wanted to speak on this issue today before the second summit because I am concerned that the President will fall prey to North Korean manipulation and accept an agreement that does not include significant concessions by the regime. Kim Jong Un's ploy is to make commitments for the future that can easily be forgotten or to offer up facilities or sites that are obsolete.

For example, if the President gets assurances for the dismantling of 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 will tell you, the real jewels 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 and that are critical to the nuclear program. This is why a full declaration is so critical—so 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 significantly undercut our ability to keep the pressure on. We need consistent messaging from the White House and the rest of the administration that the Singapore summit was the first step, and until we see concrete results, there will be no abeyance 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.

Let 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 that 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 to end the 65-year-old armistice. 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 or any future negotiations with North Korea. The presence of our troops is the cornerstone of our military alliance with South

Korea, and they must remain present and ready to ''Fight Tonight'' for the benefit of the alliance and regional security.

Looming over all of this is our long-term strategic competition with China. I find it telling that China was one of the first countries to announce the cancellation of our joint exercises with the Republic of Korea.

What are China's ambitions for this negotiation process? While China is certainly concerned about the nuclear arsenal its southern neighbor has amassed, denuclearization may not be China's highest national security concern during these negotiations. In the long run, China recognizes that its near-peer competition with the United States complicates its interests in these negotiations. China's highest priority is likely to ensure that it does not end up with a U.S.-allied reunified Korea on its southern border. Another goal is driving a wedge between the United States and its allies in order to promote itself as a regional hegemon.

We all recognize that Russia has similar ambitions—separate us from our allies, establish themselves as regional hegemons, and coerce and bully their smaller neighbors on issues of defense, trade, and economics. We cannot allow that to happen.

We already see attempts by China to relax sanctions enforcement. This trade spat is just one of the wedges North Korea will be able to leverage between China and the United States. We need a coordinated strategy that keeps our long-term interests in Asia focused while resolving the North Korean crisis. To date, we have not seen any indication that such a strategy exists.

Peace on the Korean Peninsula has eluded us for decades. There is an opportunity now to force Kim Jong Un's hand, through skillful negotiation and a coordinated sanctions regime, to take concrete steps toward denuclearization.

I hope this administration will use the Vietnam summit to negotiate a substantive agreement that keeps America and its allies safe, strong, and secure.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

S. 311

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 appropriate to leave born children to die. Today, now, in the year of 2019, how can this be? Science demonstrates that human life begins at conception, and our understanding of neonatal development is increasing every day.

I am a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services. The National Institutes of Health is one of my top priorities for funding. At the NIH, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development has advanced our knowledge of pregnancy and development in the womb. Under this Institute, the Neonatal Research Network has pioneered research that has led to techniques that saved the lives of children in their earliest stages, when these children are at their most vulnerable.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that more than 10,000 babies are aborted each year after 20 weeks of conception, when science—science—tells us that an unborn child can feel pain inside the womb. That number will increase as a result of recent State-level efforts to end virtually any restriction on abortion when a child could viably live outside the womb. These efforts are extreme and fall far beyond the mainstream of American opinion.

This legislation does nothing to limit prenatal abortion. While we must address that issue—the root causes of abortion and the ways to curb this heartbreaking trend—that is not the issue at hand today in this legislation. The question before us is this: When a child survives an abortion and is born, does the U.S. Senate believe the child can still be eliminated, or should the baby be protected and given all possible care to survive? This act requires healthcare practitioners to ''exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of a child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious healthcare practitioner would render to any other 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 Governor's shocking comments revealing an openness to infanticide and New York's expansion of abortion well beyond the age of viability that makes born-alive abortion survivors more likely—we have concrete evidence 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 purposefully deprived of healthcare and allowed to die is one too many. It is infanticide, 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 positively on this measure. Do 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 unalienable 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

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 its 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.

TVA 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 not 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 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 MCCONNELL did. The second day is a so-called intervening day when no action can be taken, so nothing 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.

Unfortunately, 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 Obama's term, compared to President Trump's 128 times; 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. Not once 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 extraordinary delay in considering nominees creates a government filled with acting appointees who, never having gone through the Senate confirmation process, are less accountable to Congress and therefore less accountable to the American people. So at a time when many complain that the Executive has become too powerful, the Senate is deliberately making itself weaker by diminishing our constitutional duty to advise and consent to individuals nominated to fill important positions—perhaps the Senate's best known role.

This abuse of power by the minority is about to produce an excessive reaction by the majority—something that I think at least nine Democratic Senators who can see 2 years ahead would want to avoid. At least nine Democratic Senators hope to be the next President of the United States. Do they not know that some Republicans will do to the next Democratic President's nominees what Democrats have done to President Trump's nominees? Let me ask that again. Do the nine Democratic Senators who want to be the next President of the United States—that election is about 20 months away—not know that if they are elected, some Republicans will do to them what Democrats have done to President Trump's nominees?

The Senate is a body of precedent. What goes around comes around. All it takes will be one Republican Senator objecting to a unanimous consent request to make it difficult for the next Democratic President to form a government, and this will continue the diminishment of the U.S. Senate.

Can Republican Senators, by majority vote, change Senate rules to stop this obstruction? Yes, we can, and we will, if necessary. There are several ways to change the rules of the Senate. We can amend the standing rules of the Senate. We can adopt a standing order. We can pass a law. We can set a new precedent. We can change the rules by unanimous consent. All of these are rules of the Senate.

The written rules of the Senate say it requires 67 votes to amend a standing rule and 60 votes to amend a standing order. There is recent precedent to change the Senate rules by a majority vote.

In 2013, the Democratic leader, Harry Reid, used a procedural maneuver—let's call it the Harry Reid precedent—that allowed the Democratic Senate majority to overrule the Chair and say, in effect, that a written Senate rule does not mean what its words say.

Now, this is as if a referee in a football game were to say the following: The rule book says that a first down is 10 yards, but I am the referee, and I am ruling that a first down is 9 yards.

Well, that is what happened in 2013. So, in 2017, what goes around comes around. The Republican majority followed this Harry Reid precedent in order to make cloture on all nominations a majority vote, and now Republicans are on the verge again of following the Harry Reid precedent.

Should Republicans do this, change a rule by majority vote, even though our written rules say it should be done by 60 or 67 votes? The answer is, no, we shouldn't, not if we can avoid it.

As Senator Carl Levin said in 2013, when he opposed the Harry Reid precedent—Senator Levin is a Democrat, and he said: A Senate in which a majority can change its rule at any time is a Senate without any rules.

Thomas Jefferson, who wrote our first rules, said: It didn't make much difference what the rules are. It just matters that there are some rules.

So it is at least awkward for Members of the country's chief rule-writing body, the U.S. Senate, to expect Americans to follow the rules we write for them when we don't follow our own written rules.

I have heard many Democrats privately say to me, they express their regret that they ever established the Harry Reid precedent in 2013. They didn't look ahead and see that what goes around comes around and that this is a body of precedent.

So what would be the right thing for us to do—something that avoided both the minority's abuse of its rights and the majority's excessive response. We should do what the Senate did in 2011, in 2012, and in 2013, when Republicans and Democrats worked together to make it easier for President Obama and his successors to gain confirmation of Presidential nominees.

As a Republican Senator, I spent dozens of hours on this bipartisan project to make it easier for a Democratic President with a Democratic Senate majority to form a government. I thought that was the right thing to do, and we changed the rules in the right way.

The Senate passed standing orders with bipartisan support and a new law, the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act, which eliminated confirmation for several positions. That bipartisan working group of Senators accomplished a lot in 2011, 2012, and 2013.

We eliminated secret holds. After over 25 years of bipartisan effort, led by Senator GRASSLEY and Senator WYDEN, we eliminated delays caused by the reading of amendments. We eliminated Senate confirmation of 163 major positions.

Now, remember what we were doing was working in a bipartisan way to try to make it easier for President Obama and a Democratic majority in the Senate to confirm the 1,200 Presidential nominees that every President has to send over here for advice and consent. We did it for President Obama. We intended to do it for his successors as well.

We eliminated 3,163 minor career positions. We made 272 positions so-called privileged nominations, which means these nominations can move faster through the Senate. We sped up motions to proceed to legislation. We made it easier to go to conference. We

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. Republicans did 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, BARRASSO, LEVIN, McCain, Kyl, CARDIN, COLLINS, Lieberman, 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 to the Senate a resolution 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 60 votes on a cloture motion, 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 them, and the Senate has other things to do 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 serve as a district 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 calendar for 6 weeks. Those 6 weeks seemed like an awfully long time to me, and that was for a Cabinet position. It was not 10 months for a part-time position for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Two weeks ago, I voted to report Senator LANKFORD and Senator BLUNT's resolution to the full Senate, even though no Democrat voted for it. I will vote for it again on the floor, even if no Democrat will join us. I will also join my fellow Republicans, if we are forced to change the rules by majority vote. I do not like the Harry Reid precedent, but I like even less the debasement of the Senate's constitutional power to provide advice and consent to 1,200 Presidential nominees.

My preference is to adopt the Lankford-Blunt resolution, which is very similar to the 2013 resolution that 78 Senators voted for, and to do it in a bipartisan way, according to the written Senate rules as we did in 2013.

I believe most Democrats privately agree that the resolution offered by Senators LANKFORD and BLUNT is reasonable, and they will be grateful that it is in place when there is a Democratic majority and one Republican Senator can block a Democratic President's nominees.

The only objection Democrats seem to have to the Lankford-Blunt resolution is that it would apply to President Trump. Their other major objection, which is truly puzzling, is that the proposed change is permanent, and the change we made in 2013 was temporary. Well, I wonder if Democrats would like it better if we made this change in the Senate temporary, only applying to the remainder of President Trump's term.

