



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2019

No. 36

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 27, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL CAROL TIMMONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my colleagues, Senator TOM CARPER and Senator CHRIS COONS of Delaware, to honor and congratulate Major General Carol Timmons for a lifetime of dedicated service to our country.

After graduating from William Penn High School in 1977, Timmons enrolled

in college and enlisted in the Delaware National Guard. With a childhood dream of becoming an airline pilot, her career in flight would begin that very summer on a C-130 airplane in Savannah, Georgia.

Despite her love of airplanes, Air Force rules prevented women from flying combat mission planes like the C-130. Due to these unfair regulations, she joined the Army National Guard in 1980 and would learn to fly noncombat Army helicopters like the UH-1 Huey.

Undeterred and committed to her dream, Timmons joined the Air Force Reserves, where she flew noncombat support missions. She soon realized her dream as Federal laws ended the discriminatory prohibition on women flying in combat missions, and during Operation Desert Storm, then-Captain Timmons would become one of the first women to fly in combat.

Following that operation, her career would come full circle as she rejoined the Delaware National Guard, flying the same C-130s she learned to fly on and to operate in the beginning.

On January 8, 2012, then-Brigadier General Timmons would make history by becoming the Delaware Air National Guard's first female commander, and again on February 1, 2017, when she was promoted to the rank of major general and made Adjutant General of the Delaware National Guard, the Governor's chief military adviser, commanding 1,500 soldiers and 1,100 airmen.

During her storied 42-year career, she earned a Bronze Star for her service in Afghanistan and has flown over 5,200 hours in the cockpit, including 400 combat hours during contingencies spanning from Operations Desert Shield to Inherent Resolve. She served on the National Guard's Joint Diversity Executive Council and the Air Force Reserve Policy Committee. She has received numerous honors, including induction into the Delaware Aviation Hall of Fame and the Delaware Women's Hall of Fame.

By refusing to compromise on her dream, Timmons broke down barriers, blazed trails, and inspired women to let nothing stand in their way in service to our Nation.

I join Senator CARPER and Senator COONS in thanking Major General Carol Timmons for her over four decades of service to our State and our country, and we wish her the very best.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS of Washington) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the President's national emergency declaration.

First and foremost, I support President Trump, and I support the wall. Walls work to protect our security, combat human trafficking, stop the flow of drugs, and encourage legal immigration.

Democrats have pushed for zero wall money, open borders, and abolishing ICE. These policies make our Nation vulnerable and threaten our security, and it is a tragedy.

So I don't blame the President for proposing extreme measures to respond to their extreme policies and tactics. However, yesterday, I made the difficult decision to disapprove of this type of unilateral executive action, just as I could not approve any such unilateral action by any President.

I am 100 percent with President Trump for building the wall, but the emergency declaration only maintains the status quo. Securing our border is fundamental to who we are as a sovereign nation, and that is why I voted over a dozen times for stronger border security, including \$25 billion for the wall last year.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2237

Unfortunately, as the President recognized, himself, this national emergency could be tied up in the courts for years with no guarantee that judges will rule in favor of the wall to be built. It is Congress' job to provide the resources our Nation needs to keep us safe, and I am concerned that if this is tied up in the courts, we will be stuck with the status quo of no wall and a border that isn't secure.

My vote to disapprove of this unilateral executive action had nothing to do with the merits or need to build President Trump's wall; it was about our Constitution and this body's exclusive Article I powers to make laws and use the power of the purse.

I spoke out strongly when President Obama said that if Congress didn't act, he would use the pen and the phone, and then he proceeded to act alone on DACA and act alone in reappropriating money within ObamaCare and regulating every mud puddle in America.

Remember, President Obama initially said he couldn't act alone on DACA because he wasn't a king or an emperor. After a robust debate in Congress, he flip-flopped and took executive action. His executive action took away Congress' authority to act, and DACA still isn't solved.

These unilateral actions by President Obama put more power in the hands of unelected people sitting in cubicles in Washington, D.C., and they turned elected Representatives into elected bystanders. When Representatives become irrelevant, citizens become irrelevant, and we the people are powerless against faceless, unelected bureaucrats.

Unilateral executive actions set bad precedent. If it is okay for the executive branch to act alone after the legislative branch doesn't reach an agreement, where does that take us?

Governor Jay Inslee already has said that he would be willing to declare a national emergency on climate change allowing for drastic Federal action that would never have to be approved by Congress.

What if, without any congressional approval, a future President used a national emergency to take money from our VA clinics, Fairchild Air Force Base, or force management at the Colville National Forest to force a Green New Deal on the American people?

Whether it is at the border or upholding the separation of powers in our Constitution, we, conservative Republicans, must be consistent about being the party for the rule of law. It is those principles that define us.

Mr. Speaker, I say to Speaker PELOSI: I am 100 percent with Trump on the wall. I am also 100 percent with the Constitution. As Representatives of the people, it is our call to put aside any personal ambition or partisan divides so that the people are protected.

This isn't about political parties, personalities, or power. It never has been. It is about making sure that the prom-

ise of America is never breached and knowing that the only ones who can preserve it are we the people. I take this seriously and will always lead by upholding my Article I constitutional authority to be a strong voice for those I have the privilege of serving in the United States House of Representatives.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this Chamber today in support of H.R. 8.

Americans have been waiting for Congress to catch up to them. It isn't often that we hear that 70, 80, or 90 percent of Americans agree on something, but when it comes to universal background checks, 97 percent of Americans think it is a good idea.

In my own district, I have seen that unity. After Parkland, we had 13,000 people in Morristown, New Jersey, at the student-led March for Our Lives demanding gun safety legislation. After the horrific shooting at the Tree of Life synagogue, members of the community came together to denounce gun violence.

The 11th District of New Jersey understands that universal background checks are a responsible way to address the gun violence epidemic in this country. It is a way to keep our communities safe.

Here in New Jersey, we know that successful, responsible gun ownership looks a lot like the legislation we have on the books. We have good gun safety laws, but they are constantly undermined by States with weak gun safety laws.

As a Federal prosecutor, I worked on cases where we traced illegal guns to neighboring States with weak gun safety laws. That is why it is so important that we have stronger Federal gun safety laws. Gun violence is a national problem, and it deserves a national response.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a culture of gun safety. My father is a hunter, and he taught me how to shoot. I went on to serve in the United States Navy, and I was qualified as an expert shot in the M16, the Colt 45, and the 9-millimeter Beretta.

I am joined today by a fellow freshman veteran, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, and we have been trained and know the power of these weapons and the damage that they can do. Universal background checks are an easy step that we can take to improve gun safety in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of H.R. 8, and I rise to tell the

story of one resident from my community, from Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District, Jamie Loeper, and his parents, Liz and Joe, from West Chester, Pennsylvania.

Jamie had just graduated college and was looking for a permanent postcollege job. In the meantime, he was working in a pizza shop in West Philadelphia when his life was tragically cut short in January 2004 when a worker accidentally shot him. This was not done in malice but was the result of a coworker accidentally mishandling a gun. Jamie passed away when he was 22 years old. Today would have been his 38th birthday.

I rise for the 1,600 Pennsylvanians and nearly 40,000 Americans who have lost their lives to gun-related incidents in 2017 alone.

The Loepers, like mine, are a military family. We understand the values of responsible gun ownership but also that we must take commonsense steps to reduce gun violence in our communities. We have seen for far too long far too many gun-related tragedies over the past several years with Congress doing nothing. We must act now.

SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House overwhelmingly passed the Natural Resources Management Act, including a provision sponsored by Senator FEINSTEIN and me that would establish California's first National Heritage Area, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area.

I want to thank my House colleagues from California, Representatives MATSUI, DESAULNIER, MCNERNEY, THOMPSON, HARDER, LOFGREN, and BERA, for their support as cosponsors of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Act, H.R. 357.

I also want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA of the Natural Resources Committee for bringing the bipartisan public lands bill to the floor of the House following Senate passage earlier this month.

I sponsored this legislation to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area since 2011 along with my colleague Senator FEINSTEIN.

A National Heritage Area designation will help conserve the California Delta, which I have had the great pleasure of calling my home for the last 40 years.

□ 1015

This iconic working landscape is central to California's life and is the most productive watershed and delta in the Western United States and, indeed, from the coast of Alaska to Chile.

Specifically, this legislation authorizes \$10 million in Federal grants for

local development of cultural heritage issues, historic preservation, and working lands conservation projects.

This Federal grant funding will be available for the next 15 years to support local governments, historical societies, and nonprofit organizations throughout the delta.

Our National Heritage Area Act proposal is endorsed by the Delta Stewardship Council and the Delta Counties Coalition, consisting of Sacramento, Solano, Contra Costa, Yolo, and San Joaquin Counties, all of which represent the delta. It is also supported by the Delta Chambers of Commerce and Visitors Bureau, Restore the Delta, and the National Parks Conservation Association.

California's Delta Protection Commission is charged with developing the management plan for the new national heritage area.

Lastly, I want to address some of the persistent misconceptions about national heritage area designations, not only this new one but also those throughout the United States. Such designations do not affect individual property rights, water rights, land ownership, or local land use decisions, nor does the designation affect hunting and fishing. Rather, the national heritage area program simply makes Federal grant funds administered by the National Park Service available for local projects.

The national heritage area program and planning process is collaborative and voluntary, meaning that local groups, businesses, and landowners can choose to participate or not. I look forward to continuing to work with local governments, county governments, local businesses, communities, local action groups, and all others interested during the public management planning process.

After nearly a decade of work, the President is expected to sign the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Act into law. We thank all who supported the legislation and the local entities that have done so.

This is truly a historic achievement for the entire delta, including the farming communities, the families, and the immigrant communities who have settled in the area over the last 150 years and generated the rich cultural and agricultural heritage.

RECOGNIZING ASHLEY AND CHRIS GASPERI

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a family from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who is dedicated to making our world a better and safer world.

Ashley and Chris Gasperi, ER nurses, were residents of Feasterville and worked at Temple University Hospital and St. Mary Medical Center. Despite

dedicating their careers to caring for others, they both craved more and later decided to move to Kenya to establish a nonprofit organization that seeks to break the vicious cycle of poverty in rural communities.

Together, they established Ekenywa. Ekenywa works to dig wells, sometimes hundreds of feet deep, to establish a reliable water source to communities and schools in rural Kenya. The creation of these wells allows for solar-powered irrigation systems, enabling communities to farm year-round, even in the presence of a drought.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the work of the Gasperi family and Ekenywa. They are truly making a difference in the lives of countless people across the world.

I speak on behalf of our entire Bucks County community when we tell them how much we appreciate their service and their sacrifice.

RECOGNIZING WALKER ANDERSON FOR HIS NATIONAL SCIENCE COMPETITION ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young citizen in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently was recognized in a national science competition.

Walker Anderson, a Doylestown resident and a senior at Central Bucks West High School, recently won \$2,000 as a semifinalist for the Regeneron Science Talent Search competition. This recognition was received by only 300 students nationwide and only four in the State of Pennsylvania.

As impressive as this may be on its own, this is only one academic achievement of Walker's. Walker previously placed first in the under-18 category at the World Puzzle Championship in Prague, competing on the U.S. team, and was recently accepted into the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will hear of Walker well into the future, as his STEM research and grasp of complex mathematical and scientific concepts is truly remarkable.

I wish Walker and his parents, Susan and Ken Anderson, all of the best. I also thank Mark Hayden, Walker's STEM Research Club adviser, for his guidance and his vision.

HONORING CIVIL RIGHTS ICON CLARA LUPER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the visionary and unwavering leadership of civil rights icon and notable Oklahoman Ms. Clara Luper.

Six months ago, I got to witness history as Oklahoma City commemorated the 60th anniversary of the sit-ins she organized. I rise today because, even as a fifth-generation Oklahoman, I realized how little I knew.

Clara Luper and her students sparked a movement, the sit-ins that led into

our Nation's civil rights movement. They deserve to be a household name.

Clara Luper made her mark in a time when people of color couldn't even walk into the front door of Oklahoma City businesses. They were relegated to hidden back rooms.

But she had a vision for equality, a heart for service, and a commitment to justice. She, in her words, "believed in a sun when it didn't shine and the rain when it didn't fall." She knew that Oklahoma and this country could be a place where everyone is treated with respect, dignity, and humanity.

Even as a history teacher at Dunjee High School in Spencer, Oklahoma, Ms. Luper instilled those principles in her students. Her steadfast commitment to ending racism and systemic discrimination inspired her to organize America's first sit-in.

In August 1958, she and 14 of her NAACP Youth Council students walked up to a lunch counter they knew would refuse them, and they ordered a hamburger and a Coke. They were denied, but they did not waver. They knew what was on the line because, in Ms. Luper's words, "within that hamburger was the whole essence of democracy."

At their own personal peril, they returned each day with more people until they broke the barrier. It was never easy. The protesters were verbally and physically assaulted, and Ms. Luper received death threats.

Because of Ms. Luper and her students' fearlessness and determination, the Katz Drug Stores integrated their lunch counters, not just in Oklahoma City but also in Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa.

When the 1958 sit-in happened in Oklahoma City, a group of college students in North Carolina were inspired by what had taken place in Oklahoma City, and they took note. In 1961, those students launched the Greensboro, North Carolina, sit-in at the Woolworth lunch counter, which fueled momentum within the civil rights movement.

It didn't end there. For years, Ms. Luper and others continued their fight. The sacrifices continued, too.

Authorities arrested Ms. Luper 26 times during her fight for freedom. Clara Luper empowered young people to imagine a future brighter than their present and taught them how to make that future a reality.

She changed lives and planted seeds of ethical leadership into those who were lucky enough to be mentored by her. Each of her former students talks about the pivotal role Ms. Luper played in instilling confidence, character, and dignity in them.

Generations reap the benefit of her sacrifice and efforts to integrate not only businesses in Oklahoma City but educational spaces.

Ms. Luper integrated the history department at the University of Oklahoma, becoming the first Black graduate of that master's program. Her contributions are reflected across our

own State, in a namesake scholarship program at Oklahoma City University, a corridor on the northeast side of Oklahoma City, a classroom at the University of Central Oklahoma, by the designation of the Oklahoma City Public Schools District building as The Clara Luper Center, and naming the African American studies department at the University of Oklahoma after her.

As a lifelong Oklahoman and representative of the Fifth Congressional District, and as an American, I recognize how we are beneficiaries of Clara Luper's efforts to create a more just and equitable place to live. I cannot and will not take that history and impact for granted.

Although we have come so far because of her sacrifices and the sacrifices of other heroes during the civil rights era, there is so much work to be done. Even with the number of accolades given to her, the best way we can honor Ms. Luper is to uphold her legacy through commitment to justice and equality in the policies that we propose.

She knew that democracy is not a spectator sport. It is our duty as a Congress and as Americans to make good on the constitutional promise of establishing justice and ensuring domestic tranquility, so we must continue to work for an inclusive, equitable place for everyone to live and feel safe, as well as to build an economy where every American has the opportunity to thrive.

Thank you to the sit-inners, and thank you to Clara Luper for your resilience and for giving us the torch to carry.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 26 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Father Philip G. Salois, American Legion National Chaplain, North Smithfield, Rhode Island, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we beseech You to pour forth Your grace and blessings on all who gather to do the work that the people of America elected them to do.

We pray for peace and harmony when we disagree. We pray for the strength and will to work out our differences and to come up with the best solutions that will benefit society as a whole.

Watch over and protect the men and women in uniform, and safeguard them from all harm. And we pray You to bring them home safely to their families and friends.

We especially remember those who are held prisoner in foreign lands, those missing in action, as we continue to seek them out and bring them home to their loved ones.

We make this prayer in Your name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California 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.

WELCOMING FATHER PHILIP G. SALOIS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Father Philip Salois, who delivered today's opening prayer.

Father Phil is a native of Woonsocket, Rhode Island, and now lives in North Smithfield, Rhode Island, a community that I am proud to represent today in Congress.

He served our country in uniform during the Vietnam war as a combat infantryman and earned the Silver Star for his valor.

After his service to our country, Father Phil felt called to service in another capacity. He was ordained into the priesthood on June 10, 1984.

A few years later, Father Phil joined the Veterans Administration in Boston, where he served as chief of the chaplain service from 1993 to 2005.

Today, he continues to minister to veterans in Rhode Island and all across America. We owe all of our service-members and their families an incredible debt of gratitude.

The men and women of the United States Armed Forces represent our country's most important values of service, honor, courage, and sacrifice. This is especially true of Father Phil, who represents the very best of our country and my home State of Rhode Island.

I thank him for his service to our country and for being here today to

offer the beautiful opening prayer. We are truly honored by his presence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, President Trump falsely declared that there was a national emergency occurring at our southern border.

The real emergency that he should be focusing on is the devastating gun violence epidemic that has torn communities apart across our country, including my own, where we are still mourning the loss of 12 precious lives at the Borderline Bar & Grill in Thousand Oaks, California.

This week, the House will vote on the first major gun safety legislation in decades. While there is no single answer that will stop all gun violence, H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112 are commonsense, bipartisan steps to strengthen our background check system to keep deadly firearms out of the hands of those we agree should not have them.

If the President is serious about addressing national emergencies, he should join us in supporting these bills.

CONGRATULATING MEP

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology is celebrating 30 years of success. I am grateful to recognize the achievement of MEP in South Carolina.

Senator Fritz Hollings of South Carolina introduced the legislation that led to the creation of the program. It later was renamed in his honor.

The MEP has served over 26,000 companies. It has earned support in Congress for assisting small- to mid-sized manufacturers.

I am grateful that the South Carolina MEP has generated almost \$380 million in new investment and created 1,361 jobs. It generated almost \$2.7 billion in statewide economic impact.