This is my invitation to my Democratic colleagues. Join me and Senators LANKFORD and BLUNT in supporting their resolution, or modifying it if you believe there is a way to improve it, and working in a bipartisan way, exactly as we did in 2011, 2012, and 2013.

A year or so ago, one of the Supreme Court Justices was asked: How do you Justices get along so well when you have such different opinions? This Justice's reply was this: We try to remember that the institution is more important than any of our opinions.

We Senators would do well 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 few moments today to pay tribute to Ernest Matt and his 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 still ranks 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, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE RULES—116TH CONGRESS

I. 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 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 any 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 a responsibility associated 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 Senators at full Committee markups 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 markups.

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 for marking up 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 via electronic 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 fifty 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 to strike a single section of any measure under consideration. Such a motion to strike a section of the measure under consideration by the Committee or Subcommittee shall not be 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 in hearings through final consideration, the Clerk shall place before each member of the Committee or Subcommittee a print of the statute or the part or section thereof to be amended or repealed showing 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 offers an amendment to a bill or joint resolution under consideration, those amendments shall be presented to the Committee or Subcommittee in a like form, showing by typographical devices the effect of the proposed amendment on existing law. The requirements of this subsection may be waived when, in the opinion of the Committee or Subcommittee Chairman, 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 only by the action of a majority of the Committee.

[b] Membership. No member may be a member of more than three Subcommittees and no member may chair more than one Subcommittee. No member will receive assignment to a second Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members of the Committee have chosen assignments to one Subcommittee, and no member shall receive assignment to a third Subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members have chosen assignments to two Subcommittees.

[c] Investigations. No investigation shall be initiated by a Subcommittee unless the Senate or the full Committee has specifically authorized such investigation.

[d] Hearings. No hearing of a Subcommittee shall be scheduled outside the District of Columbia without prior consultation with the Chairman and then only by agreement between the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

[e] Confidential testimony. No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive session of the Subcommittee 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 Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, or by a majority vote of the Subcommittee.

[f] Interrogation of witnesses. Subcommittee interrogation of a witness shall be conducted only by members of the Subcommittee or such professional staff as is authorized by the Chairman or the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee.

[g] Special meetings. If at least three members of a Subcommittee desire that a special meeting of the Subcommittee be called by the Chairman of the Subcommittee, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman of the Subcommittee for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of the Subcommittee of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman of the Subcommittee does not call the requested special meeting, to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Subcommittee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Subcommittee will be held, specifying the date and hour of that special meeting. The Subcommittee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify all members of the Subcommittee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the Chairman of the Subcommittee is not present at any regular or special meeting of the Subcommittee, the Ranking Member of the majority party on the Subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

[h] Voting. No measure or matter shall be recommended from a Subcommittee to the Committee unless a majority of the Subcommittee are actually present. The vote of the Subcommittee to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Subcommittee voting. On Subcommittee matters other than a vote to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee no record vote shall be taken unless a majority of the Subcommittee is actually present. Any absent member of a Subcommittee may affirmatively request that his or her vote to recommend a measure or matter to the Committee or his vote on any such other matters on which a record vote is taken, be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter and to inform the Subcommittee as to how the member wishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman of the Subcommittee any time before the record vote on the measure or matter concerned is taken, the member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies shall be kept 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 [24 hours preceding his or her appearance] 75 copies of his or her statement to the Committee or Subcommittee, and the statement must include a brief summary of the testimony. In the event that the witness fails to file a written statement and brief summary in accordance with this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee has the discretion to deny the witness the privilege of testifying before the Committee or Subcommittee until the witness has properly complied with the rule.

[b] Length of statements. Written statements properly filed with the Committee or Subcommittee may be as lengthy as the witness desires and may contain such documents or other addenda as the witness feels is necessary to present properly his or her views to the Committee or Subcommittee. The brief summary included in the statement must be no more than 3 pages long. It shall be left to the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee as to what portion of the documents presented to the Committee or Subcommittee shall be published in the printed transcript of the hearings.

[c] Ten-minute duration. Oral statements of witnesses shall be based upon their filed statements but shall be limited to 10 minutes duration. This period may be limited or extended at the discretion of the Chairman presiding at the hearings.

[d] Subpoena of witnesses. Witnesses may be subpoenaed by the Chairman of the Committee or a Subcommittee with the agreement of the Ranking Member of the Committee or Subcommittee or by a majority vote of the Committee or Subcommittee.

[e] Counsel permitted. Any witness subpoenaed by the Committee or Subcommittee to a public or executive hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his or her own choosing who shall be permitted, while the witness is testifying, to advise him or her of his or her legal rights.

[f] 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 Ranking Member of the Committee.

[g] Limits of questions. Questioning of a witness by members shall be limited to 5 minutes duration when 5 or more members are present and 10 minutes duration when less than 5 members are present, except that if a member is unable to finish his or her questioning in this period, he or she may be permitted further questions of the witness after all members have been given an opportunity to question the witness.

Additional opportunity to question a witness shall be limited to a duration of 5 minutes until all members have been given the opportunity of questioning the witness for a second time. This 5-minute period per member will be continued until all members have exhausted their questions of the witness.

RULE 5. VOTING

[a] Vote to report a measure or matter. No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. The vote of the Committee to report a measure or matter shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Committee who are present.

Any absent member may affirmatively request that his or her vote to report a matter be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter, and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman any time before the record vote on the measure or matter concerned is taken, any member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies shall be kept in the files of the Committee, along with the record of the rollcall vote of the members present and voting, as an official record of the vote on the measure or matter.

[b] Vote on matters other than to report a measure or matter. On Committee matters other than a vote to report a measure or matter, no record vote shall be taken unless a majority of the Committee are actually present. On any such other matter, a member of the Committee may request that his or her vote may be cast by proxy. The proxy shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently clear to identify the subject matter, and to inform the Committee as to how the member wishes his or her vote to be recorded thereon. By written notice to the Chairman any time before the vote on such other matter is taken, the member may withdraw a proxy previously given. All proxies relating to such other matters shall be kept in the files of the Committee.

RULE 6. QUORUM

No executive session of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be called to order unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, are actually present. Unless the Committee otherwise provides or is required by the Rules of the Senate, one 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 DAIS

Only members and the Clerk of the Committee shall be permitted on the dais during public or executive hearings, except that a member may have one staff person 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 8. COINAGE LEGISLATION

At least 67 Senators must cosponsor any gold medal 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 leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * *

[d][1] Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Banks, banking, and financial institutions.
2. Control of prices of commodities, rents, and services.
3. Deposit insurance.
4. Economic stabilization and defense production.
5. Export and foreign trade promotion.
6. Export controls.
7. Federal monetary policy, including Federal Reserve System.
8 Financial aid to commerce and industry.
9. Issuance and redemption of notes.
10. Money and credit, including currency and coinage.
11. Nursing home construction.
12. Public and private housing [including veterans' housing].
13. Renegotiation of Government contracts.
14. 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 PROCEDURES FOR PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Procedures formally adopted by the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, February 4, 1981, establish a uniform questionnaire 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 as well as agencies across the Executive Branch. 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 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 relationship with other countries, including those south of our border.

a. 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.

b. Jeremy B. Bash served as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Department of Defense from 2011 to 2013, and as Chief of Staff of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2009 to 2011.

c. 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 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 2015 to 2017. He previously served as Deputy National Security Advisor to the President from 2013 to 2015.

f. John O. 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 2008. 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 2011 to 2014 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.

i. Johnnie Carson served as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2009 to 2013. He previously served as the U.S. Ambassador to Kenya from 1999 to 2003, to Zimbabwe from 1995 to 1997, and to Uganda from 1991 to 1994.

j. James Clapper served as U.S. Director of National Intelligence from 2010 to 2017.

k. David S. Cohen served as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence from 2011 to 2015 and as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2015 to 2017.

l. Eliot A. Cohen served as Counselor of the U.S. Department of State from 2007 to 2009.

m. Ryan Crocker served as U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan from 2011 to 2012, as U.S. Ambassador to Iraq from 2007 to 2009, as U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan from 2004 to 2007, as U.S. Ambassador to Syria from 1998 to 2001, as U.S. Ambassador to Kuwait from 1994 to 1997, and U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon from 1990 to 1993.

n. Thomas Donilon served as National Security Advisor to the President from 2010 to 2013.

o. Jen Easterly served as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Counterterrorism from 2013 to 2016.

p. Nancy Ely-Raphel served as Senior Adviser 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.

q. Daniel P. Erikson served as Special Advisor 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.

r. 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.

s. Daniel F. Feldman served as Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan at the U.S. Department of State from 2014 to 2015.

t. 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 2016 to 2017.

u. Jendayi Frazer served as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 2005 to 2009. She served as U.S. Ambassador to South Africa from 2004 to 2005.

v. Suzy George served as Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff of the National Security Council from 2014 to 2017.

w. 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.

x. 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.

y. Avril D. Haines served as Deputy National Security Advisor to the President from 2015 to 2017. From 2013 to 2015, she served as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

z. Luke Hartig served as Senior Director for Counterterrorism at the National Security Council from 2014 to 2016.

aa. Heather A. Higginbottom served as Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources from 2013 to 2017.

bb. Roberta Jacobson served as U.S. Ambassador to Mexico from 2016 to 2018. She previously served as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs from 2011 to 2016.

cc. 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.

dd. John F. Kerry served as Secretary of State from 2013 to 2017.

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 of the Central Intelligence Agency from 2000 to 2004 and as Acting Director in 2004. His duties included briefing President-elect Bill Clinton and President George W. Bush.

gg. Lisa O. Monaco served as Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism and Deputy National Security Advisor from 2013 to 2017. Previously, she served as Assistant Attorney General for National Security from 2011 to 2013.

hh. Janet Napolitano served as Secretary of Homeland Security from 2009 to 2013. She served as the Governor of Arizona from 2003 to 2009.

ii. James D. Nealon served as Assistant Secretary for International Engagement at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security from 2017 to 2018. He served as U.S. Ambassador to Honduras from 2014 to 2017.

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 1989 to 2001, 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 E. 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, to Pakistan from 2007 to 2010, to Colombia from 2000 to 2003, and to El Salvador from 1997 to 2000.

nn. Thomas R. Pickering served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 1997 to 2000. He served as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1989 to 1992.

oo. Amy Pope served as Deputy Homeland Security Advisor and Deputy Assistant to the President from 2015 to 2017.

pp. 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.

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 2006 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. Susan E. Rice served as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 2009 to 2013 and as National Security Advisor to the President from 2013 to 2017.

vv. Anne C. Richard served as Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration from 2012 to 2017.

ww. 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 issues at the National Security Council, ultimately serving as Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Senior Director for Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs.

xx. Andrew J. Shapiro served as Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs from 2009 to 2013.

yy. Wendy R. Sherman served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs from 2011 to 2015.

zz. 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.

aaa. 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.

bbb. 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.

ccc. 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.

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 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.

2. 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 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 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 here 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) by reprogramming 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.* At the outset, there is no evidence of a sudden or emergency increase in the number of people seeking to cross the southern border. According to the administration's own data, the numbers of apprehensions and undetected illegal border crossings at the southern border are near forty-year lows. Although there was a modest increase in apprehensions in 2018, that figure is in keeping with the number of apprehensions only two years earlier, and the overall trend indicates a dramatic decline over the last fifteen years in particular. The administration also estimates that ''undetected unlawful entries'' at the southern border ''fell from approximately 851,000 to nearly 62,000'' between fiscal years 2006 to 2016, the most recent years for which data are available. The United States currently hosts what is estimated to be the smallest number of undocumented immigrants since 2004. And in fact, in recent years, the majority of currently undocumented immigrants entered the United States legally, but overstayed their visas, a problem that will not be addressed by the declaration of an emergency along the southern border.

4. *There is no documented terrorist or national security emergency at the southern border.* There is no reason to believe that there is a terrorist or national security emergency at the southern border that could justify the President's proclamation.

a. This administration's own most recent Country Report on Terrorism, released only five months ago, found that ''there was no credible evidence indicating that international terrorist groups have established bases in Mexico, worked with Mexican drug 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 twelve years 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 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. The overwhelming majority of individuals on terrorism watchlists who were intercepted by U.S. Customs and Border Patrol were attempting to travel to the United States by air; of the individuals on the 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 attempted to enter by land, only a small fraction do so at the southern border. Between October 2017 and March 2018, forty-one foreign immigrants on the terrorist watchlist were intercepted at the northern border. Only six such immigrants were intercepted at the southern border.

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 or violent behavior. According to a Cato Institute analysis of criminological data, undocumented immigrants are 44 percent *less likely* to be incarcerated nationwide than are native-born citizens. And in Texas, undocumented immigrants were found to have a first-time conviction rate 32 percent below that of native-born Americans; the conviction rates of unauthorized immigrants for violent crimes such as homicide and sex offenses were also below those of native-born

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 rates in the country's 30 largest cities have decreased on average by 2.7 percent in 2018 alone, further undermining any suggestion that recent crime trends currently warrant the declaration of a national emergency.

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. But there is no evidence of any such sudden crisis at the southern border that necessitates a reprogramming of appropriations to build a border wall.

a. The overwhelming majority of opioids that enter the United States across a land border are carried through legal ports of entry in personal or commercial vehicles, not smuggled through unauthorized border crossings. A border wall would not stop these drugs from entering the United States. Nor would a wall stop drugs from entering via other routes, including smuggling tunnels, which circumvent such 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).

b. Likewise, illegal crossings at the southern border are not the principal source of human trafficking victims. About two-thirds of human trafficking victims served by nonprofit organizations that receive funding from the relevant Department of Justice office are U.S. citizens, and even among noncitizens, most trafficking victims usually arrive in the country on valid 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.

7. *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 deliberate policies towards migrants. 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 ease the suffering of these people.

8. *Redirecting funds for the claimed ''national emergency'' will undermine U.S. national security and foreign policy interests.* In the face of a nonexistent threat, redirecting funds for the construction of a wall along the southern border will *undermine* national security by needlessly pulling resources from Department of Defense programs that are responsible for keeping our troops and our country safe and running effectively.

a. Repurposing funds from the defense construction budget will drain money from critical defense infrastructure projects, possibly including improvement of military hospitals, construction of roads, and renovation of on-base housing. And the proclamation will likely continue to divert those armed forces already deployed at the southern border from their usual training activities or missions, affecting troop readiness.

b. In addition, 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 a range of Western Hemisphere concerns. These actions are placing friendly governments to the south under impossible pressures and driving partners away. They have especially strained our diplomatic relationship with Mexico, a relationship that is vital to regional efforts ranging from critical intelligence and law enforcement partnerships to cooperative efforts 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.

c. Finally, by declaring a national emergency for domestic political reasons with no compelling reason or justification from his senior intelligence and law enforcement officials, the President has further eroded his credibility with foreign leaders, both friend and foe. Should a genuine foreign crisis erupt, this lack of credibility will materially weaken this administration's ability to marshal allies to support the United States, and will embolden adversaries to oppose us.

9. *The situation at the border does not require the use of the armed forces, and a wall is unnecessary to support the 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,'' and that a wall is ''necessary to support such use'' of the armed forces. These claims are implausible

a. Historically, our country has deployed National Guard troops at the border solely to assist the Border Patrol when there was an extremely high number of apprehensions, together with a particularly low 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.

b. 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.

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 capabilities that we are providing [at the southern border] are combat capabilities. It's not a war zone along the border.'' Finally, it is implausible that hundreds of miles of wall across the southern border are somehow necessary to support the use of armed forces. We are aware of no military- or security-related rationale that could remotely justify such an endeavor.

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 Presidential Proclamation, 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 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 claims of an emergency. And it is reported that the President made the decision to circumvent the appropriations 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,

Signed,

Madeleine K. Albright, Jeremy B. Bash, John B. Bellinger III, Daniel Benjamin, Antony Blinken, John O. Brennan, R. Nicholas Burns, William J. Burns, Johnnie Carson, James Clapper.

David S. Cohen, Eliot A. Cohen, Ryan Crocker, Thomas Donilon, Jen Easterly, Nancy Ely-Raphel, Daniel P. Erikson, John D. Feeley, Daniel F. Feldman, Jonathan Finer.

Jendayi Frazer, Suzy George, Phil Gordon, Chuck Hagel, Avril D. Haines, Luke Hartig, Heather A. Higginbottom, 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. Pickering.

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, Strobe Talbott, Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Arturo A. Valenzuela.

TRIBUTE TO TOM FONTANA

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, CVC, 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 renovation of the Pentagon 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 evenhandedness 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 CVC 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 stateside searches, two official stateside 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 children with 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 highlight animal 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 ends 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 unique 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 many of 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 quickly 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 of 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. This past 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 actively supports the Wounded Warrior Project, and their commitment to veterans in their community is a testament to the company's values.

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

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 Owner 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.

(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:

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 31.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of 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 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42–43), 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: Ms. MATSUI of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(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. KENNEDY 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. BEYER of Virginia, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. TRONE of Maryland, Mrs. BEATTY of Ohio, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. VELA of Texas.

The message also announced that pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, 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 United States Holocaust Memorial Council: Mr. DEUTCH of Florida, Mr. SCHNEIDER of Illinois, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–196), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN of New Jersey.

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.

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. 163, 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 HOLLEN):

S. 536. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to expand the ability to use testing 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. CRAMER, 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. STABENOW, and Mr. CASEY):

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):

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. HOEVEN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. BENNET, 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. RISCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MERKLEY, 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. MARKEY):

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 Ms. 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. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, 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 2090, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 disclosure 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. MARKEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 549. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote 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 and 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 reimposition 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 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 Christa McAuliffe.

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 discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, 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 XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure 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, 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.

S. 317

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.

S. 320

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.

S. 323

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.

S. 362

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 Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 383

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) 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.

S. 386

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.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), 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.

S. 488

At the request of Ms. 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.

S. 496

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.

S. 500

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 amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 506

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.

S. 507

At the request of Ms. 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.

S. 513

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) 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.

S. 514

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.

S. 521

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.

S. 524

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.

S. 525

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.

S.J. RES. 6

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.

S. RES. 73

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.

S. RES. 74

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (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 Needless 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(c)(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 JW modifier used as of the date of enactment of this subsection (or any such successor code that includes such data as determined 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 rebatable 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—

''(I) the total number of units of such drug discarded during such quarter (as determined by the Secretary based on the aggregate rebatable amount (as so defined) with respect to such drug for such quarter), if any; and

''(II) the rebate amount specified in paragraph (3) for such drug and such quarter.

''(B) REBATABLE AMOUNT.—The term 'rebatable 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)(iii)(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 (or, in the case of a drug subject to an agreement with such manufacturer 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.

''(4) 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.

''(5) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(A) AUDITS.—Each manufacturer of a rebatable single dose-vial drug that is required to provide a rebate under this subsection shall be subject to periodic audit with respect to such drug and such rebates by the Secretary.

''(B) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—

''(i) 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 the 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 of such amount.

''(ii) APPLICATION.—The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this subparagraph in the same manner as such provisions apply to a penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

''(6) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) REBATABLE SINGLE-DOSE VIAL DRUG.—The term 'rebatable 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.

''(B) UNIT.—The term 'unit' has the meaning given such term in section 1847A(b)(2)(B).''.