In the Second Congressional District, it helped to create and retain 989 jobs last year and brought in over \$30 million in new investment.

I commend these employers for creating jobs in South Carolina and nationwide.

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

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, for decades, lobbyists have stifled our national conversation about gun violence and Congress has refused to act.

Since Parkland, Thousand Oaks, and so many others, new voices have broken through. Student activists have marched, organized—alongside moms—and insisted that we take their safety seriously.

This week we do just that, by passing H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112. This will be a sea change.

And it shouldn't be controversial. Mr. Speaker, 97 percent of Americans support background checks—that is Democrats and Republicans—including 94 percent of gun-owning households.

Six years ago, I was there when the Pennsylvania House Judiciary Committee held its first hearing on background checks.

In her courageous testimony, Sandy Hook mother Francine Wheeler described losing her son Ben. She said:

When this happens to you—when my child was murdered, I no longer have the fear to stand up and to say what is right and what I believe.

And then Francine asked a crucial question:

If we all agree dangerous individuals shouldn't have guns, then shouldn't we at least take the most basic steps to make sure they don't?

I look forward to the passage of these bills.

RECOGNIZING DELEGATES OF THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR LEARNING DISABILITIES

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very impressive group of individuals visiting the Capitol this week.

Delegates of the National Center for Learning Disabilities have traveled from all over the country to advocate for themselves and their peers.

When it comes to learning, each of us must deal with our own unique challenges. These young people face some particularly difficult obstacles, including dyslexia and dysgraphia, which interfere with the brain's ability to interpret information.

But they have not let these obstacles prevent them from doing great things. They have persevered, working hard, not just for their own success but for the future success of others.

By traveling to Washington to share their stories and discuss opportunities for governmental and societal change, these young adults have demonstrated deep commitment to the community of those who have learning disabilities.

I admire their dedication and hope to use my role as co-chair of the Congressional Dyslexia Caucus to help them in these efforts. May they be encouraged to keep up their great work.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, I had a conversation with one of my constituents that I think about often.

She told me about when she sent her 5-year-old son off to his first week of kindergarten in the Loudoun County Public Schools. He came home from school one day, and he told her: Mommy, we had an emergency drill today. My place to hide is behind the backpacks.

Like a backpack is going to stop a round from an AR-15.

And she decided right then and there that we need to do better for our kids and that she needed to do something. Her way of doing something was to start the Loudoun chapter of Moms Demand Action.

Now she and millions more like her have sent us here to do something about gun violence.

We may not be able to stop every school shooting, every act of gun violence, but shouldn't we at least try to stop some? Because if we won't do that we shouldn't be here.

Today, for the first time in decades, the United States Congress will vote on meaningful gun violence prevention legislation. We will vote on and pass H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, and I will proudly vote "yes" because these checks will save lives.

HONORING OLYMPIC CHAMPION BARNEY EWELL

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Black History Month to honor an Olympic champion and truly one of the greatest athletes my district has ever produced: Mr. Henry Norwood, otherwise known as "Barney," Ewell.

Mr. Ewell was born into poverty and grew up in Lancaster. He attended McCaskey High School and later went on to attend Penn State. He served his country for 4 years, from 1941 to 1945, during World War II.

He became known as the fastest man in the world after he broke the world record for the 50-yard dash in 1940. He went on to win one gold and two silver medals at the 1948 Olympics in London.

I know people who still recall cheering on the streets in Lancaster City after Barney Ewell returned from London, having won the medals for our country and for our community.

Mr. Ewell was an inspiration to Lancaster City, and it is an honor to highlight his story today.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, in June 2016, a gunman opened fire in the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, killing 49 people, including Jerry Wright, a Miami Heat fan who loved to dance.

Jerry Wright's parents, Fred and Maria, know that their son's death was preventable but, more than that, that it was not unusual.

Nearly 40,000 people die because of guns every year, and that is why Fred and Maria lead the local Moms Demand Action group in my district. I am so proud to learn from them and work with them on commonsense gun safety in Miami-Dade and around the country.

By mandating universal background checks for every gun sale, we can be a step closer to ensuring that, when our children go to school, to concerts, to movie theaters, to clubs, they do so safely, they do so without worrying that this dance might be their last.

Fred and Maria Wright aren't asking for an overhaul of the Second Amendment; they are just asking for the adoption of commonsense solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in preventing firearms from falling into the wrong hands by supporting H.R. 8.

EMERGENCY DECLARATION

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support President Trump's declaration of a national emergency at the U.S.-Mexico border.

Sophisticated cartels—some of the most dangerous criminals and terrorist organizations in the world—are partnering with foreign adversaries, including Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, and China smuggling drugs, as well as human beings, into our country.

Mexican cartels produce or distribute the most heroin, fentanyl, cocaine, and methamphetamine here, killing tens of thousands of Americans annually.

My constituents are suffering from the opioid epidemic.

MS-13 and other violent gangs have infiltrated recent migrant caravans; however, the equivalent of a migrant caravan crosses the border almost weekly.

These forces are destabilizing and deadly to people on both sides, particularly for the less fortunate among us.

Under legal authority Congress has granted the executive branch—which Barack Obama also used to combat cartels and illegal immigration—the President, the power to declare a national emergency to fund construction of the new border barriers at dangerous weak points.

As a fiscal conservative, constitutionalist, and strong advocate for the

military, I believe the need is clear and pressing, the law supports immediate action, and ample funding exists to address this crisis.

□ 1215

BACKGROUND CHECKS WORK

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today is a momentous day, one that makes me proud of this Chamber. After years of inaction, Congress is moving to address our country's gun violence problem.

We have seen some of the worst mass shootings in our Nation's history in just the past few years. Las Vegas, Thousand Oaks, Sutherland Springs, Parkland, Sandy Hook—these are only a few of the names that recently shocked us to the core. And, sadly, each time, Congress failed to act.

But today—today—we are offering more than thoughts and prayers. We are offering legislation. This bill has bipartisan support—finally, something we can all agree on.

Strengthening our background check system is a small but a very important first step. We simply cannot allow criminals to take advantage of loopholes.

Background checks work. They keep guns out of the hands of criminals, and background checks will save lives.

No more excuses. It is just common sense.

CLOSING BACKGROUND CHECK LOOPHOLE IS LIFE SUPPORT

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, selling a gun to a convicted felon, to a perpetrator of domestic violence, to a fugitive from justice, merits a jail term, but those who oppose this reasonable background check bill are enabling just that.

Someone who couldn't buy a .22 inside a gun shop can, today, go outside that shop and buy a military-style killing machine and get away with it.

Doctors Seth Goldstein and Lisa Epstein, who visited my office this very week on behalf of Moms Demand Action, and 117 San Antonio physicians, they have a view that is different from Members of Congress concerning the result of gun violence. They witness this violence in the emergency room after young bodies are torn apart.

What a different view this debate would have if it were occurring amidst the pain, violence, and blood in a hospital emergency room, because closing this loophole is about life support.

We have got to end the trauma. Let's join the doctors who are out there seeking to save lives and do our part to save lives by passing this bill.

BACKGROUND CHECK BILL

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, more than 500 Pennsylvanians are murdered with guns each year, causing untold suffering and tearing our communities apart. Pennsylvanians are crying out for commonsense legislation to stop the bloodshed, legislation like H.R. 8, the bill before us today.

Now, nobody thinks that universal background checks would eliminate gun violence, but the facts suggest that they would reduce it.

In 2017, the Pennsylvania State Police ran over a million background checks on would-be gun purchasers. The vast majority of purchases were approved within a few minutes. But 13,000 were stopped, and the background checks led to the arrest of 150 wanted fugitives and the arrest and conviction of 500 other individuals for illegally attempting to obtain a firearm. Those background checks put some bad guys in jail, and they probably saved some lives as well.

Let's help our police enforce the laws that keep guns out of dangerous hands. Vote for the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

BALANCING GUN RIGHTS WITH SAFE COMMUNITIES

(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, I rise today to take a stand in support of H.R. 8, which takes a critical first step to ensure that every person who purchases a gun undergoes a background check.

People should have the right to feel safe from gun violence in their community, including at home, at work, and at school. Unfortunately, that is not the case today in our country. Time and time again, our communities have experienced gun violence due to the absence of commonsense gun safety measures.

Only 12 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 horrific act of gun violence.

It is time to take immediate action to help safeguard our communities from gun violence, and today, for the first time in more than two decades, the House of Representatives will vote on a major gun safety bill, and I will support it.

H.R. 8 is a strong step toward making our communities safer, and I look forward to continuing to work on commonsense legislation that balances gun rights with the safety of our communities.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand here today as we work to pass gun violence prevention legislation.

I would like to share a letter from a fifth grader constituent of mine, Alex, from Northfield, Illinois, that perfectly explains why we must pass H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112.

Alex writes: "I don't want to see innocent people dying for no reason. I want all children to feel safe at school. I want all adults to feel safe at work. I want all people to feel safe in their city. I think stronger gun laws will help and also make sure that everyone that buys a gun has to have a thorough background check."

Well, Alex, you are absolutely right, and we are about to finally ensure that everyone who purchases a gun undergoes a comprehensive background check. The next step is banning assault weapons.

This fifth grader and students around the country are telling us to do something real to make them safer, and finally, at long last, the House of Representatives will take action today.

BEER CAN APPRECIATION/ ALUMINUM BILL

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the critical role that brewers and beer importers play in our Nation's economy.

American beverage companies and brewers employ more than 2.2 million people nationwide, providing more than \$103 billion in wages and benefits. In my home State of Colorado, breweries have become a significant component of my State's culture and economy.

But in order to compete, American beverage companies and brewers need a fair and transparent pricing system for aluminum. That is why I along with my friend, Mr. LAWSON from Florida, are introducing legislation this week giving the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission oversight authority of the aluminum market. These unfair market practices have not only cost the beverage and brewing industries hundreds of millions of dollars, they have also had harmful effects on consumers.

With the help of the CFTC, I hope we can resolve these pricing irregularities that have been plaguing the market so our Nation's beverage companies and brewers can continue to produce some of America's most popular beverages.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 145 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1225

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, with Mr. BLUMENAUER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that today we are considering H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. We have promised the American people that Congress would take steps to reduce gun violence, and this bill is a critical first step toward doing so.

During the past 4 weeks, as the Judiciary Committee, and now the full House, have discussed the issue of gun violence, I have cited grim statistics. Nearly 40,000 Americans lost their lives because of guns in 2017. In fact, every day in America, on average, 34 people are murdered with a firearm, and more than 183 people are injured in an attack.

Gun violence of this magnitude is a distinctly American problem. A country-to-country comparison is shocking. For example, in 2011, the United Kingdom had 146 deaths due to gun violence; Denmark, 71; Portugal, 142; and Japan, just 30. The United States, that year, about 35,000.

A recent study in the American Journal of Medicine found that, compared to 22 other high-income countries, the gun-related murder rate in the United States is 25 times higher. Even when you adjust for population differences, Americans are disproportionately killed by gun violence.

Almost 25 years to the day after the Brady Act was first implemented, expanding our current background check requirement to cover virtually all gun transfers is one of the steps we must take to address this crisis.

Under current law, only licensed firearms dealers are required to conduct a background check before transferring a gun to another person. This means that gun shows, online sales, and other private sales can completely evade this vital tool for ensuring that guns do not get into the wrong hands. It is time to close this dangerous loophole.

This bill would make it illegal for any person who is not a licensed firearm importer, manufacturer, or dealer to transfer a firearm to any other person who is not so licensed without a background check. Individuals seeking to transfer a firearm under this measure would be required to visit a licensed firearms dealer to run the necessary background check before the transfer could be finalized.

The bill also provides a number of exceptions to this requirement, including gifts to family members and transfers for hunting, target shooting, and instances of imminent death or great bodily harm.

The FBI's internal assessment demonstrated that checks processed through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, often called NICS, are approximately 99.3 percent to 99.8 percent accurate, and in 90 percent of cases, the background checks are completed within 90 seconds. H.R. 8 will provide an accurate and speedy mechanism to help ensure firearms do not end up in the wrong hands.

There is no reason to continue to make it easy for people who are legally prohibited from possessing firearms to acquire them by circumventing the background check process. H.R. 8 would close this dangerous loophole and save many, many lives. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this vital legislation today.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8, the so-called Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. This is bad legislation that fails to make anyone safer in any regard.

I have been listening here, sitting on the floor for just the last few minutes and listening to those who came up and were happy about this bill coming forward today, and they mentioned many acts of mass violence and situations that have happened. The sad part about it is they claim this is the answer and the first step. In actuality, it is, at best, a side step, and it may actually be a step backwards and will not do what it is being claimed to do.

All this legislation will do is burden law-abiding citizens wishing to exercise their Second Amendment rights, including defending themselves from the gun-toting criminals this bill does nothing to combat.

□ 1230

H.R. 8 foolishly presumes criminals who flout existing laws will suddenly

submit themselves to background checks.

Are Members who support this bill delusional enough to think a criminal trading cocaine to another criminal for a firearm will give consideration to H.R. 8 and go to the nearest gun store to submit to a background check? That is absurd.

Most of us will agree that criminals are not going to do that anyway. My concern is what it actually does in practice to those who are not criminals.

Not only is it foolish to think they will start following the law, it is also foolish to think it is going to in any way make our country safer.

My Democratic friends have exploited every mass shooting, calling for universal background checks, but H.R. 8 would not have stopped a single mass shooting.

These strategies do, however, share one thing in common. Over and over, we see issues of mental health and missed opportunities for authorities to intercede.

Let me just say, Mr. Chair, I share the concern. I am going to share, in just a moment, actual, real things that actually could make a difference in helping to stem the tide of mass violence in our country. But doing this, we have to understand that this bill does not do that, and what may make you feel good may not heal you. That has to be understood.

Look at the recent workplace shooting in Illinois, where the gunman murdered five people. That could have been prevented, but not by H.R. 8. All law enforcement had to do was enforce existing law. The gunman was prohibited from possessing firearms.

In January 2014, he was issued an Illinois firearm owner's identification card. That March, he applied to buy a handgun from a gun dealer. Five days later, he took possession of the gun, having inexplicably passed a background check. That month, he applied for a concealed carry permit. During a background check for the permit, his felony conviction was flagged.

Illinois police revoked his firearm card and sent him a letter telling him to relinquish the firearm. Not surprisingly, the felon did not comply. Had authorities seized the firearm between March 2014 and February 2019, they could have saved five lives.

Aurora, Illinois, is not the only missed opportunity to prevent tragedy. We know about missed opportunities in Parkland; Aurora, Colorado; Sutherland Springs; Virginia Tech; and others.

The common problem here, Mr. Chair, is clear. It is not a lack of background checks.

With H.R. 8, Democrats refuse to acknowledge the human factors leading to these events, but Republicans have a bill to help law enforcement coordinate responses to mental health concerns and other mass violent threat information.

You know what else H.R. 8 doesn't address? The primary ways criminals acquire firearms. Last month, DOJ revealed nearly half of criminals obtained firearms via theft or the black market. The survey also revealed that a mere 0.8 percent of criminals purchased their firearms at gun shows.

If this bill won't prevent mass shootings and address violent crime, what will it do? It will keep law-abiding citizens from protecting themselves. Under this bill, Mr. Chair, a battered woman with a protection order against her abuser who borrows a firearm for self-defense would be a criminal. It would criminalize the selling of a firearm without a background check to someone with a valid permit allowing them to possess, acquire, or carry a firearm. If that person walked into a gun store, they could present that permit and not undergo a NICS check.

On the other hand, there are solutions to prevent mass violence and gun crime. The Mass Violence Prevention Act, which I introduced earlier this week, is one. The MVP Act directly addresses challenges in law enforcement coordination and response. It would reduce the flow of firearms into the black market, and it would bolster law enforcement's ability to prosecute criminals for firearm offenses.

If reducing gun violence, Mr. Chair, is the Democrats' concern, the MVP Act is legislation that we should be considering today, not H.R. 8. Talk to me or my staff about cosponsoring this evidence-based, commonsense legislation. Unlike H.R. 8, the MVP Act could have prevented tragedies such as Parkland.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, my Democratic colleagues, by putting this forward and continuing the same narrative, are not actually interested in stopping gun violence. I take the intent to be good; I do not question the motive. All of us in our life do not want to see the tragedies unfold. But this is not the way forward.

This is another thing put out to the very ones who have suffered, telling them we are helping them, while at the same time not telling them the truth about the bill, a bill that guts its own ability to enforce itself, a bill that actually, possibly, would keep people from purchasing firearms because of an unlimited price of a background check.

The question that I have about this bill, Mr. Chair, is not what actually could happen with this. It is what actually will be hurt by this as we move forward.

With that, I believe that we are being misled. The victims of mass violence are being misled by this bill, H.R. 8, because it would not stop what they have been promised that it would stop.

Mr. Chair, for that, I am profoundly sorry. But because of that, I call on my colleagues to reject H.R. 8 and to support real solutions.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. BASS), the chairperson of the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, which will extend the current Federal background check requirement to unlicensed sellers of guns.

It is about time that Congress takes this issue seriously, and I am pleased that this bipartisan bill has been brought to the House floor with the urgency this issue deserves.

In recent years, our Nation has experienced an increase in mass shootings, and our Nation is appropriately horrified. However, mass shootings are just one symptom of our gun violence epidemic. The daily toll of shootings occurs in communities across our country, on our streets, in our schools, and even in our houses of worship.

As Aalayah Eastmond testified before the Judiciary Committee earlier this month, 1 year after the terrible shooting that took the lives of 17 students and staff and injured 17 others at her high school in Parkland, Florida: "Minority communities bear the heaviest burden of gun violence in this country."