(b) COLLECTION OF COINSURANCE ONLY FOR PORTION OF REBATABLE SINGLE-DOSE VIAL DRUG ADMINISTERED.—Section 1833(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(S), by inserting subject to subsection (cc), before with respect to; and

(2) 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)), 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 certified under section 1882 or any other supplemental insurance coverage of the beneficiary, 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 this part (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, as indicated by the J-portion of the claim 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 5(a), 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

U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

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 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. §1302(b), I request that this publication be 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 agencies. This landmark 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 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 terms and conditions of employment (including hiring, promotion, demotion, termination, salary, wages, overtime compensation, benefits, work assignments or reassignments, grievance and disciplinary procedures, protection from discrimination in personnel actions, occupational health and safety, and family and medical and other leave) of employees; and (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 presiding 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 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 legislative branch 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 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 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:

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 330 and H. Res. 630) that require all of its Members, Officers and employees, as well as interns, detailees, and fellows, to complete an anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training program. We are pleased that the CAA Reform Act includes these broader mandates for the congressional workforce at large. Under the new law, employing offices (other than the House of Representatives and the Senate) are also required to develop and implement a program to train and educate covered employees on the rights and protections provided under the CAA, including 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 and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate no later than 45 days after the beginning of each Congress, beginning with the 117th Congress. For the 116th Congress, this report is due 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)

The OCWR stands ready to assist 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.

Adopt All Notice-Posting Requirements that Exist Under the Federal Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Other Workplace Rights Laws Covered Under the CAA

The Board has long been concerned that employees who experience harassment or discrimination in the legislative branch may be deterred from taking action simply due to a lack of awareness of their rights under 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 remain informed about their rights regardless of their location, employee turnover, or other changes in the workplace. The notices also serve as a reminder to employers about their workplace responsibilities and the legal ramifications of violating the law. They are also a visible commitment by Congress to the workplace protections embodied in the CAA. The CAA Reform Act now requires that employing offices post and keep posted in conspicuous places on their premises the notices provided by the OCWR, which must contain information about employees' rights and the OCWR's Administrative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process, along with OCWR contact information. 2 U.S.C. §1362.

Name Change

As the Board advised Congress in 2014, changing the name of the office to ''Office of Congressional Workplace Rights'' would better reflect our mission, raise our public profile in connection with our mandate to educate the legislative branch, and make it easier for employees to identify us when they need assistance. Effective December 21, 2018, the Reform Act renamed the ''Office of Compliance'' as the ''Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.'' This name change notifies legislative branch employees that the Office is tasked with protecting their workplace rights through its programs of dispute resolution, education, and enforcement. As the Office embraces its new name, it remains 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 Detailees

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 all staff, including interns, fellows, and detailees working in any employing office in the legislative branch, regardless of how or whether they are paid. The CAA Reform Act amends section 201 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 Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—to apply the protections and remedies of those laws to current and former ''unpaid staff.'' ''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, and an individual participating in a fellowship program[.]'' These laws apply to unpaid staff ''in the same manner and to the same extent as such subsections apply with respect to a covered employee[.]'' 201(d), 2 U.S.C. §1311(d). The Reform Act thus ensures that unpaid interns, fellows, and detailees 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), and the Board expressed its support for proposals to amend the CAA to include the LOC within the definition of ''employing office,'' thereby extending CAA protections to LOC employees for most purposes. The 2018 omnibus spending bill amended the CAA to bring the LOC and its employees within the OCWR's (then OOC's) jurisdiction. That bill amended 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 to LOC employees a choice on how to pursue complaints of employment discrimination—allowing them to pursue a complaint either with the LOC's Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Programs or with the OCWR. The 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).

Changes 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 law offers legislative branch employees against harassment and discrimination in the congressional workplace, OCWR Executive Director Susan Tsui Grundmann conveyed the Board of Directors' considered recommendations 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 with the OCWR pursuant to 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 the matter 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 statute, 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 of that decision would 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 often provide covered employees with their first 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 opportunity 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. Rather, 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 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. Mediation can save the parties from burdensome litigation, which can be expensive, time consuming, and a drain on resources and workplace productivity. Mediation also gives the 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 workplace 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 amendments 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 yet been implemented. (see note 1.) We continue to believe that the adoption of these recommendations, discussed below, will best promote a model 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 CHILDS WALLACE,
Chair, Board of Directors.
BARBARA L. CAMENS.
ALAN V. FRIEDMAN.
ROBERTA L. HOLZWARTH.
SUSAN S. ROBFOGEL.

Recommendations for the 116th Congress

Apply the Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act of 2015 to the Legislative Branch (Public Law 114–75)

The Wounded Warrior Federal Leave Act, enacted in 2015, affords wounded warriors the flexibility to receive medical care as they transition to serving the nation in a new capacity. Specifically, new federal employees who are also disabled veterans with a 30% or more disability may receive 104 hours of ''wounded warrior leave'' during their first year in the federal workforce so that they may seek medical treatment for their service-connected disabilities without being forced to take unpaid leave or forego their medical appointments. The Act was passed as a way to show gratitude and deep appreciation for the hardship and sacrifices of veterans and, in particular wounded warriors, in service to the United States. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch offer Wounded Warrior Federal Leave, the Board reiterates the recommendation made in its 2016 Section 102(b) Report to extend the benefits of that Act to the legislative branch with enforcement and implementation under the provisions of the CAA.

Approve the Board's Pending Regulations

The CAA directs the OCWR to promulgate regulations implementing the CAA to keep Congress current and accountable to the workplace laws that apply to private and public employers. The Board is required to amend its regulations to achieve parity, unless there is good cause shown to deviate from the private sector or executive branch regulations. The Board recommended in its 2016 section 102(b) Report to the 115th Congress that it approve its pending regulations that would implement the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), ADA titles II and III, and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act (USERRA) in the legislative branch. The Board-adopted regulations ensure that same-sex spouses are recognized under the FMLA, in accordance with Supreme Court rulings, and further extend important protections for military caregivers and service members. The Board's adopted ADA regulations will avoid costly construction and contracting errors that result when there is uncertainty or ambiguity regarding what standards apply, and will improve access to Capitol Hill for visitors and employees with disabilities. The Board of Directors also transmitted to Congress its adopted USERRA regulations on December 3, 2008 and identified ''good cause'' to modify the executive branch regulations to implement more effectively the rights and protections for veterans as applied to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the other employing offices. These rules are necessary to fulfill the commitments set forth 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 the CAA, those regulations are the same as the substantive regulations adopted by the Secretary of Labor, 2 U.S.C. §1312(d)(2), except where good cause was shown that a modification would 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 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 (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 existed prior to service and was aggravated in the line of duty on active duty, and extend FMLA military caregiver leave to family members of certain veterans with serious injuries or illnesses. As noted, the FMLA amendments providing additional rights and protections for service members and their families were enacted into law 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 amended FMLA provisions do not ''describe the manner in which the provision of the bill [relating to terms and conditions of employment]... 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

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 apply in 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, the Board makes clear through these regulations that the rights and protections for military servicemembers apply in the legislative branch, and that protections under the CAA are in line with existing public and private sector protections under the FMLA. The Board-adopted FMLA regulations implement leave protections of significant importance to legislative branch employees and employing offices. Accordingly, the Board recommends that Congress approve the Board's adopted FMLA regulations. Second, these regulations set forth the revised definition of ''spouse'' under the FMLA in light of the DOL's February 25, 2015 Final Rule on the definition of spouse, and the United States Supreme Court's decision in Obergefell v. Hodges (see note 4), which requires a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state.

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 its adopted regulations implementing titles II and III of the ADA to Capitol Hill and the district offices. First, the Board's ADA regulations clarify which title II and title III regulations apply to the legislative branch. This knowledge will undoubtedly save taxpayers money by ensuring pre-construction review of construction projects for ADA compliance—rather than providing for only post-construction inspections and costly redos when the access is not adequate. Second, under the regulations adopted by the Board, all leased spaces must meet some basic accessibility requirements that apply to all federal facilities that are leased or constructed. In this way, Congress will remain a model for ADA compliance and public access. Under the authority of the landmark CAA, the OOC has made significant progress towards making Capitol Hill more accessible for persons with disabilities. Our efforts to improve access to the buildings and facilities on the campus are consistent with the priority guidance in the Board's ADA regulations, which it adopted in February 2016. Congressional approval of those regulations would reaffirm its commitment to provide barrier-free 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 care insurance and job 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 veterans' health, welfare, access, and employment status. Approving the USERRA regulations will assist service members in attaining and retaining a job despite the call to duty. The regulations commit to anti-discrimination, anti-retaliation, and 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 below the percentage in the executive branch, or even in the private sector, which is not under a mandate to provide a preference in hiring to veterans. Indeed, many reports have put the level of veteran employees on congressional staffs at 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 legislative work. In addition, the Wounded Warrior Fellowship Program exists in the House Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) where Members can hire veteran fellows for 2-year terms. In 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 protect against discrimination based on military service. Congress can lead by example by applying the USERRA law encompassed in the CAA.

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 1995 with nearly unanimous, bi-cameral, and bipartisan support—but would further help legislative branch managers effectively implement the laws' protections and benefits on behalf of the workforce.

Protect Employees and Applicants 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 with respect to employment against, a person because that person is or has been a debtor under the bankruptcy statutes. This provision currently does not apply to the legislative branch. Reiterating the recommendations made in the 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2006 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 Discharge of Employees Who Are or Have Been Subject to Garnishment (15 U.S.C. § 1674(A))

Section 1674(a) of title 15 of the U.S. Code prohibits discharge of any employee because his or her earnings ''have been subject to garnishment for any one indebtedness.'' This section is limited to private employers, so it currently has no application to the legislative branch. For the reasons set forth in the 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2006 Section 102(b) Reports, the Board recommends that the rights and protections against discrimination on this basis should be applied to employing offices within the legislative branch.

Provide 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. The OCWR has received a number of inquiries from congressional employees concerned about the lack of whistleblower protections. The absence of specific statutory protection such as that provided under 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8) chills the disclosure of such information. Granting whistleblower protection could significantly improve the rights and protections afforded to legislative branch employees in an area fundamental to the institutional integrity of the legislative branch by uncovering waste and fraud and safeguarding the budget.

The Board has recommended in its previous Section 102(b) reports and continues to recommend that Congress provide whistleblower reprisal protections to legislative branch employees comparable to that provided to executive branch employees under 5 U.S.C. § 2302(b)(8), and 5 U.S.C. § 1221. Additionally, as discussed below, the Board recommends that the Office also be granted investigatory and prosecutorial authority over whistleblower reprisal complaints, by incorporating into the CAA the authority granted to the Office of Special Counsel, which investigates and prosecutes claims of whistleblower reprisal in the executive branch.

Provide Subpoena Authority to Obtain Information Needed for Safety & Health Investigations and Require Records To Be Kept of Workplace Injuries and Illnesses

The CAA applies the broad protections of section 5 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHAct) to the congressional workplace. The OCWR enforces the OSHAct in the legislative branch much in the same way the Secretary of Labor enforces the OSHAct in the private sector. Under the CAA, 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 employing offices with technical assistance to comply with the OSHAct's requirements. But Congress and its agencies are still exempt from critical OSHAct requirements imposed upon American businesses. Under the CAA, employing offices in the legislative branch are not subject to investigative subpoenas to aid in inspections as are private sector employers under the OSHAct. Similarly, 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 employing offices be subject to the investigatory subpoena provisions contained in OSHAct § 8(b) and that legislative branch employing offices 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, including title VII. Although some employing offices in the legislative branch keep personnel 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 also clearly intended to further 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 the OCRW General Counsel should be granted such investigatory and prosecutorial authority. Accordingly, this recommendation is not discussed further below.

2. Pub. L. 110–181, Div. A, Title V § 585(a)(2), (3)(A)–(D) and Pub. L. 111–84, Div. A, Title V § 565(a)(1)(B) and (4).

3. U.S.C. §1302(3); House Committee on Armed Services, H. Rpt. 110–146 (May 11, 2007), H. Rpt. 111–166 (June 18, 2009)

4. Obergefell v. Hodges, 135 S. Ct. 2584 (2015).

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 when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, February 26; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired and the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; 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 postcloture on the Miller nomination.

Is there 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 CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CHAD F. WOLF, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR STRATEGY, POLICY, AND PLANS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY. (NEW POSITION)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL ERIC WOOTEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR FOR FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY, VICE ANNE E. RUNG, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL D. BAUGHMAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE STEVEN R. FRANK, TERM EXPIRED.

WILLIAM TRAVIS BROWN, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KEVIN CHARLES HARRISON, TERM EXPIRED.

GARY B. BURMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMES EDWARD CLARK, RESIGNED.

WING CHAU, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMIE A. HAINSWORTH, TERM EXPIRED.

RAMONA L. DOHMAN, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE SHARON JEANETTE LUBINSKI, RETIRED.

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, TERM EXPIRED.

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 MATHIESON, TERM EXPIRED.

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. BASHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEVEN J. BUTOW

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

MAJ. GEN. KAREN H. GIBSON

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

REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES P. DOWNEY
REAR ADM. (LH) SHANE G. GAHAGAN
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANCIS D. MORLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RONALD A. BOXALL

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JEREMIAH L. BLACKBURN
JEREMY S. CAUDILL
ASA C. CHUNG
LUCAS H. DALGLEISH
MANUEL D. DUARTE
HENRY HYUN HAHM
KENNIE T. NEAL
JASON D. RAINES
ROBERT D. ROSE
JOSHUA D. RUMSEY
DARREL L. SCHRADER
TIMOTHY D. WARF
THOMAS A. WEBB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

THOMAS D. CRIMMINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD
BRADLEY A. AMYS
GRAHAM H. BERNSTEIN
JOHN H. BONE
ELIJAH FRANCIS BROWN
MARK CLIFFORD BRUEGGER
BRIAN CHARLES CALL
SARA JOY CARRASCO
JEFFREY ALLAN DAVIS
SARAH WILLIAMS EDMUNDSON
EVAN ALLEN EPSTEIN
CHAD THOMAS EVANS
SATURA MCPHERSON GABRIEL
JASON E. GAMMONS
JEFFREY BEVAN GARBER
CHRISTOPHER J. GOEWERT
TIMOTHY GOINES
MARK ANDREW GOLDEN
DUSTIN L. GRANT
DAVID R. GROENDYK
BENJAMIN RUSSELL HENLEY
NATHANIEL GLENN HIMERT
ELGIN D. HORNE
DAPHNE LASALLE JACKSON
WILLIAM JESSE LADUKE
KURT ALAN MABIS
MARC PHILLIP MALLONE
NATHAN H. MAYENSCHEIN
ERIC M. MCCUTCHEN
ELIZABETH ANNA MCDANIEL
MATTHEW JOSHUA NEIL
JOSHUA BRYAN NETTINGA
SALEEM SYED RAZVI
DAVID M. REDMOND, JR.
NICKLAUS JAMES REED
LAURA LANTZY RODGERS
THOMAS ANDREW SMITH
DUSTIN MARCELLUS TIPLING
NICHOLE MARIE TORRES
BRANT FREDERICK WHIPPLE
JOSHUA CURTIS WILLIAMS
AARON ALLEN WILSON
GABRIEL MATTHEW YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SHAWN C. BISHOP
HEATHER A. BODWELL
RANDY A. CROFT
STEVEN R. CUNEIO
DENNIS U. DEGUZMAN
RALPH T. ELLIOTT, JR.
JAMES M. HENDRICK
KYLE A. HUNDLEY
BRADLEY L. KIMBLE
JOEL D. KORNEGAY
MARK B. MCKELLEN
JOSHUA N. PAYNE
KATHERINE M. SCOTT
TRAVIS N. SEARS
STEVEN L. SURVANCE
CHRISTIAN L. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHELL A. ARCHEBELLE
ARTEMUS ARMAS
MARY J. BERNHEIM
JENNIFER J. BRATZ
KEVIN M. COX
MISCHA A. DANSBY
REBECCA S. ELLIOTT
KATHLEEN MYERS GRIMM
DALE E. HARRELL
RACHELLE J. HARTZE
JACQUELINE M. KILLIAN
LAURA J. LEWIS
RUTH A. MONSANTO WILLIAMS
SHELLEY A. SHELTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PETER N. FISCHER
DAVID W. KELLEY
CHRISTOPHER M. LAPACK
MICHAEL S. NEWTON
GLENNDON E. PAGE, JR.
JONATHAN H. WADE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRIAN M. ALEXANDER
MICHAEL C. ALFARO
CARLOS L. ALFORD
PAMELA A. ALLEY
RUSSELL P. ALLISON
MATTHEW R. ALTMAN
DAVID R. ANDERSON
SHANON E. ANDERSON
CRAIG R. ANDRLE
DAVID K. ARAGON
MICHELLE M. ARTOLACHIPE
NEIL O. AURELIO
SHAWN R. AYERS
BRIAN T. BACKMAN
DONNY LYNN BAGWELL
BLAINE L. BAKER
KRISTEN D. BAKOTIC
LEE E. BALLARD, JR.
BRIAN P. BALLEW
CHARITY A. BANKS
CHARLES D. BARKHURST
JASON R. BARNES
PATRICK H. BAUM
STEVEN D. BAUMAN
STEVEN M. BEATTIE II
BRANDON M. BEAUCHAN
BECKY M. BEERS
CHRISTOPHER P. BELL
JASON B. BELL
JEREMY S. BERGIN
MATTHEW O. BERRY
JOHN R. BEURER
JOSEPH M. BIEDENBACH
LISA M. BIEWER
ADAM DEWAIN BINGHAM