The impact on our young people is simply unacceptable. Every day, 47 children and teens are shot in this country. Eight of these young people die, and 39 are shot and survive.

Citizens across this country such as Diane Latiker, who also testified before the committee, are taking it upon themselves to organize and engage in community-based efforts to reduce gun violence and to assist the young people it affects. We in Congress must match their courage and commitment with action of our own.

I support H.R. 8 because it will reduce gun violence by narrowing the avenues for criminals and other prohibited persons from obtaining guns.

Certainly, there is no single change to our gun laws that will prevent every shooting, but enacting measures that will help prevent some of them is clearly the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill does not narrow—in fact, it continues the process of those who are going to receive guns. Much of the daily toll that we see is actually coming from those who are already violating laws currently on the books. It is time we actually enforce those as well.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8 is brought to us by the same groups and politicians who have made no secret of their desire to ultimately strip law-abiding citizens of their right to defend themselves. Now, they can't do that outright; they know

that. So they do it through cynical measures like this, which weave a web of laws so intricate, that, sooner or later, everyone can be caught up in them.

This law affects not just transfer of ownership, but any transfer of weapon for any period of time. Suppose you exchange shotguns with a friend on a hunt and then separate for a period of time, or you loan a gun to your next-door neighbor of 20 years who is being victimized by a stalker, or you give a gun to your stepson or your great-grandson. Under any of these innocent scenarios and countless more like them, you are guilty of a Federal crime.

These flaws were all pointed out to the bill's sponsors, and none were addressed. Why not? I think the reason should be obvious.

Last October, a 10-year study by Johns Hopkins and UC Davis concluded that California's universal background check law had no effect on gun homicides or suicides—none.

The purpose of this bill is not public safety. That is just a deceptive facade. Its true purpose is to make gun ownership so legally hazardous, so fraught with legal booby traps and draconian penalties, that no honest and law-abiding citizen would want to take the risk of gun ownership.

Most criminals already get their guns illegally and are unconstrained by laws like this. Make no mistake, this is aimed squarely at law-abiding citizens, moving us closer to a society where decent people are defenseless and armed criminals are kings.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, we have a gun violence epidemic in this country. For 8 years, we have marked it with moments of silence and doing nothing, saying nothing and doing nothing. But today, that changes with passage of H.R. 8 for universal background checks.

We know universal background checks work, because since the passage of the Brady bill, 3.5 million illegal gun sales were prevented. But, of course, there is a huge loophole. Millions and millions of gun sales happen without a background check at all. In fact, one in five, 22 percent, of guns are sold with no background check. That means criminals, domestic abusers, and people prohibited due to mental illness can get a gun. This bill changes that.

We also know that States that have enhanced background checks have lower rates of gun homicides, gun suicide rates, and gun trafficking.

This is a commonsense bill to protect the American people from the scourge of gun violence.

Finally, after 8 years of pleading with our Republican colleagues to do something about gun violence in this country, to take up a bill—we had a sit-in to try to force a vote—finally,

today, we are taking our first step to reduce gun violence in this country by passing H.R. 8.

Finally, we will see Members of Congress standing up to the power of the gun lobby and doing what is right for the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I remind the Chair that we did pass Fix NICS last year. We did take into account—those things have been done. We just simply are not moving a bill that we don't feel works, and we actually have offered an alternative.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you that H.R. 8 will do little more than further burden law-abiding gun owners. Without an unconstitutional Federal gun registry, this bill is impossible to enforce.

There is no gun show loophole. Federal law is the same regardless of where a firearm sale takes place. Federal law requires all firearms dealers to be licensed and to initiate a background check before transferring a firearm to a nondealer, regardless of where that transfer takes place.

As for nondealers, Federal law prohibits transferring a firearm to anyone known or believed to be prohibited from possessing firearms. That is already the law.

According to DOJ, less than 1 percent of criminals in State prison for firearm crimes get their firearms from dealers or nondealers at gun shows. According to ATF, 6 percent of Federal armed career criminals got their firearms from dealers or nondealers at gun shows.

Online sales loophole: There is no online sales loophole. The Federal law is the same regardless of how people communicate about selling or buying a firearm.

Federal law prohibits anyone, licensed firearm dealer or not, from shipping a firearm to a person who lives in another State unless the receiver is also a dealer. Dealers must document all firearms they receive.

H.R. 8 also fails to include many of the realistic exceptions to the new background check requirements for private transfers, such as transfers between law enforcement officers outside of their duties, transfers to concealed carry permit holders, transfers to museums or licensed collectors, transfers to Active Duty military, and many more.

H.R. 8 includes an exception to the background check transfer if the transfer is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm. But that transfer is only allowed for the length of time that it is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm. It doesn't even define those terms.

What about a false alarm? Does it extend to domestic violence fears if the person is not getting attacked immediately? Gun rights groups have argued

that without a definition, this provision would only provide protection in instances where it is likely too late for the victim to make it out safely.

Finally, H.R. 8 would not have prevented any of the recent high-profile shootings. In those cases, the shooter either passed a Federal background check or stole the firearms they used.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the chief author of this legislation and the chairman of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

Mr. Chair, first, I thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman NADLER for their support. Gun violence is a true national emergency, and I am glad that we are moving so early in this Congress to address this crisis.

Mr. Chair, I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who recognize the importance of passing this legislation, Representatives KING, FITZPATRICK, MAST, UPTON, and SMITH, who stand with more than 90 percent of Americans who support universal background checks.

□ 1245

This bill will require a background check on all firearm sales and most transfers. Mr. Chairman, I am a life-long gun owner. I am a hunter and I support the Second Amendment. If this bill did anything to erode the rights of lawful gun owners, I wouldn't support it and it wouldn't have my name on it.

Background checks work. Every day, they stop 170 felons and 50 domestic abusers from getting a gun from a licensed dealer. But, in some States, those same people can go into a gun show or go online and buy a gun without a background check. This bill will help stop them from doing so.

Some will argue that criminals won't follow the law. If that is the case, then why do we have laws against murder? People still commit murder. Why do we have laws against stealing? People still steal. This is flawed logic, and don't fall for it.

This bill is supported by law enforcement, medical professionals, veterans, gun owners, religious leaders, and the millions of Americans who took to the streets in support of H.R. 8.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this bill and honor the lives lost with action. No more moments of silence with no action to follow. Today, your thoughts and your prayers aren't enough. Today, you can vote, "yes".

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 8, a bill that criminalizes gun transfers between law-abiding citizens who have no criminal record and no criminal intent.

The bill includes several flawed and unworkable exceptions. Take the law enforcement exception. It allows the police to transfer a firearm, but criminalizes transfers to law enforcement.

Under this bill, a parent whose child finds a gun in a park commits a Federal crime if the parent surrenders the gun to police.

Under this bill, a citizen commits a Federal crime if they participate in a local gun buy-back program.

Under this bill, an attorney commits a Federal crime when they turn a client's gun over to the police to clear the client through ballistics testing.

Will criminalizing cooperation with law enforcement make us safer? The majority apparently thinks so, and I think it is crazy.

The Democrats' bill gives special privileges to the bodyguards of the wealthy elite, like former Mayor Bloomberg, who is funding the special interest advocacy for this bill. He can afford to hire bodyguards. But average Americans, who rely on the Second Amendment as their source of personal protection, are not given similar protections.

Nothing should be more offensive to this body than a bill that denies citizens their endowed rights while giving wealthy elites special protections, privileges, and dispensations. But that is H.R. 8.

Take the family exception; the rule allows a vote on an amendment to ensure that transfers between parent and child include stepparents and stepchildren. What about transfers between a foster parent and foster child? This bill says foster relationships are not worthy of the same respect and equal treatment. Every Member of this body should be ashamed to vote for this bill that reflects such terrible policy and discrimination.

Take the Good Samaritan exception, allowing transfers where a threat of death or harm is imminent. Imminent means death is menacingly near, a standard so strict that it is, frankly, too late to transfer a gun once it is obvious a gun is needed for protection.

Under this standard, it is illegal to loan a gun to a victim of domestic violence for her protection until the transferor is practically witnessing a murder in progress.

This standard would also prevent a gun owner who has intermittent suicidal thoughts, a known side-effect of certain prescription medications, from legally transferring a gun—his own gun—to a friend for safekeeping.

Because this bill criminalizes transfers between law-abiding Americans, while doing nothing to curb criminals' access to guns, this bill provides the American public with a false sense of security.

Because this bill includes unworkable exceptions that will mislead people

into thinking a gun transfer is legal when it is not, this bill provides law-abiding gun owners with a false sense of immunity.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this totally and completely unconstitutional legislation that would deprive people of their constitutional rights to keep and bear arms.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a member of the committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today marks a very pivotal moment in our fight to prevent gun violence and to ensure the safety of every community across our Nation.

I thank the more than 230 of my colleagues who have cosponsored H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. I thank Chairman NADLER, Speaker PELOSI, Congressman THOMPSON, and Congressman KING for making gun violence prevention a priority in this Congress. I am so proud to be an original cosponsor of this historic legislation.

As many of you may know, gun violence is an issue that is deeply personal for me. Gun violence prevention and a desire to make meaningful change is the very reason I am here today, in this legislative body, speaking to every one of you.

In 2012, my son, Jordan Davis, was shot and killed by a man who opened fire on a car of unarmed teenagers at a gas station in Jacksonville, Florida. My son was only 17 years of age. Jordan would have turned 24 this month.

After my son's death, I dedicated my entire life to advocating for commonsense gun safety solutions, but it was the shooting at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, last year, that finally motivated me to join this legislative body.

The overwhelming bipartisan support for universal background checks symbolizes the power of advocacy and the incredible power of the survivors, family members, and students who have shared their stories as they advocate for commonsense gun safety solutions and demand that we act to address gun violence.

Today, we are truly taking this action. H.R. 8 will ensure that mothers and fathers have one less reason to worry. It will give students one less thing to fear when they walk into a school. Most importantly, it will make our communities and our Nation a safer place to live, and every human being in America deserves such.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. It is time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation claims to be a solution to gun violence, yet

does nothing to actually solve the real problems that contribute to this crisis. As it stands now, this legislation does nothing to make our schools, churches, or communities safer. In fact, it only infringes on the constitutionally guaranteed Second Amendment rights of law-abiding American citizens, something I cannot support.

This bill will criminalize the private transfer of firearms and will make exercising basic constitutional rights impossibly expensive for millions of law-abiding Americans. Not to mention, it is essentially unenforceable without a national gun registry. But, let's be honest, that is where my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to end up: registering firearms so they can systematically take them away. We must stop our Nation from falling down this slippery slope.

I think we can all agree that something needs to be done to stop the illegal ownership and misuse of firearms, but H.R. 8 is not the answer. This legislation would have done nothing to prevent many of the prominent tragedies that occurred in my home State of Florida.

The shooter at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland passed a background check. The shooter at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando passed a background check. And, just weeks ago, a man who murdered five women in my district passed a background check.

H.R. 8 would have done nothing to stop these violent acts, just like the previous attempts to require universal background checks have done nothing to prevent actual crimes.

If Democrats are serious about gun violence, they would have voted for my amendment. I filed an amendment in committee that would have required law enforcement to be notified upon the attempt of someone to purchase a firearm and failed a background check. Law enforcement would have been notified. But instead of supporting policies that curtail legal possession of firearms, the Democrats on both the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee rejected my proposal. How is that unreasonable?

Mr. Chairman, I stand for the Constitution. I stand for freedom. And I stand for the Second Amendment. That is why I am not voting for this proposal.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will point out that the bill says:

Nothing in this act . . . shall be construed to authorize the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a national firearms registry.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for his leadership as chair of the Judiciary Committee, for bringing us to this place promptly. It is an historic day in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished colleague from California, Mr. MIKE THOMPSON, for his relentless, persistent leadership to make America safer by bringing forth commonsense background check legislation. He is a gun owner and a veteran. He has been on both sides of the gun. He is a hunter. He is an advocate for the Second Amendment. And, as he said, if this had anything to diminish that, he would not have his name on it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this strong, bipartisan bill and join Mr. THOMPSON in commending Mr. KING of New York for making this initiative bipartisan from the start, in the previous Congress and now. It is a long, overdue commonsense action to end the epidemic of gun violence in America.

Let us salute, again, the persistent leadership of so many in this body. And, again, Mr. THOMPSON, as chair of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force; he has worked in a bipartisan way to protect our communities, and we are grateful to him for that.

We can do all the inside maneuvering that we want, and that is really important and essential, but, without the outside mobilization, we cannot enjoy the success of saving lives and making progress. So I want to thank the courageous advocates who are here today, in the gallery, including March for Our Lives and Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and so many more. They have made a complete difference.

As President Lincoln said: “Public sentiment is everything. With it you can accomplish almost anything, without it almost nothing.”

I thank them for building public sentiment to a point where now about 90 percent of the American people support commonsense background check legislation, including many members, courageously, of the National Rifle Association.

This bill is proudly bipartisan because gun violence prevention should not be a Democratic or Republican issue. Gun violence does not discriminate by party or politics. It reaches into all of our communities, our schools, our places of worship, our workplaces, and our streets, and it will require all of our courage to defeat it.

Last night, we were at an occasion to mark the 25th anniversary of the Brady Bill. Some of us were in Congress at that time. Many of us here, then or not, admire the courageous work of Sarah and Jim Brady to make the country a safer place by reducing gun violence.

Twenty-five years ago, we enacted the Brady background check system, which has denied more than 3 million sales to potentially dangerous individuals. Yet, the Brady Bill does not stop people from purchasing guns from unlicensed sellers without a background check at gun shows and online.

We must pass H.R. 8 to close this dangerous loophole and keep our communities safe from gun violence. That is what we are intending to do today.

George Bernard Shaw said that: "It is the mark of a truly intelligent person to be moved by statistics," and here are the facts:

Nearly 40,000 lives are cut short every year from gun violence.

An average of 47 children and teenagers are killed by guns every single day. As I said, it is all about the children, the children, the children.

We read about the tragic mass murders that have happened in our country, and they stir us to action, hopefully. Here it has been they stir us to a moment of silence, and now, finally, to action.

□ 1300

But it is every day. Every day 47 children and teenagers killed by guns.

And, again, another figure, hearkening back to 90 percent of the American people want commonsense universal background checks.

The statistics spell out the stories, but it is the human personal stories that change minds.

How moving it was to hear our colleague, Congresswoman McBATH, with her generosity of spirit tell her personal story of losing her son, Jordan—I can't even imagine carrying that burden—but turning her grief and her tragedy into action and courage to run for Congress, to stand on this floor and share her personal story with us. That takes real courage.

Let's hope that we all have the courage to save children's lives, everyone's lives in our country whose deaths can be avoided.

There is no person in this body whose political survival is more important than the survival of our children.

We are grateful, again, to the young people, parents, survivors across America who have told their stories, marched for their lives, and demanded change. This bill delivers that change, ensuring that people who are a danger to themselves and others cannot purchase a gun and perpetuate violence in our communities.

This week, the House will build on this progress by passing another bipartisan background check bill. We must close the Charleston loophole that enabled the horrific hate crime at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church.

We salute the majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, for his leadership on H.R. 1112.

Tomorrow, we will vote on that. That is another part of strengthening the background check provisions.

As Members of Congress, again, we take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, the American people. To honor that oath, to honor the victims of gun violence and their families, Congress must take real action on this floor. Today, we must pass this bill and take the first steps toward ending the senseless crisis of gun violence in our Nation.

Again, I hope that all of us will have the courage to save lives, remembering

that no one's political survival here is more important than the survival of the American people—especially our children.

I urge a strong bipartisan "yes" vote and pray that we can do the right thing and send a clear message to the families of those who have lost their loved ones to gun violence, that we have crossed a threshold here today to reduce gun violence in our country and take more steps to improve the safety of the American people, honoring the Constitution of the United States, respectful of our hunters and the need for people to defend themselves, but doing so in a way that does not endanger others.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I agree. I believe facts are important, and I believe the strength to tell that. I believe the chairman just redid that. He exactly explained why this bill will not operate because of the very fact that, inside the bill itself, it does not have a registry, which I will remind the Chair that the Department of Justice under President Obama said a universal background check bill will not work without a registry and is on the websites of many advocates for this bill. That is just one of the areas that we look at as we go forward in realizing that this has already gutted itself when we look at the bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the previous speaker, the Speaker of the House, reminding us all that it is California where Michael Bloomberg and the gun control advocates have established their utopia of a land without guns. And what has it led us to? With some of the strictest gun control laws in the land, we have some of the worst incidents of gun violence in the country.

Gun control measures do not address the problems of gun violence, and this bill will not address gun violence.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8. The legislation is an attempt to take away our Second Amendment rights, hidden under the guise that we will see a reduction in violent crime.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim the bill would save lives, but nothing in this bill would have stopped any of the recent mass casualty shootings that have occurred in our country. The only thing this bill does is limit the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

They will tell you this bill closes loopholes; however, the loophole that they believe exists is private gun ownership, and what they really want is to regulate the private transfer of firearms. If my neighbor is in trouble and needs to borrow a firearm to protect his family, I should be allowed to loan that firearm to my neighbor so that he can protect himself and his family.

This is not something we should need to go to the Federal Government to get

permission to do. The Second Amendment does not say that, after you get permission from the government, your right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution to protect us from the government and gave individuals the Second Amendment to protect themselves.

I carry this Constitution every day on the campaign trail asphalt. I carry it with me every day now to remind myself of those protections that were given to us—not by government, but by God.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt to advance the agenda of radical gun-grabbers and lay the foundation for a national gun registration scheme. Mr. Chair, I urge the House to reject this misguided legislation so we can begin having real discussions about ways to reduce crime across this great Nation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a member of the committee.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise today to express my strong support for this bill, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act.