DENNIS R. BIRCHENOUGH
ALLISON K. BLACK
BRETT T. BLACK
ROBERT B. BLAKE
JACK A. BLALOCK
JEFFREY A. BLANKENSHIP
DAVID B. BLAU
HEATHER BRANDT BOGSTIE
RYAN M. BOHNER
ROBERT J. BONNER
JOHN F. BOROWSKI
DOUGLAS J. BOUTON
AARON J. BOYD
SEAN S. BRAMMERHOGAN
MARVIN T. BRANAN
KEVIN R. BRAY
MATTHEW SEAN BRENNAN
BRADLEY M. BREWINGTON
MARC A. BROCK
TONYA J. BRONSON
CORY L. BROWN
DAWSON A. BRUMBELOW
JEFFREY A. BURDETTE
JONATHAN E. BURDICK
KENNETH R. BURTON, JR.
RICHARD J. BUSH, JR.
KEITH J. BUTLER
LUKE B. CASPER
CHRISTOPHER R. CASSEM
DAVID A. CASTOR
ALEXANDER CASTRO
ERICK J. CASTRO
BRIAN C. CHELLGREN
DOMINIC V. CHIAPUSIO
CORY R. CHRISTOFFER
GEOFFREY I. CHURCH
CHRISTOPHER G. CLARK
JAMES M. CLARK
STEVEN A. CLARK
CHARLES A. CLEGG
SUMMER A. CLOVIS
RYAN M. COLBURN
MATTHEW F. COLEMAN
BRIAN P. COLLINS
WILLIAM T. COLLINS
NATHAN T. COLUNGA
CORY A. COOK
DANIEL J. CORDES
DANIEL L. CORNELIUS
JAMES RONALD COUGHLIN
LAUREN COURCHAINE
LELAND K. COWIE
ERIC W. CROWELL
RYAN A. CROWLEY
GEORGE M. CUNDIFF, JR.
JAMES H. DAILEY
CORY M. DAMON
ROBERT WILLIAM DAVIS
GEOFFREY D. DAWSON
KENNETH L. DECKER, JR.
MONIQUE C. DELAUTER
NATHAN P. DILLER
IAN M. DINESEN
NICHOLAS M. DIPOMA
ALAN F. DOCAUER
MEGHAN B. DOHERTY
MICHAEL S. DOHERTY
JEFFREY A. DONHAUSER
GARY L. DONOVAN
MICHAEL J. DOOLEY
ERIK N. DUNN
BRANDON C. DURANT
CHESLEY L. DYCUS
WESLEY B. EAGLE
JOHN R. ECHOLS
JOSEPH S. ELKINS
ANDREW J. EMERY
KIRBY M. ENSSER
JOSEPH R. EWING
ELIZABETH J. EYCHNER
EMILY E. FARKAS
ERICKA S. FARMERHILL
PATRICK F. FARRELL
JAMES R. FEE, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. FERNENGEL
PAUL P. FIDLER
DANIEL E. FINKELSTEIN
SEAN M. FINNAN
KATHRYN E. FITZGERALD
BARY D. FLACK
RYAN W. FLEISHAUER
LARRY B. FLETCHER, JR.
GARRY S. FLOYD
BRIAN M. FLUSCHE
PHILIP M. FORBES
JASON M. FORD
RICHARD B. FOSTER
DOUGLAS J. FOWLER
TYLER P. FRANDER
NIKKI RENEE FRANKINO
RYAN PAUL FRAZIER
CHARLES M. FREEL
PAUL B. FREEMAN
GEOFFREY S. FUKUMOTO
NICOLE E. FULLER
ALLISON M. GALFORD
JOHN B. GALLEMORE
DANIEL A. GALLTON
BRIAN J. GAMBLE
FRED E. GARCIA
DARIUS V. GARVIDA
JULIE M. GAULIN
MICHAEL P. GERANIS
MATTHEW C. GETTY
JAMES B. GHERDOVICH
AARON D. GIBSON
AMY M. GLISSON
JASON J. GLYNN
CHRISTOPHER R. GOAD
DAVID P. GOODE
VANCE GOODFELLOW
JOHN T. GOODSON III
RANDEL J. GORDON
RYAN E. GORECKI
JONATHAN W. GRAHAM
CHRISTOPHER P. GRAVES
ANDREW J. GRIFFIN
KEVIN S. GRISWOLD
ERIN R. GULDEN
EDWARD J. GUSSMAN III
JOHN M. GUSTAFSON
JUNG H. HA
MICHAEL J. HAGAN
MARY C. HAGUE
JOHN M. HALE
RUSSELL J. HALL
NILS E. HALLBERG, JR.
JAMES R. HAMILTON
ELIZABETH A. HANSON
JOHN P. HEIDENREICH
TIMOTHY M. HELFRICH
JAIME I. HERNANDEZ
WILLIAM R. HERSCH
DANIEL S. HOADLEY
CALVIN C. HODGSON
TIMOTHY J. HOFMAN
RICHARD N. HOLIFIELD, JR.
JEFFREY G. HOLLAND
CORY S. HOLLON
PATRICE O. HOLMES
TERRANCE J. HOLMES
MATTHEW EARL HOLSTON
TIMOTHY N. HOOD
TRAVIS G. HOWELL
MARCUS D. JACKSON
KEVIN M. JAMIESON
ROMEL L. JARAMILLO
HENRY R. JEFFRESS
JEFFREY T. JENNINGS
MARTIN T. JENNINGS
JASON D. JENSEN
TODD M. JENSEN
JORGE I. JIMENEZ
JOSE E. JIMENEZ, JR.
JUSTIN L. JOFFRION
ROBERT W. JOHNSON
MARK S. JONES
PAUL R. JONES
KATHY LYNNE JORDAN
WILLIAM F. JULIAN
ALISON L. KAMATARIS
JASON P. KANE
JOHN B. KELLEY
RICHARD CARROL KIEFFER
BARRY A. KING II
JASON M. KING
SCOTT L. KLEMPNER
RYAN T. KNAPP
DEANE R. KONOWICZ
BRIAN C. KREITLOW
JAMES H. KRISCHKE
KENNETH P. KUEBLER
JOHN KURIAN
KALLIROI LAGONIK LANDRY
NATHAN P. LANG
PATRICK R. LAUNEY
DAVID A. LEACH
ROBERT H. LEE, JR.
TYLER E. LEWIS
PETER J. LEX
SCOTT C. LINCK
RONALD M. LLANTADA
MICHELE A. LOBIANCO
JASON K. LOE
HECTOR G. LOPEZ
EDMUND X. LOUGHRAN II
PETER J. LUECK
JONATHAN E. LUMINATI
CHRIS D. LUNDY
PATRICK O. MADDOX
KEVIN M. MADRIGAL
MICHAEL D. MAGINNESS
ANGELINA M. MAGUINNESS
ROBERT M. MAMMENGA
FREDERICK W. MANUEL
EDWIN J. MARKIE, JR.
GARY R. MARLOWE
MICHAEL A. MARSICEK
RICHARD W. MARTIN, JR.
JAMES H. MASONER, JR.
MARK A. MASSARO
TIMOTHY R. MATLOCK
ANDREA R. MAUGERI
BRIAN P. MAYER
JAMAAL E. MAYS
ANTHONY S. MCCARTY
BRYON E. C. MCCLAIN
JOHN C. MCCLUNG
DANIEL C. MCCRARY
MATTHEW W. MCDANIEL
TAMMY L. MCELHANEY
KENNETH C. MCGHEE
MARK MCGILL
SCOTT D. MCKEEVER
JOHN M. MCQUADE
ROBERT G. MEADOWS II
CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER
JOHN M. MEHRMAN
JAMES K. MEIER
ERIN P. MEINDERS
JASON B. MELLO
SHELLY L. MENDIETA
BENJAMIN D. MENGES
SETH A. MILLER
SCOTT C. MILLS
JASON M. MITCHELL
JASON P. MOBLEY
TIMOTHY A. MONROE
CECILIA I. MONTES DE OCA
TYTONIA S. MOORE
SIRENA I. MORRIS
PHILIP G. MORRISON
TYLER W. MORTON
ROBERT J. MOSCHELLA
KURT E. MULLER
STEVEN L. NAPIER
SEAN B. NEITZKE
JARED C. NELSON
KATHRYN M. NELSON
KRISTEN A. NEMISH
BRENT M. NESTOR
MARK D. NEWELL
CHAD R. NICHOLS
SHARON A. NICKELBERRY
RYAN J. NOVOTNY
CELINA E. NOYES
RYAN D. NUDI
RYAN S. NYE
BENJAMIN C. OAKES
WILLIAM H. OBRIEN IV
ANGELA F. OCHOA
VINCENT J. OCONNOR
CAROL L. ONEIL
BRENDA A. OPPEL
BRAD E. ORGERON
KEVIN J. OSBORNE
KYLE F. OYAMA
MARTIN J. PANTAZE
SCOTTY A. PENDLEY
JEFFREY A. PESKE
MALCOLM N. PHARR
JENNIFER A. PHELPS
DENNIS L. PHILLIPS
CANDICE LINETTE PIPES
JEFFREY W. PIXLEY
BYRON R. POMPA
DOYLE A. POMPA
BILLY E. POPE, JR.
CHRISTOPHER M. PORTELE
JACOB D. PORTER
CALVIN B. POWELL
JOHN R. POWERS
BRADLEY B. PRESTON
KEVIN M. PRITZ
KYLE J. PUMROY
ERICA K. RABE
SCOTT R. RALEIGH
BRIAN D. RANDOLPH
TODD E. RANDOLPH
JAMES D. REAVES
ROY P. RECKER
JEREMY R. REEVES
MATTHEW H. REYNOLDS
OLIVER I. RICK
BROOKE A. RINEHART
MEGHAN M. RIPPLE
TIMOTHY J. RITCHIE
JOSHUA H. ROCKHILL
ANDREW L. RODDAN
H. WARREN ROHLFS
DAVID J. ROSS
DORENE BETSY J. ROSS
CHRISTOPHER T. RUBIANO
LOUIS J. RUSCETTA
NATHAN L. RUSIN
ANTHONY J. SALVATORE
DONALD J. SANDBERG
JEREMY C. SAUNDERS
MICHAEL J. SCALES
MEGAN A. SCHAFER
R. ERIC SCHMIDT
RONALD D. SCHOCHENMAIER
JASON N. SCHRAMM
ROBERT J. SCHREINER
NICHOLE K. A. SCOTT
THOMAS E. SEGARS, JR.
ANTHONY T. SHAFER, JR.
PHILLIP A. SHEA
FRANKLIN C. SHIFFLETT
MICHAEL J. SHREVES
ANDREW J. SHURTLEFF
JOEL A. SLOAN
NISHAWN S. SMAGH
DOMENIC SMERAGLIA
BERNARD C. SMITH
KRISTOFFER R. SMITH
MARIE E. SMITH
PHILIP D. SMITH
STEVE A. SMITH
JUSTIN B. SPEARS
TODD C. SPRISTER
BRIAN T. STAHL
JOHN C. STALLWORTH
CHADWICK J. STERR
TIMOTHY J. STEVENS
WILLIAM F. STORMS
DANY MARK STRAKOS
MATTHEW J. SWANSON
ROBERT G. SWIECH
BRIAN R. TAVERNIER
DAVID M. TAYLOR
ROBERT M. TAYLOR
VAN T. THAI
PAUL A. THERIOT
JOHN G. THIEN
STEVEN E. TOFTE
ERIC D. TRIAS
LAYNE D. TROSPER
JONATHAN E. TUCKER
RAYMUNDO O. TULIER
BRADY J. VAIRA