Since the Brady law was enacted in 1994, many American lives have been saved, murders have fallen by at least 32 percent, and our community streets are safer and stronger as a result. But our work is not done. In Houston alone, we see an average of 550 acts of gun violence per year.

Too many of our loved ones are lost to senseless gun violence that could be prevented by keeping firearms out of dangerous hands. We know expanded background checks work.

States requiring background checks on all handgun sales see half as many mass shootings as States without the expanded requirements. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 8. This commonsense bill will prevent private firearm sales to prohibit purchasers and close online and gun show loopholes.

While this bill does not cover everything, it is a step in the right direction that will make my district—Houston, Texas—and this country safer.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, may I request the time for both sides, please.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 16¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, my name is PETE STAUBER, and I was a law enforcement officer for 23 years in the great State of Minnesota, the city of Duluth.

In December of 1995, at 10:32 p.m., at the intersection of 6th Avenue East and 4th Street in Duluth, Minnesota, a criminal who should not have had a

firearm tried to take my life. I was shot in the head, and by the grace of God, I survived.

A few years after that, while on duty in a hostage situation, another criminal pulled a gun on me. Face-to-face, I was staring down the barrel of a handgun. The suspect pulled the trigger. The gun malfunctioned, and I was in a fight for my life. When it was all over, by the grace of God, I was alive. The individual was handcuffed.

Both those individuals were career criminals.

Back to when I was shot in the head, Mr. Chair: I begged the U.S. attorney, along with our police department, to charge the individual with possession of a handgun by a felon. They didn't do it. That individual was allowed to circumvent our community for another 8 years before he was finally put in prison, where he belonged. No more harming other people.

Representative COLLINS' Mass Violence Prevention Act gets the county attorneys and our Federal attorneys present to prosecute these individuals who have no respect for life.

I carried a handgun for 23 years, Mr. Chair, as a tool to defend my life or somebody else's life from great bodily harm. I support the individual right of law-abiding citizens, the right to keep and bear arms.

Both my wife and I live in rural Minnesota. When we need to protect ourselves, when it takes awhile for law enforcement to get there, we have the ability.

There is nobody I know who wants somebody who is going through a mental health issue or a career criminal or a drug dealer to have these.

We need to start respecting life. Life is precious, from conception to natural death. I am a very proud husband of an Iraq war veteran who understands the value of life.

Mr. Chair, I rise against this. There are better ways to get mothers and fathers, county attorneys, Federal prosecutors, local police departments, and sheriff departments to work together to have a fusion center so, when a young individual types into a computer "I want to be a mass school shooter," there is an instant response to identify the individual and work through it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a member of the committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, we introduced H.R. 8 8 years ago after our friend and former colleague, Gabby Giffords, was shot and nearly killed.

When she was by our side to introduce the bill, she said: "Speaking is still difficult for me, but I don't think I can make myself more clear: Congress must act to make our country safer from gun violence."

Now is that time. We have waited too long to close loopholes that let people easily avoid background checks through private sales. I have cried with too many survivors and attended too

many funerals. I have marched with too many student activists, and I have bowed my head through too many moments of silence.

We know strong gun laws work. In the 25 years since the Brady law took effect, background checks have stopped more than \$3 million in gun sales and have saved countless lives.

It is time to expand the Brady law. It is time to close the dangerous loopholes. It is past time for Congress to take action to save lives from gun violence.

Mr. Chair, this is not a moment of silence. This is not a sit-in. This is action by the United States House of Representatives on behalf of everyone who has pled for that action after San Bernardino and after Sutherland Springs and after Fort Hood and after Virginia Tech and after Columbine and Sandy Hook and Las Vegas and Pulse and everyday gun violence in our communities and, yes, after Parkland.

Let's represent the 95 percent of the American people who want us to take this action to help save lives. Let's pass H.R. 8.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, before I yield to the gentlelady, it has been quoted here, especially, 90 to 95 percent of the people want universal background checks. And everything has statistics, a poll, but when actually put to the voters of Maine, the voters of Maine actually rejected it, and I understand where they are coming from on that.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, I rise today to defend the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Nebraskans.

In Nebraska, the need for firearms is the same today as it was even when the Second Amendment was enacted before we were even a territory of the United States.

Rural Nebraskans depend on their firearms for self-defense and for protecting their livestock. They also know how to handle firearms, to store them securely, to handle them appropriately, and perhaps to even let neighbors who are able to use them safely borrow them to meet their needs.

I have serious concerns. The bills we are considering today and tomorrow are going to criminalize this behavior for Nebraskans who have done this for generations and won't even know that they are breaking the law.

Should a rancher who lends a rifle to a neighbor to address threats from predatory animals face a year in prison and a \$100,000 fine? No.

Should a legally carrying farmer who is injured at work be subject to arrest for handing his firearm off before being taken to the hospital? No.

These are exactly the situations this bill would create, while doing little to address the real problems underlying crime in our society.

Mr. Chair, this is a bad bill, and I urge its swift rejection.

□ 1315

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman, and I certainly thank the ranking member for being present here today. I hold up in my hand pages and pages of mass shootings, which I will include in the RECORD.

LIST OF MASS SHOOTINGS SINCE COLUMBINE MASSACRE

(By Zayed Abdalla, Feb 20, 2018)

Below is a list of all mass shootings in the United States which occurred after the Columbine High School Massacre. Dates and death tolls (excluding the shooter) are included. Although many other mass shootings have occurred, for the sake of time and physical space, only shootings involving the death of five or more people have been included in this article.

1. Columbine High School Shooting, Littleton, Colorado—April 1999: 13 Dead
2. Atlanta Shootings, Atlanta, Georgia—July 1999: 12 Dead
3. Wedgwood Baptist Church shooting, Fort Worth, Texas—September 1999: 7 Dead
4. Xerox Killings, Honolulu, Hawaii—November 1999: 7 Dead
5. Tampa Hotel Shootings, Tampa, Florida—December 1999: 5 Dead
6. Wakefield Massacre, Wakefield, Massachusetts—December 2000: 7 Dead
7. Lockheed Martin Shooting, Median, Mississippi—July 2003: 6 Dead
8. Living Church of God Shooting, Brookfield, Wisconsin—March 2005: 7 Dead
9. Red Lake High School, Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minnesota—March 2005: 9 Dead
10. Goleta Postal Shootings, Goleta, California—January 2006: 7 Dead
11. Capitol Hill Massacre, Seattle Washington—March 2006: 6 Dead
12. West Nickel Mines Amish School, Nickel Mines, Pennsylvania—October 2006: 5 Dead
13. Tolley Square Shooting, Salt Lake City, Utah—February 2007: 5 Dead
14. Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, Virginia—April 2007: 32 Dead
15. Crandon Shooting, Crandon Wisconsin—October 2007: 6 Dead
16. Westroads Mall Shooting, Omaha Nebraska—December 2007: 8 Dead
17. Kirkwood City Council Shooting, Kirkwood, Missouri—February 2008: 6 Dead
18. Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois—February 2008: 5 Dead
19. Atlantis Plastics Shooting, Henderson Kentucky—June 2008: 5 Dead
20. Carthage Nursing Home Shooting—Carthage, North Carolina—March 2009: 8 Dead
21. Geneva County Massacre, Geneva and Samson, Alabama—March 2009: 10 Dead
22. Binghampton Shootings, Binghampton—April 2009: 13 Dead
23. Fort Hood Shooting, Fort Hood, Texas—November 2009: 13 Dead
24. Hartford Beer Distributor Shooting, Manchester, Connecticut—August 2010: 8 Dead
25. Tucson Shooting, Tucson, Arizona—January 2011: 6 Dead
26. Seal Beach Shooting, Seal Beach, California—October 2011: 8 Dead
27. Oikos University, Oakland, California—April 2012: 7 Dead
28. Seattle Café Shooting, Seattle, Washington—May 2012: 5 Dead
29. Aurora Shooting, Aurora, Colorado—July 2012: 12 Dead
30. Sikh Temple Shooting, Oak Creek, Wisconsin—August 2012: 6 Dead

31. Accent Signage Systems Shooting, Minneapolis, Minnesota—September 2012: 6 Dead
32. Sandy Hook Elementary School, Newtown, Connecticut—December 2012: 27 Dead
33. Santa Monica College, Santa Monica, California—June 2013: 5 Dead
34. Hialeah Shooting, Hialeah, Florida—July 2013: 6 Dead
35. Washington Navy Yard Shooting, Washington D.C.—September 2013: 12 Dead
36. University of California Santa Barbara, Isla Vista, California—May 2014: 6 Dead
37. Marysville Pilchuck High School, Marysville, Washington—October 2014: 4 Dead
38. Charleston Church Shooting, Charleston, South Carolina—June 2015: 9 Dead
39. Chattanooga Military Recruitment Center, Chattanooga Tennessee—July 2015: 5 Dead
40. Umpqua Community College, Roseburg, Oregon—October 2015: 9 Dead
41. San Bernardino Attack, San Bernardino, California—December 2015: 14 Dead
42. Kalamazoo Shooting Spree, Kalamazoo County, Michigan—February 2016: 6 Dead
43. Orlando Night-club Shooting, Orlando, Florida—June 2016: 49 Dead
44. Dallas Police Shooting, Dallas Texas—July 2016: 5 Dead
45. Cascade Mall Shooting, Burlington, Washington—September 2016: 5 Dead
46. Fort Lauderdale Airport Shooting, Fort Lauderdale, Florida—January 2017: 5 Dead
47. Las Vegas Shooting, Las Vegas, Nevada—October 2017: 58 Dead
48. Sutherland Springs Church, Sutherland Springs, Texas—November 2017: 26 Dead
49. Rancho Tehama Shooting, Rancho Tehama, California—November 2017: 5 Dead
50. Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, Parkland, Florida—February 2018: 17 Dead

According to The Washington Post, since 1966, 1077 individuals have been fatally shot and wounded as a result of mass shootings in which more than four people perished; Children and teenagers compose about a tenth of these fatalities. Almost 300 guns have been obtained by authorities in these shootings, and over half of them were obtained legally. The AR-15 rifle has been increasingly used in such shootings, with the latest being in this month's most recent high school shooting in Florida. It is estimated that more than 8 million of these weapons are owned in American households. The trend in mass shootings has been rising notably since 2006-07.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Moms Demand Action, and I thank all those who have offered themselves in this fight. I thank our chair, Mr. THOMPSON, for his constant and persistent work.

Through my tenure as ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, and now third in seniority on the Judiciary Committee, it has given me a picture that many have not seen, and that is that we have been fighting for gun safety legislation for almost three decades.

It seems that even though Mr. Cohen is in a hearing right now where facts are being disputed, there are no facts to dispute the fact that people die from guns. And those who get guns are never regulated.

By no means do I want you not to have a handgun to protect yourself, or to enforce gun trafficking laws, or to make sure that prosecutors prosecute

those for gun possession, but it begs the question. What is the question? The interpretation of the Second Amendment is no one should prohibit the right to bear arms. As I stand here today, there is nothing in the underlying bill that is prohibiting that.

It is simply common sense and giving dignity to those who died at the Columbine High School shooting, the Atlanta shooting, the Wedgwood Baptist Church shooting, the Lockheed Martin shooting, the Living Church of God shooting, the Red Lake High School shooting, the Northern Illinois University shooting, the Santa Fe shooting in Texas, the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting, and the Sutherland Springs church shooting in Texas.

It says that you have to have a check, a background check. It closes the gun show loophole. It gives exemptions for the issues of domestic violence and sexual assault. It allows families to transfer, and ranchers, farmers, and fishers to transfer.

My God, what more do we want? People have died. Are we not going to show that we are committed to saving lives, not to abuse the Second Amendment, to misuse it? We can bear arms. But the question is whether or not we will recognize that there are 350-plus million Americans, and there are more guns in this country than there are citizens.

I beg of my colleagues: Stop the violence. Vote for this bill.

Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong of H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019," legislation that strengthens the background check system that is already in place to purchase a firearm.

A 2013 study found that approximately 80 percent of all firearms acquired for criminal purposes were obtained from sources who were not required to run a background check and that 96 percent of inmates who were not prohibited from possessing a firearm at the time they committed their crime obtained their gun this way.

This loophole exists largely because unlicensed sellers need not conduct any background check under current law, even if the sellers sell a large number of guns.

H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019," would make it illegal for any person who is not a licensed firearm importer, manufacturer, or dealer to transfer a firearm to any other person who is not so licensed without a background check.

Individuals seeking to transfer a firearm under this measure would be required to visit a licensed firearms dealer to run the necessary background check before the transfer could be finalized.

H.R. 8 is intended to provide an accurate and speedy means of ensuring firearms do not end up in the wrong hands.

An internal assessment by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) demonstrated that the National Instant Criminal Background Checks System ("NICS") yields results that are approximately 99.3 percent to 99.8 percent accurate, and in 90 percent of cases, are processed within 90 seconds.

We must be constructive and proactive in our response to the countless mass shootings

and gun violence in our country that continue to claim so many innocent lives.

Newly released data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC") found firearm-related deaths rose for the second-straight year in 2016, largely due to spikes in gun violence.

In 2016, the new CDC report on preliminary mortality data shows that there were more than 38,000 gun-related deaths in the U.S.—4,000 more than 2015.

An Associated Press analysis of FBI data shows there were about 11,000 gun-related homicides in 2016, up from 9,600 in 2015.

Congress must act to keep our country safe through gun safety and violence deterrence.

There is nearly one mass shooting per day in the United States—355 mass shootings in 2015.

In December 2012, a gunman walked into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, and killed 20 children, 6 adults, and himself.

Since December 2012, there have been at least 1,518 mass shootings, with at least 1,715 people killed and 6,089 wounded.

On the night of October 1, 2017, a gunman opened fire on a large crowd of concertgoers at the Route 91 Harvest Music Festival on the Las Vegas Strip, leaving 58 people dead and 527 injured.

On November 5, 2017, a mass shooting occurred at the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, Texas, where the gunman, 26-year-old Devin Patrick Kelley, killed 26 and injured 20 others.

Every day, on average, 92 Americans are victims of gun violence, resulting in more than 33,000 deaths annually.

States with higher gun ownership rates have higher gun murder rates—as much as 114 percent higher than other states.

A recent study by the CDC looking at 30 years of homicide data found that for every 1 percent increase in a state's gun ownership rate, there is a nearly 1 percent increase in its firearm homicide rate.

Gun death rates are generally lower in states with restrictions such as safe storage requirements or assault weapons bans.

Mass shootings stopped by armed civilians in the past 33 years: 0.

This is why legislation put forward to arm teachers is not the solution.

Stronger legislation is needed to prevent guns from getting into the wrong hands because unfortunately, more than 75 percent of the weapons used in mass shootings between 1982 and 2012 were obtained legally.

We must look at gun violence in its totality to determine what are the root causes of these alarming rates of lives cut short.

We are elected by our constituents to lead in resolving the issues that plague our country, and the issue of gun violence is a definite plague across the nation.

My good friend, Houston Police Chief Art Acevedo, gave a statement after four of his officers were shot while on duty.

He rightfully admonished us elected officials who, so far, have accomplished absolutely nothing about the public-health epidemic of gun violence.

Thanks to the new Democratic majority in Congress, we had a long overdue Gun Safety Hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

That hearing is the first step in the legislative process of addressing the epidemic.

Chief Acevedo was a witness at that hearing, testifying that if the proposed legislation on background checks is enacted and saves at least one life, then it is worth it.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, for his leadership of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force and for introducing this timely and important legislation.

Congressman THOMPSON sat in the audience during the entirety of the Gun Safety Hearing on February 13, 2019, demonstrating his longstanding commitment to the issue.

Also helping to bring us to this point today is Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY of Illinois, who represents one of the most affected districts when it comes to gun violence.

She is a valiant leader who will not rest until the Congress finds solutions for communities like hers and others all over this country.

I want to thank Aalayah Eastmond, a survivor from the Parkland School Shooting, for testifying as a witness at the House Judiciary Gun Safety Hearing.

Her heartfelt and vivid testimony was met with a standing ovation by the crowded audience in the hearing.

Back in my state, despite incident after incident of rampant gun violence, Texas Governor Greg Abbott and Attorney General Ken Paxton, both prominent Republican opponents of gun control, issued the usual statements of offering the usual thoughts and prayers.

Chief Acevedo said, "I appreciate your prayers . . . but the question is, what are policymakers willing to do, besides prayers, to address a public-health epidemic?"

I want to answer his question—"what ARE we going to do?"

We are going to overcome the fierce opposition from House minority members.

We are going to overcome a recalcitrant and reluctant Senate.

And finally, we are going to overcome the opposition of the President and the gun lobby.

I am a defender and supporter of the Constitution.

I appreciate the Second Amendment and the right that it provides our citizens.

However, I am also a defender of the right to live, the greatest divine right of all.

I want all Americans to enjoy their Second Amendment right, but not at the expense of the lives of our children, students, communities, and law enforcement officials.

Imagine going to grade school in this day and age and having to undergo "active shooter" drills.

Imagine having children in grade school today.

Imagine the anxiety parents feel knowing that any day the precious lives of their children may be interrupted by someone with an AK-47 or AR-15.

Imagine a brighter future for America's children, one that does not include active shooter drills and funerals for adolescents.

We can help make that future a reality and we can start by voting to pass H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. Let's be very clear on this: H.R. 8 will not prevent criminals from getting their hands on firearms. What H.R. 8 will do

is violate the constitutional rights of millions of Americans.

Under this bill, almost every time a lawful gun owner wants to transfer or sell a gun, he or she will have to go through a government-sanctioned intermediary. Under this bill, no longer could I let my cousin or my neighbor borrow my gun. If this bill becomes law, overnight, millions of law-abiding gun owners could suddenly be subject to Federal prosecution. Of course, we all know that criminals are going to do what they already do: make illegal transfers of firearms.

We have heard a lot about how this is going to be the most open Congress in history. Well, Mr. Chair, I filed an amendment that would strip out the text of H.R. 8 and replace it with a nationwide concealed carry reciprocity. Mr. Chair, the Democratic leadership blocked a vote on my amendment. What are they so afraid of? I guess they think they can shield their Members from votes to protect the Second Amendment and benefit our Nation's law-abiding gun owners.

Mr. Chair, I have news for the majority. Gun owners of America are watching this debate. They know what H.R. 8 is all about, and they know that this is just a sham to chip away at the Second Amendment and our Constitution.

I will oppose this bill and any bill that goes against the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" and fighting against this assault on the Second Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, the chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan bill. Atlanta, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Parkland, Charleston, Oak Creek, Newtown, Orlando, Las Vegas, and many other places: How many more must suffer? How many more must die?

For years, the people spoke up. Mothers called. Fathers cried. Students marched. But Congress offered a blind eye or a deaf ear to their cries.

Today, we say to those who begged and pleaded for us to act that we see you. We feel your pain. We heard your cries, and we are going to answer today, now.

We sat in on this floor. I want to thank the chair of our task force, MIKE THOMPSON, for never giving up, for never giving in, for keeping the faith, for keeping your eyes on the prize. We are doing the right thing today.

We have a mission. We have an obligation and a mandate to pass this bipartisan bill that must become public law.

Today, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes." It is good. It is the right thing to do to save lives and to stop this madness.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8. I commend the efforts of Congressman MIKE THOMPSON from California for introducing this commonsense legislation.

What it simply does is require that all sales of firearms go through a licensed firearms dealer who has to run a background check. Current law mandates that all licensed gun dealers, before transferring a weapon, have to perform a background check.

The problem we have in this country is the law allows unlicensed firearms dealers competing with licensed firearms dealers to sell just as many firearms as a licensed gun dealer, but without doing the background check. That enables criminals and people who should not have weapons to have firearms, and that contributes to the proliferation of weaponry on our streets in the hands of those who should not have them.

It produces violence, and we are looking to stop the violence with this legislation, and so I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chair, today, we tell our fellow Americans that their children's right to learn without fear; that their own right to dance at a concert, worship at a synagogue, shop at the mall; that all those rights to come home, to live, and to love are greater than any other right in the Constitution.

This bill puts in place an expansion of violent history checks on firearm purchases where there were too many gaps before.

It will not end every gun violence death in America, but we should try. It also will get rid of this argument about States like California and Illinois, where you have gun violence. You can no longer say, well, they have tough background checks there, so it is not working. Well, no, we are only as safe as the lowest common denominator. If our States like Nevada and Arizona have low restrictions when it comes to purchasing a firearm, we are only as safe as they are.

We will have a nationwide background check that will make sure that all of us are safe. We are here, Mr. Chair, because of Mr. THOMPSON, because of Moms Demand Action, because of Everytown for Gun Safety, and because of March For Our Lives.

Keep marching. You got us to this point.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 8. This bill is long overdue. For too long, Congress has failed to end the cycle of gun violence and death that too many families are now familiar with.

In 2017 alone, 40,000 people died from gun violence. Congress did nothing. Last year, five reporters at the Capital Gazette in my district were murdered in cold blood in a mass shooting that took place in their newsroom. Congress did nothing.

Gun violence is a crisis in our communities and a real national emergency that will no longer be met with inaction.

For the first time since Congress passed the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1994, we will pass a bill in pursuit of our effort to protect our communities and end this scourge of gun violence.

The American people overwhelmingly want us to act. For the people, we will pass universal background checks out of the House as our first piece of comprehensive gun safety reform.

Mr. Chair, today is only the beginning.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), a member of the committee.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I am delighted that we are finally at this day, because you know the tide, you know the toll that takes place every day. On average, every day in America, 342 people are shot: murders, assaults, suicides, or suicide attempts. That means every single day—yesterday, tomorrow, and the next day, and the next day—100 people, on average, will die of gun violence and another 200 or more will literally be wounded or shot in the crossfire.

We know that, in 2017, more than 39,000, nearly 40,000 people died of gun violence, all kinds of gun violence. That was an extraordinary uptick in gun violence.

I carry with me today the picture of Ben Wheeler, whose courageous mother testified before the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in 2014.

I carry with me today a picture of Ron, the son of my dear friend, Marge, who died of gun violence by suicide.

I carry with me, not by picture, but in my heart, the 16-year-old son of my former student at La Salle University who was shot in random gun violence in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8. In conclusion, Mr. Chair, I long for the day when orange ribbons are obsolete and when orange scarves are a fashion statement, not a cry for help.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentle-

woman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a member of the committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, just 2 weeks ago in my district, six lives and six families were forever changed by gun violence in a 6-day period. Four people were killed and two were injured in six different shootings. One person was 28. The other five were 16, 17, and 18. They were teenagers. My heart goes out to all of those victims' families.

Thoughts and prayers are no longer enough. It is long past time that our actions speak louder than our words. No matter which State we are from, with over 40,000 gun violence deaths last year, every State has been severely impacted by gun violence.

The public health crisis has been politicized and weaponized as a means to divide us, despite the fact that it is a crisis that should bind us together, and we must come together.

□ 1330

Background checks are the foundation of commonsense gun policy, and they are supported by the overwhelming majority of Americans. Our current system fails us in two ways, but the bills we are looking at this week are designed to address that.

Under current law, firearm sales can proceed regardless if a good background check comes back within a 3-day period, and it doesn't capture all the sales. So this puts an incredible burden on law enforcement and an incredible burden on ATF agents who have to go and reclaim guns that are sold, despite the owner of the gun not being able to pass the background check. So for too long those in a position to act have failed to do so. But that ends now.

I strongly support the commonsense gun legislation in H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I agree with the sentiment that we need to actually fashion something that will work. Unfortunately, this, for many reasons we have already stated, will not.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My friend, the gentleman from Georgia, just rose and said that this won't work. We have risen on this floor time after time after time after time and had a moment of silence followed by no action.

As I said time after time, we have had a moment of silence. I will tell my friend from Georgia that it hasn't worked. It has been appropriate, but it has not worked.

Can we guarantee that this will work to make every person safe?

It cannot. It will not. But I rise in strong support of doing something, and in this case doing something that 90 percent of America supports.

Mr. Chairman, this House is finally going to do its job and take action—not just a moment of silence, but action—to address the epidemic of gun violence in our country.

After the tragedies at Sandy Hook, Orlando, Las Vegas, Charleston, the Tree of Life synagogue, and Great Mills High School in my district, the House, under the previous leadership, did nothing. It didn't work.

After the shooting just down the street at the Washington Navy Yard, the Republican-controlled House did nothing. Three of the victims of that attack were constituents of mine living in southern Maryland. Dr. Wendy Edmonds and Wanda Wallace are in the gallery, Mr. Chairman. They are the sisters of Sylvia Fraser, a Navy Yard shooting victim.

Montana Geimer, daughter of Wendi Winters, a writer for the Capital Gazette of which my colleague, Mr. BROWN, just spoke; and Mackenzie Boughey, a high school student who organized a March for Our Lives rally in Anne Arundel County, are here with us today not to have a moment of silence, but to have a moment of action.

Many of our districts have been painfully affected by gun violence. In St. Mary's County in Maryland, as I told you, Mr. Chairman, a student was killed by a shooter at Great Mills High School, and a courageous school resources officer there saved countless other lives. In Annapolis, five staff members of the Capital Gazette were gunned down in their newsroom.

For years, the American people have demanded action to address gun violence. After the Parkland shooting, just over a year ago, students marched in cities from coast to coast to demand that Congress protect them in the classroom, in the streets, in houses of worship, and in all public gathering places.

I, as I am sure many of you have, had the opportunity to meet with many of the students who participated in the March for Our Lives and heard the determination in their voices as they spoke about working to achieve a future where students would no longer have to practice active-shooter drills in their schools. I found their courage and persistence deeply inspiring.

Now, with a change in the majority control, we are bringing to the floor legislation supported by, as I said, nine out of ten Americans, including a majority of responsible gun owners to expand criminal background checks to make sure that those who have a criminal past, a past of violence—domestic or otherwise—a mental health problem, or are on the no-fly list because they are perceived as possibly terrorists, won't be able to buy a gun.

Does that mean they won't get a gun?

It does not. I understand that. But as I told my friend from Georgia, the moments of silence have not worked. They were appropriate, I understand, but they didn't work.

We will also be voting this week on legislation offered by our whip, Mr. CLYBURN, to close the loophole that contributed to the horrific mass shooting at Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston in 2015.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Senate to follow the House and pass the legislation we advance, and I call on the President to sign it without delay.

Mr. Chairman, let us not have a moment of silence for this legislation. Do not let it die. Do not let the hope that it provides die. Do not let us stand by one more time to lament the death of a constituent, a friend, a neighbor, a fellow citizen, who dies at the hand of a gun purchased illegally or by someone who should not have a gun.

This is not about taking away guns. It is about preventing guns getting in the hands of people who do bad things, and we can predict that they are a danger to others. Let us not have a moment of silence for this bill. Let us pass it. Let the Senate pass it. Let the President sign it. Let's make an effort at least to stop the carnage.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words of the majority leader. However, I will say that in the previous Congress, this Congress did pass Fix NICS. It also passed the STOP School Violence Act. I am sure, among other reasons, it is probably why the majority leader voted against those bills in which they were included.

I do agree with him. The moments of silence may not have stopped, but it did call upon a higher power to realize that we are fragile human beings involved in tragedies. I will also remind the folks, and Mr. Chairman, yourself, that this bill will also not do what it has many times been promoted for it to do, because any of these mass violence episodes would not have been affected by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to these gun control bills that are being brought forward. They are brought forward under the guise of background checks.

Let's look at what these bills would actually do. We had identified any number of problems with this bill that we were trying to improve, and every one of those was shut out, shut out by the Democratic majority who wanted to try to stifle the opposing side's debate because they think just saying background checks makes this a good bill.

Let's talk about what this bill will do to make criminals—felons—out of law-abiding citizens. If you loan your gun to a friend under this bill, maybe they are thinking of buying a similar gun to protect themselves and they want to go to a shooting range to see if this gun is the right kind of gun to protect themselves with, which they have a right to

do under the Second Amendment of this Constitution, loaning your gun to that friend in that act would make you a felon subject to a year in jail and subject to a \$100,000 fine, Mr. Chairman.

We tried to fix that. They shut that amendment out.

In this bill, if you loan your gun to a friend who maybe has been a victim of domestic violence—and one of my colleagues who is here in opposition to this bill is one of those victims of domestic violence. She had an amendment to fix this bill to say, if she has got a temporary restraining order against her boyfriend who has been beating her and she is afraid he is going to come back tonight, under one of the bills, if she goes to buy a gun tonight and the Fix NICS system isn't working, she may have 20 business days to get that gun.

Now, good luck if the boyfriend shows up to beat her up that night and she says: Don't worry, I am on day 8. I only have another 12 days before I can buy the gun. Will you come back so I can defend myself then?

Do you really think that is going to happen?

You know what that means to her.

So in the bill we said: What if you can loan your gun to her?

She goes to a friend and says: I know you have a gun. I don't have a gun. I am trying to protect myself because I have got a TRO, but I know he is probably going to come back.

Under this bill, you will be a felon, a year in jail, \$100,000 fine. We tried to fix that, too, Mr. Chairman, and they shut that amendment out. That is what this bill does.

Oh, by the way, we are talking about law-abiding citizens here. If you go hunting with a buddy and you try to loan your gun to a buddy, Mr. Chairman, they say there is an exemption in the bill. But it is written so vaguely that you not only need to bring your hunting partner, you might need to bring your attorney to find out if loaning your shotgun to your friend makes you a felon under this bill.

These are law-abiding citizens. These are people who use guns to defend themselves, which is the basis of the Second Amendment. Our Founding Fathers believed every American has the right to defend themselves, because every day, on average, in this country guns are used by good people to defend themselves against bad people, and it is going to make it harder for them to get access to these guns to defend themselves. So, again, we tried to fix some of these problems.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you about another problem we tried to identify and fix. If you loan your gun, you will be a felon.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCALISE. So now we have identified areas where law-abiding citizens

can become felons. We tried to fix it; they wanted that to stay in place.

So what is that motivation?

But then we identified another problem. If someone who is in this country illegally goes to buy a gun and the system flags them, and it says: Wait a minute, this person is not even here legally. They are breaking Federal law trying to buy a gun. We said that we should notify ICE so at least our Border Patrol agents in the interior can deport them. They blocked that amendment.

So now a law-abiding citizen can become a felon under their bill, but someone who is here illegally trying to buy a gun in violation of the law can't be turned over to authorities. This is a bad gun control bill, and we ought to reject it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out the penalty in this bill that is being cited as \$100,000 is in fact \$1,000.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I request of the chairman: Does he have any more speakers at this time?

Mr. NADLER. Yes, I have one more.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Members are reminded to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

□ 1345

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the distinguished author of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was asked to talk about some of the outrageous allegations that were made about this bill, and the chairman already cleared one up, and that is the \$100,000 fine that we are hearing from the other side. It is \$1,000, as was pointed out.

We also heard that this isn't constitutional. Well, the Constitution is pretty clear: Individuals have a right to bear arms. Nobody is disputing that. As a matter of fact, it was settled in *District of Columbia v. Heller*.

But also in that opinion were Justice Scalia's remarks that stated that government also has a responsibility and a right to regulate firearms. That is all we are doing.

We are saying that people who are felons, domestic abusers, dangerously mentally ill, a danger to themselves or others shouldn't be able to have guns. I don't think anybody can dispute that. And how do you find out if you don't do a background check?

My friends on the other side of the aisle said this won't work. We have

heard it a hundred times: This won't work. Well, we have been working on this for 6½ years, ever since Sandy Hook. We have pleaded with the other side to work with us, have a hearing.

What are your ideas?

Absolute silence from them. Absolute silence.

This does work. We know that licensed dealers stop the sale of firearms to 170 felons every day and 50 domestic abusers every day because they are required to do background checks.

But in some States, that same individual can be found to be prohibited, walk outside and go to a gun show or go online and buy a gun without the benefit of a background check—and that is wrong.

Countless speakers from the other side of the aisle said this wouldn't have stopped this crime, this wouldn't have stopped this mass shooting, this wouldn't have stopped that mass shooting. Well, my friends, if that is your standard, if you will only support a bill that will stop every mass shooting, that will stop every death by a firearm, that means you want to get rid of all guns, and no one on this side of the aisle is saying that.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. The only way you can ensure that there will never be another person murdered by someone with a gun is to do away with all guns. We recognized that from day one.

Numerous speakers have said, just today on this floor, this will not stop every death. But it will stop some, and it is certainly worth pursuing.

I urge your "aye" vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, is this now the final speaker?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close as well.

Mr. Chair, before I close, I would like to say that I agree with the statement from the gentleman just now that there are maybe the ones turned away every day. The problem is there are only 60 a year prosecuted for what is a crime. This doesn't address that.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a licensed firearms dealer.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for allowing me the time.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8 and want to lay out a couple of reasons for my opposition.

Before I do, I think it is important to acknowledge how polarizing this debate has become over the last several years. More specifically, I want this body to know that, as a human being, as an American, as a father, when I see the heartbreaking news of a mass shooting like the one we saw just 54 weeks ago in Parkland, it just breaks my heart.

With that being said, this bill that we are voting on today would not have done anything to stop that tragedy from happening, nor would it have prevented any of those recent mass shootings.

The 19-year-old murderer in Parkland passed a background check.

The man who murdered 26 innocent people at First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs also passed a background check, although he wouldn't have if the Air Force had passed along his criminal information like they were supposed to have done.

And the evil that took place in Sandy Hook wouldn't have been stopped by this bill either. The killer used his mother's guns to kill her and 26 others. They were bought legally.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is that criminals don't abide by the law, and this would only create traps for law-abiding gun owners.

However, there are actions that we can take, actions that we can do, that would make meaningful strides in combating the violence that we see today.

One example of something we could do, improve information sharing between law enforcement officials across this country.

Mr. Chair, to close, I disagree with the policy of this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, we have heard the other side here say that some people lie on the forms; they are not prosecuted. Well, that may be, and maybe law enforcement ought to prosecute more people.

That doesn't negate the necessity for the bill. It doesn't negate the fact that too many people who shouldn't have guns, who are mentally unstable, who have committed crimes, and who are abusers get guns because they buy a gun at a gun show or not from a registered gun dealer and, therefore, do not have to undergo a background check.

Everyone who gets a gun should have to undergo a background check, with the few exceptions we put in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8 is legislation that is long overdue for passage by this body and for enactment so that we can take a critical step overwhelmingly supported by the American people to protect us from gun violence.

We have had too many moments of silence, too many expressions of sympathy, too many deaths—39,000 deaths from guns last year—but little action here in Congress on this issue.

Today we act. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this vital bill to start taking back our streets from the killers, to start blocking people who shouldn't have them from having guns.

Save our lives.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, when I voted for the Brady Law in 1993—which took

effect on February 28, 1994—it was to keep firearms out of the hands of dangerous persons including felons and abusers.

Twenty-five years later—and 300 million background checks that have blocked 3 million purchases to dangerous individuals—few if any today seriously suggest that the Brady law should be repealed.

I support the Second Amendment. Universal background checks prescribed in H.R. 8 are an attempt to ensure that firearms are procured, owned and used by responsible, law abiding citizens.