TERENCE J. VANCE
DAVID D. VANDERBURG
JOSEPH M. VANONI
JOHN D. VARILEK
RICHARD G. VASQUEZ
ROBERT P. VICARS IV
KENNETH J. VOIGT, JR.
MATTHEW R. VOLLKOMMER
ERWIN T. WAIBEL
CHRISTOPHER V. WALKER
MARC A. WALKER
JEREMY L. WALLER
MIA L. WALSH
DANIEL T. WALTER
STEVEN L. WATTS II
DARREN P. WEES
KARL WEINBRECHT
RYAN P. WEISIGER
ERICK O. WELCOME
PETER J. WHITE
BERNABE F. WHITFIELD
JASON A. WHITTLE
JEREMY E. WILLIAMS
PHELEMON T. WILLIAMS
STUART A. WILLIAMSON
DAVID J. WILSON
AARON N. WILT
ERIC A. WINTERBOTTOM
THOMAS B. WOLFE
CARL F. WOOD
TRAVIS L. WOODWORTH
TAD W. WOOLFE
JASON M. WORK
JASON T. WRIGHT
MICHAEL C. WYATT
SCOTT T. YEATMAN
MELISSA L. YOUDERIAN
JOHN F. ZOHN, JR.
JASON C. ZUMWALT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

JASON BULLOCK
LLENA C. CALDWELL
PAUL COLTHIRST
CYNTHIA V. FELEPPA
THOMAS M. JOHNSON
YOUNG S. KANG
DENNIS J. KANTANEN
CHARLES C. LAMBERT
MICHAEL R. MANSELL
WADE H. OWENS
MANUEL PELAEZ
CONSTANCE L. SEDON
THOMAS STARK
LEWIS WAYT
DEMETRES WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

JULIE A. AKE
JOSEPH F. ALDERETE, JR.
JARED M. ANDREWS
ALISON L. BATIG
KRISTEN M. BAUER
AMIT K. BHAVSAR
BRANDON D. BROWN
JACOB F. COLLEN
JEANCLAUDE G. DALLEYRAND
PATRICK DEPENBROCK
JAY M. DINTAMAN
JUSTIN P. DODGE
DAVID M. DOMAN
ELIZABETH H. DUQUE
TRACY L. EICHEL
DAVID ESCOBEDO
PAUL M. FAESTEL
KATHLEEN M. FLOCKE
DANIEL J. GALLAGHER
RUSSELL GIESE
MATTHEW B. HARRISON
JOSHUA D. HARTZELL
GUYON J. HILL
MATTHEW S. HING
SEAN J. HIPP
MICHAEL C. HJELKREM
JOSEPH HUDAK
STEPHEN P. HYLAND
YANG E. KAO
KEVIN M. KELLY
DANIEL E. KIM
JEFFREY S. KUNZ
JASON S. LANHAM
MATTHEW A. LAUDIE
MARK Y. LEE
ERIK K. LUNDMARK
JAN I. MABY
MICHAEL B. MADKINS
KATHARINE W. MARKELL
DANIRA H. MAYES
JOHN J. MCPHERSON
NIA R. MIDDLETON
GEORGE R. MOUNT
THORNTON MU
LEON J. NESTI
WILLIAM D. OCONNELL
MICHEAL A. ODLE
BRUCE A. ONG
JONATHAN R. PARKS
CHRISTOPHER T. PERRY
WYLAN C. PETERSON
ERIC PRYOR
JASON A. REGULES
ANGEL M. REYES
JAMIE C. RIESBERG
JEFFREY L. ROBERTSON
KIMBERLY C. SALAZAR
DENNIS M. SARMIENTO
DAVID J. SCHWARTZ
CARL G. SKINNER
FREDERICK L. STEPHENS
JOSEPH R. STERBIS
TOIHUNTA STUBBS
GUY H. TAKAHASHI
SCOT A. TEBO
WESLEY M. THEURER
JOHN E. THOMAS
DAWN M. TORRES
KYLE WALKER
KATRINA E. WALTERS
JAMES A. WATTS
MICHAEL A. WIGGINS
JOSHUA S. WILL
GARY H. WYNN
D013176

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

P. J. FOX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

NATHAN M. CLAYTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ADAM P. JAMES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JASON S. BAKER
BRETT D. BASLER
PAUL R. BOYD
SEAN T. BOYETTE
VERNON A. CHANDLER
MATTHEW W. COOPER
MICHAEL V. CRAWFORD
JOHN D. DEMENT
JAMES J. DEVERTEUIL
EDWARD K. DION
JON C. EISBERG
ERIK A. FESSENDEN
ANDREW D. GOLDIN
EVERETT R. GRIFFEY
STEVEN C. GUST
DOUGLAS P. HUEY
ANDREW A. INCH
MICHELLE JARAMILLO
COLBY C. JENKINS
GEORGE C. KRAEHE
JEFFREY M. LAING
MARK E. LENHART
MICHAEL J. LIESMANN
KIM S. MCGHEE
MARK S. PONTIF
DANIEL F. PUGH
SARAH D. SMITH
KRISTA M. SORIA
MURRAY M. THOMPSON
STEPHEN E. WALKER
TUNSTALL I. WILSON
MICHAEL A. WUNN
RICHARD J. ZEIGLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SHELIA R. DAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT D. COPE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

WILLIAM C. MITCHELL

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHEAL K. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON T. STEPP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

STEPHEN C. PLEW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL D. KRISMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MICHAEL J. CIRIVELLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ZACHARY J. CONLEY

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 giveaway 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 every day, and she will be sorely missed. I extend my heartfelt condolences to her many family and friends who are mourning her passing.

COMMAND WARRANT OFFICER FIVE SEFER STEVE IMERAJ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Command Warrant Officer Five Sefer Steve Imeraj on his retirement.

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 Assistance S1 and was later detailed as the AV BN Battle Captain 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 Olathe, Colorado, a World War II veteran of Pearl Harbor and Guadalcanal Campaign 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 bombed out by Japanese forces. After his service was complete, he used his military education to build his ranching operation back home in Colorado and ultimately created the Nick Gray Construction Company.

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.

Madam Speaker, Nick's service to his country, enduring work-ethic, and love of family will continue to have an impact on the Olathe community for years to come. It is my privilege to acknowledge him here today, and express heartfelt gratitude for the important work he has done throughout his life. I wish him all the best in his future.

IN RECOGNITION OF COLIN ALLRED AND WELCOMING HIS NEWBORN SON

HON. HALEY M. STEVENS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colin Allred and his wife Alexandra on congratulating them for their newborn son, Jordan Eber Allred.

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.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Jordan into this world. I couldn't be happier.

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 spirt 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 hope my colleagues will recognize the importance of the Korean March 1st Movement as a reflection of our own values of freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom to self-govern.

CHET HITT RECEIVES THE DISTINGUISHED COMMUNITY SERVICE 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 Chet Hitt, who received the Distinguished Community Service Award from the Victor Valley College Foundation on February 23, 2019.

Chet was born in the High Desert and has lived in Apple Valley for most of his life. Always ambitious and driven, Chet's entrepreneurial spirit came alive when he began to control High Desert mortuary business market. In 1997, he became partners with the owner of a prior competitor, Victor Valley Mortuary, and within three years they were able to purchase four additional mortuaries in the High Desert. Chet has served on the Board of Trustees of St. Mary Hospital, where he is the only Board Member to have been born at that hospital, and also sits on the Board for Friends of the Fair for the San Bernardino County Fairgrounds. He was named the Apple Valley Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year in 2002, and was named Service-Based Entrepreneur of the Year at the 2017 Spirit of the Entrepreneur Awards for the Inland Empire. Chet serves as Chairman of the Board of the Sunset Hills Children's Foundation and the Topock 66 Children's Foundation.

Chet Hitt is one of the most kind, generous, and hard-working people in the High Desert, and is eminently deserving of this award. I offer my sincere congratulations to Chet on this recognition and my thanks for all the outstanding work he does in our community.

HONORING STEPHEN PHILIP SPERNAK

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

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 spokesman 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 his 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.

REMEMBERING THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KHOJALY 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 Khojaly Massacre, which took place on February 26, 1992, and remember the 613 men, women, and children who were brutalized during this despicable act of violence.

Khojaly, 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 Khojaly 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 Azerbaijan 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 working as chief engineer at the radio station WHEB 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 who 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 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 lifelong 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 American 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 corporate citizen.

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. He served his country first as an Infantry 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 tenure, 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 TGFB. The increased TGFB 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, curved 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 hemi 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 applaud the National Institutes of Health, particularly the National, Heart, Lung and Blood Institute and 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 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 proper treatment by raising awareness leading to early diagnosis. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing February as Marfan Awareness Month.

DANIEL ''DANNY'' M. BARBER

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 2019

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 of SOY, 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 longstanding 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 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 kid 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 Service Council, and served as Director and Chairman of the Board for the Victor Valley Chamber of Commerce.

I thank 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 champions—our friend Bill Hahn of Rockledge, Florida, passed away. Bill was one of those unspoken heroes who got up every morning and fought to keep going, for himself, and so many other people struggling with kidney disease, recovering from transplant surgery and waiting to receive the special gift of life.