According to the Brady Campaign, about 1 in 5 guns now sold in America are done so without a background check. That's a significant loophole.

According to the CDC, there was a record 39,773 deaths from firearms in 2017—higher than in any other year—23,854 were self-inflicted and 14,542 were homicides.

To mitigate gun violence in America, H.R. 8 expands Brady background checks to transactions by private sellers not currently covered by the law.

Multiple school shootings have led to robust, comprehensive action at every level to make classrooms safer. I have visited many schools in my district—and I have found that while the threat is being taken seriously, no one policy, program or initiative can ensure the level of protection our students need and deserve.

Mr. Chair, no constitutional right is absolute including the Second Amendment. The First Amendment's freedom of speech, for example, has reasonable limits including the promulgation of slander and libel law.

To preserve public order, we accept reasonable restrictions on the freedom to assemble. Even freedom of religion isn't without some modest boundaries.

In like manner, universal background checks don't erode Second Amendment rights but do help ensure much needed protection from gun violence for everyone.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act.

This year, my State of the Union guest was Alexandria Goddard, a young activist who helped organize Portland's March for Our Lives.

Alexandria led thousands of Oregonians in a march to demand that Congress take action to prevent gun violence.

By passing this bill we are heeding the call of the hundreds of thousands of students who marched for their lives.

They know—and we know—that this bill will save lives because it requires a background check for nearly all firearm sales and transfers.

The evidence shows that Oregon and the other states that have already passed comprehensive background checks have 35 percent fewer gun deaths, and 47 percent fewer women shot by their intimate partners.

Congress is finally doing more than offering thoughts and prayers.

We are acting. We are acting for Parkland, for Sandy Hook, for Umpqua Community College, and for the hundreds of thousands of victims and survivors around the country.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 8.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 8, The Bipartisan Background Check Act of 2019. This

common sense bipartisan legislation would expand the current firearm background check system to cover all commercial firearm sales nationwide.

Our nation is currently enduring a crisis that is putting families and communities at risk. Gun violence has become so commonplace in our society that we no longer seem to flinch whenever these events occur. Gun violence threatens national security and inflicts a toll. 125,000 people are shot every year and more than 36,000 people die as a result of these shootings. A 2018 report conducted by the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention revealed that there were 3,353 firearm-related deaths in my home state of Texas. 352 of these were children and teenagers under 19 years old. Texas unfortunately has played host to some of the most viscous recent mass shootings, such as the 2009 Fort Hood shooting, the Dallas police officer shooting in 2016, the Plano and Sutherland Springs Church shootings in 2017, and last year's Santa Fe High School shooting.

We have high levels of gun violence in this country because we have weak laws that are riddled with loopholes. This bill will not only eliminate those loopholes, but it will do so without infringing upon second amendment rights. Implementing universal background checks is supported by 97 percent of Americans, including 97 percent of gun owners.

The reality is that gun safety laws will reduce violence and we must do everything in our power to prevent the reoccurrence of unnecessary tragedy and loss of life in this country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-5. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 8

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 "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to utilize the current background checks process in the United States to ensure individuals prohibited from gun possession are not able to obtain firearms.

SEC. 3. FIREARMS TRANSFERS.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (s);
(2) by redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (s); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (s), as redesignated, the following:

"(t)(1)(A) It shall be unlawful for any person who is not a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to transfer a firearm to any other person who is not so licensed, un-

less a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer has first taken possession of the firearm for the purpose of complying with subsection (s).

"(B) Upon taking possession of a firearm under subparagraph (A), a licensee shall comply with all requirements of this chapter as if the licensee were transferring the firearm from the inventory of the licensee to the unlicensed transferee.

"(C) If a transfer of a firearm described in subparagraph (A) will not be completed for any reason after a licensee takes possession of the firearm (including because the transfer of the firearm to, or receipt of the firearm by, the transferee would violate this chapter), the return of the firearm to the transferor by the licensee shall not constitute the transfer of a firearm for purposes of this chapter.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

"(A) a law enforcement agency or any law enforcement officer, armed private security professional, or member of the armed forces, to the extent the officer, professional, or member is acting within the course and scope of employment and official duties;

"(B) a transfer that is a loan or bona fide gift between spouses, between domestic partners, between parents and their children, between siblings, between aunts or uncles and their nieces or nephews, or between grandparents and their grandchildren;

"(C) a transfer to an executor, administrator, trustee, or personal representative of an estate or a trust that occurs by operation of law upon the death of another person;

"(D) a temporary transfer that is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm, if the possession by the transferee lasts only as long as immediately necessary to prevent the imminent death or great bodily harm;

"(E) a transfer that is approved by the Attorney General under section 5812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

"(F) a temporary transfer if the transferor has no reason to believe that the transferee will use or intends to use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms under State or Federal law, and the transfer takes place and the transferee's possession of the firearm is exclusively—

"(i) at a shooting range or in a shooting gallery or other area designated for the purpose of target shooting;

"(ii) while reasonably necessary for the purposes of hunting, trapping, or fishing, if the transferor—

"(I) has no reason to believe that the transferee intends to use the firearm in a place where it is illegal; and

"(II) has reason to believe that the transferee will comply with all licensing and permit requirements for such hunting, trapping, or fishing; or

"(iii) while in the presence of the transferor.

"(3)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Attorney General may implement this subsection with regulations.

"(B) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision requiring licensees to facilitate transfers in accordance with paragraph (1).

"(C) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision requiring persons not licensed under this chapter to keep records of background checks or firearms transfers.

"(D) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision placing a cap on the fee licensees may charge to facilitate transfers in accordance with paragraph (1).

"(4) It shall be unlawful for a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to transfer possession of, or title to, a firearm to another person who is not so licensed unless the importer, manufacturer, or dealer has provided such other person with a notice of the prohibi-

tion under paragraph (1), and such other person has certified that such other person has been provided with this notice on a form prescribed by the Attorney General."

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SECTION 922.—Section 922(y)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking "(g)(5)(B), and (s)(3)(B)(v)(II)" and inserting "and (g)(5)(B)".

(b) CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012.—Section 511 of title V of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking "subsection 922(t)" each place it appears and inserting "subsection (s) or (t) of section 922".

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to—

(1) authorize the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a national firearms registry; or

(2) interfere with the authority of a State, under section 927 of title 18, United States Code, to enact a law on the same subject matter as this Act.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 116-14. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike "or".

Page 4, line 15, strike the period and insert "; or".

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following:

"(G) a transfer to a participant in the PreCheck or successor trusted traveler program of the Department of Homeland Security."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allow gun owners to legally transfer their firearms to individuals who have been approved and are participants in TSA's PreCheck program.

TSA PreCheck identifies trusted travelers and, thus, allows expedited movement through airport security. In order to receive TSA PreCheck, one must submit an application, have an in-person interview, and go through a background check and fingerprinting.

Fingerprinting is not required, currently, to purchase a gun; thus, a TSA PreCheck background check is more stringent. If an individual can pass this background check and be admitted to this Federal Government program, there is no reason why they shouldn't be able to borrow a firearm from a friend. They have already gone through a more extensive background check system than to acquire a weapon. The current background check does not require fingerprints; a TSA PreCheck does.

Membership to TSA PreCheck must be renewed every 5 years. Again, the TSA PreCheck process requires fingerprints and an in-person interview. The process, currently, for purchasing a gun requires neither of those under Federal law. It appears, then, that the TSA PreCheck process is a more extensive process.

H.R. 8 restricts not only the purchase, but also the everyday gun transfer for law-abiding citizens. This amendment and many other Republican amendments—I think I had five others that were not made in order—seek to give some relief to law-abiding citizens from this overarching and burdensome legislation.

In H.R. 8, we are not only talking about the purchase of firearms, we are talking about the transfer of firearms, which includes lending your firearm. The Democrats have proposed a bill that would criminalize millions of law-abiding Americans. Because this bill uses ambiguous, overarching, and vague language, it encompasses so many potential situations. This amendment seeks to give some relief.

If we are going to allow Americans to be given expedited and reduced screening in our most sensitive and secure environments in the U.S. airport getting on a plane, why wouldn't we allow them to lend a gun to their friend?

H.R. 8 criminalizes me and others just for handing someone a firearm who isn't a direct family member or in other very narrow situations. In fact, as I said yesterday, the language in this bill is so ambiguous. What is "imminent danger"? There is no definition in the bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it is fatally flawed and would undermine the public safety impact of the bill.

The amendment would add an exception to the background check requirement for anyone who is a participant in the TSA PreCheck program by the Department of Homeland Security.

By exempting those who have obtained a TSA PreCheck from the background check requirement, the amendment would allow many dangerous people, including people with disqualifying mental health conditions and some

criminal convictions, to obtain firearms without a background check.

The current background system, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, was designed specifically for background checks pursuant to the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

The system, often called the NICS, contains the information that no other Federal database contains, and the TSA does not check NICS when determining a person's eligibility for the TSA PreCheck program.

Although participants in the TSA PreCheck program have had their criminal backgrounds vetted, the standards for approval and participation in the TSA PreCheck program are not the same and, in many cases, are more lenient than those which prohibit firearm possession and purchase.

For example, the NICS searches the records of people prohibited for mental health reasons during a firearms background check. These mental health reasons, though, are not part of the TSA PreCheck search.

As of January 31, there are more than 5.7 million of these mental health records in the NICS indexes, making it the second most populous category of prohibited records for firearm purchase.

Because the Department of Homeland Security does not have access to these mental health records for TSA PreCheck program purposes, individuals who have been adjudicated to be disqualified to own firearms for reasons of mental condition or have been committed to any mental institution may be accepted under the TSA PreCheck program but are not legally able to possess a gun. Under this amendment, they would be legally exempted from the background check requirement and would be able to get a gun, despite being legally prohibited from doing so.

The TSA bars people convicted of certain criminal offenses, such as rape or aggravated sexual abuse, from participating in the TSA PreCheck program only temporarily. It doesn't restrict people convicted of these serious crimes for more than 7 years, and it wouldn't bar people released from prison for these crimes within the last 5 years.

Under current law, these felony convictions prohibit possession or purchase of a weapon, but, under this amendment, people released from prison within the last 5 years for these crimes could get the weapons—could get the weapons.

The TSA PreCheck program does not have a minimum age requirement, and this amendment would allow people under the ages of 18 and 21 to purchase firearms illegally and without a NICS background check.

Furthermore, the TSA PreCheck program only requires a background check every 5 years, and the PreCheck system may not be advised that a firearms disqualifying offense has taken place after the initial PreCheck background check has occurred.

In other words, you get the TSA PreCheck, and if you are convicted afterwards, within 5 years, for a very serious crime, under this amendment, you could get the gun, although, legally, you shouldn't without a background check, and the TSA PreCheck program would not have picked it up.

□ 1400

These shortcomings of the TSA PreCheck system make it an inadequate and dangerous substitute for a NICS background check. To prevent potentially prohibited purchasers from obtaining firearms, licensed dealers should conduct background checks on participants in the PreCheck program as they would with any other member of the public.

The blanket exception of this amendment for anyone who participates in the TSA PreCheck program would undermine the bill's ability to enhance public safety because it would enable people convicted of serious crimes, people adjudicated to have serious mental illnesses, to purchase guns without a background check, even though the TSA system would not pick them up.

The TSA system is not a substitute for the background check system. It doesn't pick up many of the crimes. It doesn't carry it forward. And it is not a substitute for this system.

To pass this amendment, which would allow people who have qualified under the TSA PreCheck program not to have background checks, would allow a lot of people who shouldn't have guns to have them. Therefore, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I ask that my colleagues vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I won't take even the 30 seconds. I just support the amendment. I think it is good. Many of the flaws that we have seen in this bill so far, this is an amendment that actually works.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. NADLER, in his statement, said that my amendment would allow dangerous people to get guns. I have to say I disagree.

I am the ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security subcommittee that deals with TSA, and the TSA PreCheck system is more stringent than the background check currently required to obtain a gun, when you purchase it. Again, it requires a fingerprint background check and an individual interview. Neither of those are required right now.

We had offered a number of amendments to help this bill become less burdensome on law-abiding citizens, and so I am happy that one was at least ruled in order, this TSA one, and I would ask my colleagues to please vote "yes" on it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PRICE of North Carolina). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, after "harm," insert "including harm to self, family, household members, or others,".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. My amendment clarifies that those at risk of committing suicide would be exempt from the background check requirement in instances of imminent threats of death or great bodily harm.

Specifically, this legislation amends the bill to insert the line "including harm to self, family, household members, or others" to the list of instances when a person is exempt from the background check requirement and may temporarily transfer away a firearm for safekeeping.

The spirit of this long overdue legislation is to save lives, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which will further achieve this goal by addressing the leading instance of gun death in this country, suicide.

Last year, nearly 40,000 people were killed by gun violence, with another 80,000 literally caught in the crossfire. Of those killed, over half, more than 20,000, people tragically died by gun suicide.

And the problem has grown. Nationally, over the past years, the past decade, the rate of suicide by gun death has increased 19 percent. This is a problem that grips our entire Nation.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, there has been a 24 percent increase in gun suicides over the past 10 years, claiming the lives of over 14,000 people. These are our friends, our loved ones, young and old, people for whom our

hearts ache, people we wish we could hold just one more time.

I offer up a picture of a dear friend of my family, Ron.

Unfortunately, very few of us are left unscathed by this problem. While there are many factors that contribute to self-harm, the presence of a firearm in the home increases the risk of suicide. Not surprisingly, using a gun is the method that most often ends in death.

Guns are dangerously effective at what they are designed to do. That is why this amendment is so important. It ensures that those in crisis can temporarily transfer a firearm safely until the crisis has passed. It clearly defines that a person can temporarily hand over firearms to someone they trust while they work through this difficult time.

This clarity is needed because, in times of crisis, moments matter. It may literally be the difference between life and death.

We are here today at a historic moment to take action against the violence that plagues this country, our communities, and our loved ones. The Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, with this amendment, will keep guns out of the hands of those who legally should not have them and also gives those who need a safe way to separate themselves from their guns a way to do so.

If we have the courage to pass this legislation, the courage here in the House and in the Senate and in the White House, it will do just that. It will save lives.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the amendment, I think, but I rise in that, again, this is something discussed at committee. It was an attempt to—it is basically a failed attempt to fix one of the shortcomings of this legislation.

I understand why they would bring it. I understand why they would want to fix it, because its existence indicates what we have been saying about the flaws in the bill, which we discussed at committee.

Like other floor amendments that are going to be offered, this is nothing more than trying to basically change the appearance of what is a flawed perception. The problem here is it addresses the undefined term of "imminent" used in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known, and I have spoken about it many times, that I am still currently serving as a United States Air Force chaplain. I have pastored for many years, and I have been on the other end of phone calls from those who were struggling and thinking of taking their life.

Suicide is not something that we can define very easily. It is not something

that we can simply limit to: Yes, guns are effective. But any method that someone uses to choose to end their life is sad and a struggle for those of us who have dealt with this.

The term "imminent" here is problematic for those of us who have dealt with those who are struggling with suicide because imminent to them and imminent to a judge and imminent to someone who wants to take his life, and to law enforcement, indicates something precipitous that will happen in a very short amount of time, a very imminent act, something that is maybe going to happen, Mr. Chairman, even before I finish my speech. That is an imminent kind of act.

Imminent does not extend to 12 hours or 24 hours or even 46 hours. That would not fall under the definition of "imminent." And I am not willing to let a prosecutor or a judge who may not like guns, who would actually say that was an imminent threat, and by transferring it for more than a short amount of time, you have then fallen under and fall under this.

Now, I would hope that would never happen, Mr. Chairman. But we have to be serious about this issue of imminence. For those of us who have dealt with this, there may be, and I have had times when people would come to me and they were thinking about harming themselves, but the imminence factor was not there. They were just trying to see if they could clear their head. It may be a week that would pass, and they came back and would say it was fine.

But in this issue, I understand the intent and the heart here, but it is a very weak attempt to fix problems that we had already pointed out in this bill. And it will still not fix the problem, because the problem is the imminent standard. That is the part that we are struggling with.

We can disagree about this, and I will respect the gentlewoman if she disagrees, and would expect her to. But let's remember, this is carried out, if, say—which I would hope would not happen—this bill actually becomes law. It then will present a problem for those who have to enforce it and those judges who would have to interpret it.

We have to remember that our actions here, we vote on words on paper, not aspirational ideas. Those are happy thoughts, not words on paper. The only thing that the courts can do is vote on words on paper.

I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this. I support the intent, especially dealing with suicide, which many of us have worked on, and the tragedy that it leaves in the wake of so many. But please understand my opposition to this is it is still a flawed product because we have not dealt with the very issue of imminence in this legislation and this amendment.

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, which clarifies the bill's exemption for the background check requirement in instances of imminent threats or great bodily harm would apply to someone who is at risk of committing suicide.

The amendment makes clear that the limited number of exemptions to the background check requirement include circumstances in which someone feels that they are a danger to themselves. They may temporarily transfer a firearm until the danger has passed. This is a limited and reasonable exemption that only applies to those who fear they will harm themselves, so that they may temporarily surrender their weapon.

I listened to the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate he doesn't think that the amendment goes far enough or solves the underlying problems of the bill, as he sees it. But even from his point of view, it should go in the right direction. So I urge everyone to support this amendment.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the author of this bill, Representative THOMPSON, and I thank all the tireless advocates who have worked to bring us to this day.

I thank the good gentleman from Georgia for his comments. Clearly, he understands the gravity and the grave nature of gun death by suicide in this country. As you can see, that number has been escalating over the past 10 years. That includes more than 20,000 people in a single year.

Gun violence by suicide is quite deadly. We know it, and so I thank my colleague from the other side of the aisle for at least supporting the spirit of what we are trying to do here.

For the greater safety of our citizens, our neighbors, our friends, and our family members, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and please support this bill, H.R. 8.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 14, insert “, including the harm of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse” before the semicolon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 8 is a critical piece of legislation that I am proud to support. Congress needs to act to cut down on our Nation's widespread gun violence. We must close loopholes that give buyers and sellers a way around background checks. There is no reason vendors at gun shows or online should be exempt from the safety measures other merchants must obey. We should also vet sales between two people.

That is not to say that there should be no exceptions. My amendment carves out protections for people who face risk of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse.

The underlying bill, H.R. 8, already creates an exception to the background check requirement when there is a temporary weapon transfer, if the transferee is at imminent risk of death or great bodily harm. Our amendment is meant to make it crystal clear and explicit that this exception applies when the transferees are protecting themselves from an abuser. It does not expand the underlying exception; it offers one critical example of where it might apply.

□ 1415

When I talked to Oklahomans across my district last year, they confided in me their concerns about gun violence. I promised to work towards policies that would protect them.

We need to protect our Second Amendment right, but there is no credible reason why we as a state and nation can't acknowledge there are steps we can take to save lives and find a path forward to do so.

H.R. 8 does just that. It increases safety without limiting our Second Amendment rights by implementing commonsense policy.

But when we take these commonsense steps, we need to acknowledge our power to create unintended consequences, and to prevent them.

That is why I am offering this amendment. In addition to my commitment to gun safety, I have talked about my devotion to helping protect women and families.

Between 1998 and 2017, the Oklahoma Domestic Violence Fatality Review Board found nearly 1,700 people were killed in our State because of domestic violence. In 2017 alone, 91 Oklahomans were murdered.

The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that nearly two in five Oklahoma women will face some form of domestic abuse or sexual violence during their lifetimes.

Oklahoma is consistently ranked in the top five States for women killed by men in one-on-one homicides.

Oklahoma domestic violence programs serve an average of 18,000 people annually, according to the YWCA.

Oklahoma is not an exception. These problems persist. One in four women and one in nine men experience intimate partner physical violence; these people deserve to be protected.

For us, that means many things, including strengthening and reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act and investing in support services and family justice centers. But it also means we need to empower people to protect themselves.

That is why Congress should pass laws to strengthen background checks and create exceptions for those who truly need them.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I understand the need or want to do this is to make many things that actually came in discussions in our committee about some of the problems that we found here, and the mere submission is another tacit admission that the Democrats understand the flaws in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not something that I am going to relitigate here, but also, when debate is cut short, this is what happens when you get to the floor. When debate is cut short in committee, this is what happens.

They realize that good products were brought up, but yet they chose to push through a bill because they had a timeline.

We went through this in the Rules Committee. I get it. This is what is coming up. But, again, to put this in, “great bodily harm,” it is minimally helpful at this point. It goes back to the problem we had with “imminent” in the last one.

These are all things, frankly, that could have been—even in a bill that I would disagree with at the end of the day on this—this is, again, not something that is going to fix it. A victim of domestic abuse can live in constant fear of her abuser and feel threatened at all times.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I understand at least the attempt to fix something, because they understand that there were problems and they don't want to make it worse, but I have advocated all along that what this does help, it also hurts. And this is, again, just another attempt to do that.

I appreciate that they are figuring out the problems now; I just would oppose this amendment, because, again, it does not completely fix the problems that we have seen, and would not in the bigger picture.

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

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she

may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for this amendment to H.R. 8 introduced by Representatives HORN and MURPHY.

This amendment protects people facing the threat of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse.

I am the daughter of a military veteran, and like most Kansans, I respect the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. But also, like most Kansans, I am tired of politicians doing nothing to stop senseless killings.

That is why I support commonsense solutions to keep our communities safe, like expanding background checks and closing dangerous loopholes in our laws.

In our effort to ensure the safety of our communities, however, we can't forget the needs of those at risk of domestic violence to protect themselves from abuse.

According to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation, in 2017 a domestic violence incident was reported every 23 minutes and a domestic violence murder occurred every 9 days in the State of Kansas.

In the United States, more than 12 million people experience some form of domestic violence by a current or former domestic partner every year.

These women and men deserve our support, which means we also need to reauthorize and strengthen the Violence Against Women Act.

These men and women deserve to be protected. I cannot emphasize that enough.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to support H.R. 8. It is a critical piece of legislation that will save lives, and I urge my fellow colleagues to stand up for survivors and those at risk and support this amendment.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I simply want to say I support this amendment, which clarifies that great bodily harm is included in the exception to the bill's background check requirement, includes domestic violence, sexual assaults, stalking, et cetera. It is a good amendment. I urge people to support it.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply close by reiterating the importance of H.R. 8 and my support for it in this amendment, and clarifying and protecting individuals who are at risk from domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Congresswoman STEPHANIE MURPHY, who cosponsored this amendment, as well as Congresswoman DAVIDS and Congressman NADLER for their remarks.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. VAN DREW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after "children," insert "including step-parents and their stepchildren".

Page 3, line 5, insert "if the transferor has no reason to believe that the transferee will use or intends to use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms under State or Federal law" before the semicolon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my amendment clarifies that the exceptions for gifts and loans of firearms between parents and their children applies to stepparents and stepchildren.

The reason I offer this amendment is to recognize that the relationship between stepparents and stepchildren is sometimes stronger than or as strong as that of the biological parent-child relationship.

The parents of one of my closest friends are technically stepparents, but you would never know it, because they are all so close and love each other so much.

The amendment also clarifies that gifts and loans of firearms among family members are still subject to the existing legal standard for all transfers.

Existing law states that no person may deliver a firearm to someone if he or she has a reason to believe that the person is prohibited from possessing a firearm.

Consequently, even gifts and loans among family members are not permissible if the transferor has a reason to believe that the transferee may use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms.

Again, the amendment clarifies that while a background check is not required for these transfers, the existing legal standard continues to apply.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I am not opposing this amendment, but like the previous amendment, again, it is proof that this bill is still not ready for prime time and should have spent more time instead of moving a very ill-timed previous question because of a timing deadline that they had to get to the floor. It fixes one of the many flaws in the bill.

Again, Republicans had solutions to these loose ends all over the bill, but our debate time was stopped. But I do have just a question here. Although I am not opposing this amendment, it merely adds the exchange between stepparent and their stepchildren.

What about stepsiblings who also love each other dearly? But this doesn't include that. Stepgrandparents and stepgrandchildren? What about foster families or adoptive families?

It is a simple fix that, again, goes forward and, again, struggles.

But I do want to go back and address something, Mr. Chairman, that came up earlier, and it seemed to get an interesting response from my friends across the aisle, my colleague stated that the appropriate fine is \$1,000, not \$100,000. They cite the U.S. sentencing guidelines for this number, but I do have to remind the chairman that since the Booker decision, of course, the guidelines are only advisory. And we need not look to the advisory guidelines, but look at the statute the bill amends.

Remember, we do not vote on aspirations in this Chamber; we vote on words on paper.

18 USC 924(a)(5) contains the penalty for violating part "(s) or (t) of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

18 USC 3571(b)(5) "for a Class A misdemeanor", which this is, "that does not result in death, not more than \$100,000."

So it could be \$1,000 or it could be up to \$100,000.

I appreciate our confusion over this issue, but unfortunately, as I stated before, this is what happens when a bill is rushed to the floor, and it is why we oppose this legislation.

When we understand this, Mr. Chairman, again, you can offer amendments that make Members feel good, but feeling good doesn't heal you and feeling good will not make this better.

I will not oppose this amendment, but, again, I think in just the moments that I have had here, I raised enough questions about this amendment to

take up those very issues that were spoken of about the love between step-parents and stepchildren. What about the stepsiblings? What about the stepgrandparents? That is still part of that device and not addressed in this.

And, again, going back to the issue of the fine: again, the statute and the bill itself are pretty clear; it is fined under this process and not the guidelines that are sentencing.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the body for its support of my amendment, and I urge a “yes” vote on the Van Drew amendment.

This is a good amendment, and I believe it will be helpful, and I believe it creates an atmosphere which is a fair atmosphere for everyone to increase safety and yet at the same time to understand the relationships that do exist in stepfamilies.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again, I appreciate the gentleman bringing it, but as was said, this is an attempt to make a bill that should have been vetted more in committee not be vetted more. And I appreciate that.

I am not going to oppose the amendment, but when I take it a step further, what about the stepparents and the stepsiblings between each other, and the stepgrandparents and stepgrandchildren? I have had a wonderful look at those families. Those are precious families. Why are we just stopping at one?

Again, it goes back to the heart. And I understand the rush to get here, but, again, what makes you feel better and makes you feel good does not always heal you. This is something that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Chair, with this, I am not going to oppose this amendment. It is unfortunately very lacking in a bill that is lacking on many points, but with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 116-14 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. LESKO of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 250, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

AYES—182

Abraham	González-Colón	Nunes
Aderholt	(PR)	Olson
Allen	Gooden	Palazzo
Amodei	Granger	Palmer
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Pence
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Posey
Babin	Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Green (TN)	Reed
Baird	Griffith	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Grothman	Rice (SC)
Banks	Guest	Riggleman
Barr	Guthrie	Roby
Bergman	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Harris	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Brady	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Scalise
Buck	Hudson	Schweikert
Budshon	Huizenga	Scott, Austin
Budd	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Shimkus
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Simpson
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Smith (MO)
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Smith (NE)
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Spano
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Staubert
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Cole	King (IA)	Steube
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Stewart
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Taylor
Comer	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Thornberry
Cook	Lamborn	Timmons
Crawford	Latta	Tipton
Crenshaw	Lesko	Turner
Cuellar	Long	Upton
Curtis	Loudermilk	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Walberg
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Walker
Duffy	Marshall	Walorski
Duncan	Mast	Waltz
Dunn	McCarthy	Watkins
Emmer	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Estes	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McKinley	Westerman
Flores	Meadows	Williams
Fortenberry	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Foxx (NC)	Miller	Wittman
Fulcher	Mitchell	Womack
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Gibbs	Mullin	Yoho
Gohmert	Newhouse	Young
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Zeldin

NOES—250

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Carson (IN)
Aguilar	Bonamici	Cartwright
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Case
Amash	F.	Casten (IL)
Axne	Brindisi	Castor (FL)
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Beatty	Buchanan	Cicilline
Bera	Bustos	Cisneros
Beyer	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Clay

Cleaver	Johnson (TX)	Plaskett
Cline	Kaptur	Pocan
Clyburn	Keating	Porter
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Connolly	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Cooper	Khanna	Quigley
Correa	Kildee	Raskin
Costa	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kim	Richmond
Cox (CA)	Kind	Rose (NY)
Craig	King (NY)	Rouda
Crist	Kirkpatrick	Roy
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Cunningham	Lamb	Ruppersberger
Davids (KS)	Langevin	Rush
Davidson (OH)	Larsen (WA)	Rutherford
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Ryan
Davis, Danny K.	Lawrence	Sablan
Dean	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
DeLauro	Levin (CA)	Schakowsky
DelBene	Levin (MI)	Schiff
Delgado	Lewis	Schneider
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Schrier
Deutch	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lofgren	Scott, David
Doggett	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lowe	Sewell (AL)
F.	Luján	Shalala
Engel	Luria	Sherman
Escobar	Lynch	Sherrill
Eshoo	Malinowski	Sires
Espallat	Maloney,	Slotkin
Evans	Carolyn B.	Smith (NJ)
Finkenauer	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Soto
Fletcher	Matsui	Spanberger
Foster	McAdams	Speier
Fudge	McBath	Stanton
Gabbard	McCollum	Stevens
Gallagher	McEachin	Stivers
Gallego	McGovern	Suoizzi
Garamendi	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Garcia (IL)	Meeks	Takano
Garcia (TX)	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Golden	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Gomez	Morelle	Titus
Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton	Tlaib
Gottheimer	Mucarsel-Powell	Tonko
Green (TX)	Murphy	Torres (CA)
Grijalva	Nadler	Torres Small
Haaland	Napolitano	(NM)
Harder (CA)	Neal	Trahan
Hastings	Neguse	Trone
Hayes	Norcross	Underwood
Heck	Norton	Van Drew
Herrera Beutler	O'Halleran	Vargas
Higgins (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez	Veasey
Hill (CA)	Omar	Vela
Himes	Pallone	Velázquez
Hollingsworth	Panetta	Visclosky
Horn, Kendra S.	Pappas	Wasserman
Horsford	Pascrell	Schultz
Houlahan	Payne	Waters
Hoyer	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman
Huffman	Perry	Welch
Jackson Lee	Peters	Wexton
Jayapal	Peterson	Wild
Jeffries	Phillips	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Frankel	Katko	San Nicolas
Gosar	Radewagen	

□ 1458

Mr. RUSH, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PETERS, Meses. PRESSLEY, SCANLON, Messrs. KENNEDY, HECK, O'HALLERAN, Miss RICE of New York, Messrs. PETERSON, GALLAGHER, CLINE, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. PERRY and LEWIS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SPANO, GOHMERT, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Messrs. KINZINGER and BUCK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 310, noes 119, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

AYES—310

Adams	Davis, Danny K.	Jeffries
Aguilar	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (GA)
Allred	Dean	Johnson (LA)
Arrington	DeFazio	Johnson (TX)
Axne	DeGette	Joyce (OH)
Bacon	DeLauro	Kaptur
Balderson	DelBene	Keating
Barragán	Delgado	Kelly (IL)
Bass	Demings	Kennedy
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Khanna
Bera	Deutch	Kildee
Beyer	Diaz-Balart	Kilmer
Bilirakis	Dingell	Kim
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kind
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	King (IA)
Blunt Rochester	F.	King (NY)
Bonamici	Duncan	Kirkpatrick
Bost	Engel	Krishnamoorthi
Boyle, Brendan	Escobar	Kuster (NH)
F.	Eshoo	Lamb
Brindisi	Españillat	Langevin
Brooks (IN)	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Brown (MD)	Finkenauer	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lawrence
Buchanan	Fletcher	Lawson (FL)
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Lee (CA)
Burchett	Foster	Lee (NV)
Burgess	Fudge	Lesko
Bustos	Gabbard	Levin (CA)
Butterfield	Gaetz	Levin (MI)
Carbajal	Gallego	Lewis
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lieu, Ted
Carson (IN)	Garcia (TX)	Lipinski
Cartwright	Gianforte	Loebsack
Case	Gohmert	Lofgren
Casten (IL)	Golden	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Lowe
Chabot	Gonzalez (OH)	Lucas
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez (TX)	Luján
Cicilline	González-Colón	Luria
Cisneros	(PR)	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Malinowski
Clarke (NY)	Graves (GA)	Maloney,
Clay	Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.
Cleaver	Green (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Cloud	Griffith	Mast
Clyburn	Haaland	Matsui
Cohen	Harder (CA)	McAdams
Cole	Hartzler	McBath
Collins (NY)	Hastings	McClintock
Conaway	Hayes	McCollum
Cannolly	Heck	McEachin
Cook	Herrera Beutler	McGovern
Cooper	Hice (GA)	McHenry
Correa	Higgins (NY)	McKinley
Costa	Hill (AR)	McNerney
Courtney	Hill (CA)	Meadows
Cox (CA)	Himes	Meeks
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	Meng
Crenshaw	Horsford	Miller
Crist	Houlahan	Moore
Crow	Hoyer	Morelle
Cuellar	Hudson	Moulton
Cummings	Huffman	Mucarsel-Powell
Cunningham	Huizenga	Murphy
Davidson (KS)	Hurd (TX)	Nadler
Davidson (OH)	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Jayapal	Neal

Neguse	Rush	Thompson (PA)
Newhouse	Ryan	Tipton
Norcross	Sablan	Titus
Norman	Sánchez	Tlaib
Norton	Sarbanes	Tonko
O'Halleran	Scanlon	Torres (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Schakowsky	Torres Small
Omar	Schiff	(NM)
Pallone	Schneider	Trahan
Panetta	Schrader	Trone
Pappas	Schrier	Turner
Pascarell	Schweikert	Upton
Payne	Scott (VA)	Van Drew
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Vargas
Perry	Serrano	Veasey
Peters	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Peterson	Shalala	Velázquez
Phillips	Sherman	Visclosky
Pingree	Sherrill	Wagner
Plaskett	Shimkus	Walden
Pocan	Sires	Wasserman
Porter	Slotkin	Schultz
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Price (NC)	Smucker	Webster (FL)
Quigley	Soto	Welch
Raskin	Spanberger	Wexton
Reed	Stanton	Wild
Rice (NY)	Stauber	Wilson (FL)
Richmond	Stefanik	Wittman
Riggleman	Steil	Womack
Roe, David P.	Stevens	Woodall
Rooney (FL)	Stivers	Wright
Rose (NY)	Suzoi	Yarmuth
Rouda	Swalwell (CA)	Young
Roybal-Allard	Takano	Zeldin
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	

NOES—119

Abraham	Granger	Palazzo
Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Allen	Green (TN)	Pence
Amash	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Amodei	Guest	Reschenthaler
Armstrong	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Babin	Hagedorn	Roby
Baird	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Barr	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bergman	Holding	Rose, John W.
Biggs	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Bishop (UT)	Hunter	Roy
Brady	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Buck	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Budd	Joyce (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Calvert	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Kinzinger	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Kustoff (TN)	Spano
Cheney	LaHood	Speier
Cline	LaMalfa	Steube
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Stewart
Comer	Latta	Taylor
Crawford	Long	Thornberry
Curtis	Loudermilk	Timmons
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Underwood
Duffy	Marchant	Walberg
Dunn	Marshall	Walker
Emmer	Massie	Walorski
Estes	McCarthy	Waltz
Ferguson	McCaul	Watkins
Fleischmann	Meuser	Weber (TX)
Flores	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Fox (NC)	Moolenaar	Westerman
Fulcher	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gallagher	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Nunes	Yoho
Gooden	Olson	

NOT VOTING—8

Castro (TX)	Gosar	Radewagen
Frankel	Grijalva	San Nicolas
Garcia (IL)	Katko	

□ 1509

Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. KELLY of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, and, pursuant to House Resolution 145, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I am.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Collins of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 4, insert the following:

“(E) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph shall include, in the case of a background check conducted by the national instant criminal background check system in response to a contact from a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, which background check indicates that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(5), a requirement that the system notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

As was just read, the motion to recommit will notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, commonly known as ICE, when an illegal alien who is prohibited from possessing a firearm attempts to purchase a firearm by going through the process of application.