From an early age, Bill believed in physical fitness and leading a very active and healthy life. As a young man he was a male model 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 New Year's Eve 2008, Bill received a true gift of life—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 lifelong 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 Catheterization Laboratory 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 fierce 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, 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 Díaz, 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 and 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 Resident 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 champion 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. He is married to his wife 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 citywide 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 1988 and was reelected 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, he did 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 and I am eternally grateful to have been so fortunate to have shared time with this remarkably knowledgeable, judicious and beloved man. Last year, Congress

passed and the President signed into law my bill designating the post office at 1325 Autumn Avenue as the Russell B. Sugarmon Post Office. I had hoped Judge Sugarmon would be on hand for its dedication later this year but its existence will stand as a lasting physical monument to his stature in our city, in our state and in our nation. No one is more deserving. Supporting Russell Sugarmon's great work and providing encouragement and strength was the Sugarmon family. Russell was a beloved husband and father of six children, sadly preceded in death by his dear daughter Tina Spence. I extend my sincere condolences to his devoted wife and companion, Gina; his children Judge Tarik Sugarmon, Elena Williams, Erika Sugarmon, Monique Sugarmon and Carol Spence; his extended family and his many friends.

JUSTICE ELIZABETH TAYLOR

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 pay tribute to Justice Elizabeth Audrey Taylor for her many years of compassionate service and tireless work to improve the lives of our Bronx residents. Justice Taylor is a great example of the countless contributions that African Americans make every day to the Bronx and our Nation.

Justice Taylor was born and raised in the Highbridge Section of the Bronx and is a product of the public school system. She received a Bachelor of Arts in English from Binghamton University and her Juris Doctor from Ohio Northern University School of Law. She began her career as a legislative aide in the New York City Council and then went to work in private practice, where she specialized in landlord and tenant issues. Thereafter, Justice Taylor returned to the public sector as the Senior Court Attorney to Justice Edgar G. Walker, who at the time was serving in the Bronx Criminal Court. Until 2008, she continued her commitment to public service by serving as Principal Law Clerk to New York Supreme Court Justice Kenneth L. Thompson, Jr. , who is currently serving in the Civil Term of Bronx County Supreme Court.

In addition, Justice Taylor was recently elected Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. She was first elected in 2008 to the Civil Court of the City of New York and has been honored as Judge of the Year by the Bronx County Bar Association and the Bronx Advocates for Justice.

Justice Taylor is also a member of the Military Academy Review Committee for the 15th Congressional district. She has been a member of this committee since 2014 and has been instrumental in helping our office make military academy recommendations since then. This has allowed numerous students from the 15th Congressional District to attend these prestigious schools with full scholarships.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues join me in honoring Justice Elizabeth Audrey Taylor for her consistently remarkable dedication to the law and commitment to serving her community.

REMEMBERING THE KHOJALY 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 Khojaly Tragedy, also known as the Khojaly Massacre.

I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the town and people of Khojaly 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 Azerbaijani men, women, and children killed in Khojaly 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 Representatives, I would like to congratulate Assistant Sheriff Lana Tomlin on this award. Lana is an exemplary 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 better world 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 across America.

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, clergy, 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 known to man. 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 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 NECO 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.

2018 ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Ziauddin Ahmed, MD, Nancy Anschutz, Phil Anschutz, Dr. Bahman Atefi, Maryam

Banikarim, Michael Barnard, Marta Batmasian, Diana L. Bennett, Nicolas Berggruen, John P. Bilezikian, MD, Lieutenant General Gwen Bingham, Dr. Ed Bosarge, Vanu C. Bose, Denis A. Bovin, Kay Buck, Sanford R. Climan, William A. Colon, Armand C. Dellovade, Peter P. Dhillon, Robert Dilenschneider, General Larry R. Ellis, USA (Ret), Akram Elias, Adam S. Falkoff, Farnaz Fassihi, David S. Ferriero, Captain Liam J. Flaherty, Honorable Albert A. Frink, Honorable Edward M. Gabriel, Larry Gagosian, Professor Henry Louis Gates, Major General Cedric George, Charles M. Ghailian, Barbara Grapstein, Murat Guzel, Rosemary Hanley, Franco Harris, Dottie Herman, Dave A. Isay, John W. Jackson, Susan G. Jackson, Naveen Jain, Francisco S. Jin, Dean Kamen, Farooq Kathwari, Bibiji Inderjit Kaur Khalsa, James K. Kim, General Joseph Lengyel, Sheriff Joseph M. Lombardo, Jacob Lozada, PhD, Mun Y. Lum, Colonel Patrick Mahaney, USA, Commissioner Robert Manfred, Honorable Michael McCaul, Scott L. Menke, Rita Moreno, Chief Terence A. Monahan, Jeanne D. Mrozek, MD, Angella Nazarian, David Nazarian, Steven D. Nerayoff, Esq., Hadi Partovi, Rear Admiral Steven D. Poulin, Eduardo Rodriguez, Michael Rogers, USN, Jerrold F. Rosenbaum, MD, Albeti I. Salama, Qiongzhao E. Schicktanz, PhD, Jeff Schottenstein, Khosrow Semnani, Vicken P. Sepilian, MD, FACOG, Sir Bruno Serato, Rahmat A. Shoureshi, PhD, Mark Solazzo, Jeffrey Sonnenfeld, Shari Staglin, Garen Staglin, Philip E. Stieg, PhD, MD, Richard W. Stocks, Daniele C. Struppa, PhD, Jon Stryker, Dennis W. Sullivan, Ardeshir Tavangarian, Dr. Masoud Tayebi, Anthony K. Tjan, Major General Hugh Van Roosen, Marica F. Vilcek, Jan T. Vilcek, Josef H. von Rickenbach, Vincent Wang, DO, MD, Arieh Warshel, PhD, Honorable James W. Ziglar, Anita G. Zucker.

INTERNATIONAL ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Stefan W. Hell, Hinduja Foundation, Albert II Prince of Monaco.

BENJAMIN B. TUCKER

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 First Deputy Commissioner Benjamin B. Tucker of the New York Police Department for his years of public service and tireless work to improve the lives of our community and our city. He is a great example of the countless contributions that African Americans make every day to the Bronx and our Nation.

First Deputy Commissioner Tucker began his career with the New York City Police Department (NYPD) in 1969 as a Police Trainee. In this role, he conducted an innovative school-based drug prevention education program. He became a Police Officer in 1972 and was promoted to Sergeant in 1987. During his 22 years of service with the NYPD, Mr. Tucker performed patrol, school task force, anti-crime, and community affairs assignments. In addition, he served as a Police Academy instructor, legal advisor in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Legal Matters; and as the Assistant Director of the Civilian Complaint Review Board.

In 1995, President William Jefferson Clinton appointed Mr. Tucker as the Deputy Director for Operations in the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services at the U.S. Department of Justice. In 2009, Mr. Tucker was nominated by President Barack H. Obama, and confirmed by the United States Senate, as the Deputy Director for State, Local and Tribal Affairs within the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy.

His unique experiences in law enforcement, public service, and academia led in 2014 to Mr. Tucker's appointment as Deputy Commissioner for Training during NYPD Commissioner William J. Bratton's tenure. Proving to be a valued member of the executive staff, Mr. Tucker was promoted to First Deputy Commissioner and entrusted to direct design and implement a broad range of policy, programs, and training to strengthen community relations and improve the performance of the Department.

First Deputy Commissioner Tucker holds a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice from the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York, a Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law, and is a tenured professor at Pace University.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring First Deputy Commissioner Benjamin B. Tucker for his distinguished public service and extensive contributions in ensuring the safety and well-being of the residents of New York City.

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; "nay" 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.

CONGRATULATING MAUREEN MCFADDEN ON HER RETIREMENT AFTER 40 YEARS AT WNDU-TV

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 though 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 3.5 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 bites 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, Bettye 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. Stalling's 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 for votes on February 11th due to unavoidable travel delays.

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

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 26, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

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–G50

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 45th 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

FEBRUARY 28

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–G50

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 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.

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

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

MARCH 7

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

Daily Digest

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**

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 ⅔ 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 ⅔ 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.". Page H2064

Recess: The House recessed at 5:46 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. Page H2064

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. Page H2065

Electing the Clerk of the House of Representatives: The House agreed to H. Res. 143, electing the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Page H2066

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. Page H2066

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. Pages H2068–87

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)*

H. J. Res. 31, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019. Signed on February 15, 2019. (Public Law 116–6)

H.R. 439, to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America. Signed on February 21, 2019. (Public Law 116–7)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine United States Strategic Command and United States Northern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on Airland, to receive a closed briefing on the B–21 ''Raider'', 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–562.

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 Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled ''Oversight Hearing: Understanding the Changing Climate System and the Role of Climate Research'', 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

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.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled ''Public Witness Hearing'', 12:45 p.m., 2007 Rayburn.

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 Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''INF Withdrawal and the Future of Arms Control: Implications for the Security of the United States and its Allies'', 2 p.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.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce, hearing entitled ''Protecting Consumer Privacy in the Era of Big Data'', 10 a.m., 2123 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.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Made by Maduro: The Humanitarian Crisis in Venezuela and U.S. Policy Responses'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''A Global Crisis: Refugees, Migrants and Asylum Seekers'', 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security; and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Innovation, joint hearing entitled ''Securing U.S. Surface Transportation from Cyber Attacks'', 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

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.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife, hearing entitled ''The State of Water Supply Reliability in the 21st Century'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

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 Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled ''The Future of ARP–E'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations, hearing entitled ''Shutdown Lessons: SBA Capital Access Programs'', 10 a.m., 2360 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.

Committee on Armed Services: February 26, to hold hearings to examine United States Strategic Command and United States Northern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

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 Semiannual 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.

Committee on Appropriations, February 27, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing entitled ''Election Security: Ensuring the Integrity of U.S. Election Systems'', 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

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.

February 28, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled ''Female Veterans Access to VA'', 10 a.m., HT–2 Capitol.

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.

Committee on Education and Labor, February 27, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing entitled ''Classrooms in Crisis: Examining the Inappropriate Use of Seclusion and Restraint Practices'', 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

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 the Judiciary, February 28, Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled ''The National Emergencies Act of 1976'', 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

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.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.