Madam Speaker, I have been here all afternoon, and we have heard time and time again how we have had the problem of mass violence. We have talked about how to solve it, and, unfortunately, this underlying bill, as I have brought out many times already, will not do this. We have heard that we have to do something basically even if it won't work.

Madam Speaker, I will remind this House one more time that what makes you feel good does not always heal you. When we understand that, then we can begin to move forward.

What we have found this day is that this bill has many problems because we chose to rush it to the floor because we had a deadline, and we cut off debate in committee.

We found amendments offered to fix parts of this bill that do not fix them but actually make them worse.

We have found out that the authors of the bill did not even know how much was going to be fined in the bill until we actually pointed it out.

Now we come to the biggest part: I have been here all day listening to: We have to keep criminals from having firearms. We have to keep criminals from having firearms.

I will say it once more, Madam Speaker: We must keep criminals from having firearms.

I am glad to let you know, Madam Speaker, we are now giving everyone in this body a chance to do just that.

A similar measure was promoted. What we are simply saying is that, if you have someone who is a criminal who came into our country illegally—criminal time number one—if they then try to buy or purchase a firearm which they are unable to do, that is the second strike as a criminal, and what we are simply saying is, if they do that, they will be reported to ICE.

Now, which Members in this body are opposed to notifying law enforcement when a person prohibited from purchasing a firearm attempts to do so? Are we against that? No.

I believe my friends across the aisle are not. I have heard it all day: We don't want criminals to have firearms.

But my question to you now, Madam Speaker, is—be very careful. If you vote “no” on this motion to recommit, you cannot go back to your constituency, no matter what is said, and say: I voted to keep illegal aliens, those who should not have a firearm, from having a firearm.

We have heard it all day. And you can moan, you can talk, you can think about it, but, again, Madam Speaker, I understand the sympathy and the concern and the pain upon this bill, but let's not kid ourselves. The bill itself guts itself when it will not even allow a registry which the Obama administration said it had.

Let's actually get back to a point in saying, if there is something about this bill, give everybody an opportunity to actually keep a gun out of a criminal's hands and actually have that criminal punished for that by turning them in.

But, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, please listen to me right now. Hear me clearly. Hear me clearly. No matter what will be said in just a moment, no matter what the chairman or anyone else will say about this bill, if you vote “no,” you are voting to allow someone who should not have a firearm to get away with it and not be prosecuted for it.

Be very clear, Madam Speaker. You can try and make it look better. You can try and say: “Well, it was not part of the bill. I have got to have the bill”; but never get away from the fact, Madam Speaker, if you vote “no” on this motion to recommit, you are making a choice to say: “I guess some criminals can get away with trying to get a firearm.”

That is why this motion to recommit needs a “yes” vote. This is why we on this side stand for making sure that proper firearm safety is upheld while our rights are being upheld and, at the same time, looking to find real solutions, not perpetrating a fraud on those who are scared simply to pass a piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, vote “yes” on the motion to recommit and actually keep guns out of criminals' hands.

Madam Speaker, I yield back balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, let's remember what we are dealing with. We are dealing with the fact that current Federal law with respect to firearms background checks is dangerously limited and flawed because background checks are only required for sales by licensed gun dealers and that many, many people get a gun at a gun show or from someone else. Something like 20 percent, I think the figure is, or 25 percent of gun sales escape background checks.

So all kinds of people who may be criminals, who may be mentally ill, and who may be domestic abusers who shouldn't have guns get guns, and that results in lives forfeited. It results in people killed.

This bill goes a long way toward solving that by saying we are going to require background checks of everyone who gets a gun, with some exceptions, with some reasonable exceptions which are in the bill.

Now, along comes this motion to recommit, which is a total red herring having nothing to do with the purpose of the bill, and says that, if someone fails a background check because he is illegally in this country, you should report that to ICE.

First of all, if he fails a background check because he is illegally in the

country, that means the system knows he is illegally in the country. It means they already know that.

So what is the point of reporting him? He has to be in the system as illegally in the country in order to fail the background check because of section (g)(5). So we already know that, and this is totally circular, number one.

Number two, this is just a red herring to try to mix up the immigration issue with the gun violence issue, and they really have nothing to do with each other.

Number three, for 8 years, we couldn't get a hearing—not a hearing in a committee—on this bill or on any real bill to stop the plague of handgun violence in this country.

Madam Speaker, 150 people killed in Great Britain, 95 in Austria or wherever, 39,000 in the United States—no one will tell me that Americans are 10,000 times as mentally ill as Europeans or Japanese. The problem is we don't have adequate protections on guns. This bill goes in the direction of doing it, and they want to sabotage the bill with a phony issue raised by this MTR.

Now, there is an issue. If people fail the background check for various reasons, then you can make a case it should be reported to local law enforcement agencies. Mr. CICILLINE has a bill to do just that. I am going to yield to him in a second. But the fact is it has nothing to do with this bill. It is just an attempt to sabotage this bill.

If you believe that we ought to cut down on the plague of gun violence in this country, that we ought to save lives, that we ought to get rid of all these people who shouldn't have guns having guns, and that we ought to have background checks in sensible situations, then vote against the motion to recommit and for the bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are on the precipice of passing the first commonsense gun safety bill in this Congress in 25 years. I have been here for 8 years. We begged and pleaded and had a sit-in to try to force Republicans to take up some measure to reduce gun violence in this country.

There are women, men, and families all across America who are demanding that Congress do something. We are about to do this, and you raise a motion to recommit on a phony issue to try to muck this up with this gimmick. If you were concerned about reducing gun violence in this country and passing commonsense gun safety legislation, you had 8 years to bring a bill to the floor.

But if you are really concerned about this, I have good news for you. I have legislation, because, in fact, if someone buys a gun who is a prohibited purchaser, whatever their immigration status is, if they have committed a crime, then they should be arrested

and prosecuted. Every single Democrat believes that.

So I have a piece of legislation that says, if that happens, notify the field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the local law enforcement agency, and the State law enforcement agency, the agencies responsible for enforcing the criminal law, so they can arrest and prosecute that person.

I am looking for a Republican colead. I look forward to hearing from you.

Madam Speaker, defeat this phony amendment and pass universal background checks.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, let us not accept this red herring. Let us not divert. Vote “no” on the motion to recommit and “yes” on the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 209, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—220

Abraham	Cook	Grothman
Aderholt	Costa	Guest
Allen	Craig	Guthrie
Amodei	Crawford	Hagedorn
Armstrong	Crenshaw	Harris
Arrington	Crist	Hartzler
Axne	Cunningham	Hern, Kevin
Babin	Curtis	Herrera Beutler
Bacon	Davidson (OH)	Hice (GA)
Baird	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Balderson	Delgado	Hill (AR)
Banks	DesJarlais	Holding
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hollingsworth
Bergman	Duffy	Horn, Kendra S.
Biggs	Duncan	Hudson
Bilirakis	Dunn	Huizenga
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Hunter
Bost	Estes	Hurd (TX)
Brady	Ferguson	Johnson (LA)
Brindisi	Finkenauer	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (SD)
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Jordan
Buchanan	Flores	Joyce (OH)
Buck	Fortenberry	Joyce (PA)
Bucshon	Fox (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Budd	Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Burchett	Gaetz	Kim
Burgess	Gallagher	King (IA)
Byrne	Gianforte	King (NY)
Calvert	Gibbs	Kinzinger
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	Kustoff (TN)
Carter (TX)	Golden	LaHood
Chabot	Gonzalez (OH)	LaMalfa
Cheney	Gooden	Lamb
Cline	Gottheimer	Lamborn
Cloud	Granger	Latta
Cole	Graves (GA)	Lee (NV)
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Long
Comer	Green (TN)	Loudermilk
Conaway	Griffith	Lucas

Luetkemeyer	Reschenthaler
Luria	Rice (SC)
Marchant	Riggleman
Marshall	Roby
Massie	Rodgers (WA)
Mast	Roe, David P.
McAdams	Rogers (AL)
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)
McCaul	Rooney (FL)
McClintock	Rose (NY)
McHenry	Rose, John W.
McKinley	Rouzer
Meadows	Roy
Meuser	Rutherford
Miller	Scalise
Mitchell	Schrader
Moolenaar	Schweikert
Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin
Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Murphy	Sherrill
Newhouse	Shimkus
Norman	Simpson
Nunes	Slotkin
O'Halleran	Smith (MO)
Olson	Smith (NE)
Palazzo	Smith (NJ)
Palmer	Smucker
Pence	Spanberger
Perry	Spano
Peterson	Stauber
Posey	Stefanik
Ratcliffe	Steil
Reed	Steube

NAYS—209

Adams	Fletcher	McEachin
Aguilar	Foster	McGovern
Allred	Fudge	McNerney
Amash	Gabbard	Meeks
Barragán	Gallego	Meng
Bass	Garamendi	Moore
Beatty	Garcia (IL)	Morelle
Bera	Garcia (TX)	Moulton
Beyer	Gomez	Mucarsel-Powell
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler
Blumenauer	Green (TX)	Napolitano
Blunt Rochester	Grijalva	Neal
Bonamici	Haaland	Neguse
Boyle, Brendan F.	Harder (CA)	Norcross
Brown (MD)	Hastings	Ocasio-Cortez
Brownley (CA)	Hayes	Omar
Bustos	Heck	Pallone
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Panetta
Carbajal	Hill (CA)	Pappas
Cárdenas	Himes	Pascrell
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Payne
Cartwright	Houlahan	Pelosi
Case	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Casten (IL)	Huffman	Peters
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Pocan
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Porter
Cisneros	Johnson (TX)	Pressley
Curtis	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Clarke (MA)	Keating	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Clay	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Cleaver	Khanna	Richmond
Clyburn	Kildee	Rouda
Cohen	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kind	Ruiz
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Ryan
Cox (CA)	Langevin	Sanchez
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Scanlon
Cummings	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Davids (KS)	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (CA)	Schrier
Dean	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Lewis	Scott, David
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
DeBene	Loeb sack	Shalala
Demings	Loftgren	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Sires
Deutch	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Luján	Soto
Doggett	Lynch	Speier
Doyle, Michael F.	Malinowski	Stanton
Engel	Maloney	Stevens
Escobar	Carolyn B.	Suozzi
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Españolat	Matsui	Takano
Evans	McBath	Thompson (CA)
	McCollum	Thompson (MS)

Titus	Vargas	Waters
Tlaib	Veasey	Watson Coleman
Tonko	Vela	Welch
Torres (CA)	Velázquez	Wexton
Trahan	Visclosky	Wild
Trone	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Underwood	Schultz	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Frankel	Gosar	Katko
---------	-------	-------

□ 1533

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

Messrs. DAVIDSON of Ohio and MASSIE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 8, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER:

Page 5, after line 4, insert the following:

“(E) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph shall include, in the case of a background check conducted by the national instant criminal background check system in response to a contact from a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, which background check indicates that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(5), a requirement that the system notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, in order for the amendment that was just passed to be passed, am I correct that you would have to vote for this bill with that amendment now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the question on the amendment and then the question on passage.

Mr. HOYER. The vote now is to pass the bill as amended. Am I correct?

My parliamentary inquiry is, if that does not pass, am I correct that the amendment that was just voted for by so many in this House, it would be defeated if the bill is defeated?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Following the disposition of the amendment, the Chair will put the question on passage of the bill.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 190, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—240

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Allred	Gottheimer	Pallone
Axne	Green (TX)	Panetta
Barragán	Grijalva	Pappas
Bass	Haaland	Pascarell
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bera	Hastings	Pelosi
Beyer	Hayes	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Peters
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Hill (CA)	Pingree
Bonamici	Himes	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brindisi	Horsford	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Buchanan	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Hurd (TX)	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carbajal	Jayapal	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz
Case	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Keating	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kildee	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schneider
Clay	King (NY)	Schrader
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Connolly	Lamb	Serrano
Cooper	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Shalala
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Courtney	Lawrence	Sherrill
Cox (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Craig	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Crist	Lee (NV)	Smith (NJ)
Crow	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Cummings	Lewis	Spanberger
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Suoizzi
Dean	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe y	Takano
DeGette	Luján	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Luria	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lynch	Titus
Delgado	Malinowski	Tlaib
Demings	Maloney,	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Torres (CA)
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Torres Small
Diaz-Balart	Mast	(NM)
Dingell	Matsui	Trahan
Doggett	McAdams	Trone
Doyle, Michael F.	McBath	Underwood
Engel	McCollum	Upton
Escobar	McEachin	Van Drew
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Espallat	McNerney	Veasey
Evans	Meeks	Vela
Finkenauer	Meng	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	Moore	Visclosky
Fletcher	Morelle	Wasserman
Foster	Moulton	Schultz
Fudge	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy	Watson Coleman
Galleo	Nadler	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
	Norcross	Yarmuth
	O'Halleran	

NAYS—190

Gooden	Palmer
Gosar	Pence
Granger	Perry
Graves (GA)	Peterson
Graves (LA)	Posey
Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Green (TN)	Reed
Griffith	Reschenthaler
Grothman	Rice (SC)
Guest	Riggleman
Guthrie	Roby
Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Harris	Roe, David P.
Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)
Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.
Higgins (LA)	Rouzer
Hill (AR)	Roy
Holding	Rutherford
Hollingsworth	Scalise
Hudson	Schweikert
Huizenga	Scott, Austin
Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (LA)	Shimkus
Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Jordan	Smith (NE)
Joyce (OH)	Smucker
Joyce (PA)	Spano
Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
King (IA)	Steil
Kinzinger	Steube
Kustoff (TN)	Stewart
LaHood	Stivers
LaMalfa	Taylor
Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Thornberry
Lesko	Timmons
Long	Tipton
Loudermilk	Turner
Lucas	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Marchant	Walden
Marshall	Walker
Massie	Walorski
McCarthy	Waltz
McCaul	Watkins
McClintock	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Wenstrup
Meadows	Westerman
Meuser	Williams
Miller	Wilson (SC)
Mitchell	Wittman
Moolenaar	Womack
Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Mullin	Wright
Newhouse	Yoho
Norman	Young
Nunes	Zeldin
Olson	
Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—2

Frankel Katko

□ 1544

Mrs. BEATTY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 787

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 787.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of a bill I sponsored, H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, to make sure that the most vulnerable children in the United States have access to lifesaving medical care, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the 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.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the Majority Leader to immediately schedule a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act so that we can protect the sanctity of human life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING HEALTH AND WELLNESS COACHES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor America's health and wellness coaches.

Approximately 70 percent of healthcare dollars in the United States are spent on lifestyle-related diseases; but health and wellness coaches can decrease those costs by helping people achieve their personal health and wellness goals.

Far too many people suffer and struggle with poor health because they don't have the motivation and resources or sustained support needed in

order to transform their habits. Healthy habits are not always easily achievable when a patient is working alone, but health coaches are there to ensure people succeed in taking control of their health issues.

That is why, earlier in February, Congressman MULLIN and I introduced a bipartisan resolution to express our support for health and wellness coaches. I am proud of our work together as co-chairs of the Congressional Men's Health Caucus, and I encourage my colleagues to join us in recognizing America's health and wellness coaches.

METHANE RELIEF ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, in 2016, the Environmental Protection Agency announced the New Source Performance Standards for the oil and natural gas industry to further regulate methane emissions. Thankfully, the EPA is revisiting this regulation in an effort to provide flexibility and relief moving forward.

For many small oil and gas producers, these requirements contained in the original regulation are simply unworkable and overly burdensome.

For example, the regulation would even apply to wells that produce less than 15 barrels of oil and less than 90,000 cubic feet of natural gas per day. Because these wells produce at low volumes, the profit margin remains tight for the operators.

However, under the original rule, these low-volume producers would be subject to expensive upgrades, additional reporting requirements and administrative costs in order to comply with the regulation.

Madam Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 1391, the Methane Relief Act of 2019, which would exempt these low-volume wells from the rule's requirements. Doing so will allow for commonsense regulatory relief and certainty for these smaller operators which account for an important part of our domestic energy industry.

AN ACTUAL NATIONAL EMERGENCY

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address an actual national emergency. There are too many damn guns in America, and far too many lives have been lost. Last year alone 40,000 Americans were fatally shot, the most in 50 years.

My county suffers from gun violence on a near-daily basis. In the last 5 years, we have lost 370 people to gun violence; 127 of these victims were children.

Recently, a pregnant mother was killed, and her teenage daughter in-

jured in a senseless shooting. The family had already lost a relative to gun violence.

Almost as shocking as these statistics, for 25 years Congress failed to pass significant gun control legislation until today. I am comforted by how swiftly House Democrats began tackling this crisis, and pray that the Senate finds the courage to follow our lead.

American voters sent us an urgent message last November; thoughts and prayers and moments of silence are not enough. Let us reassure them that passing the Background Checks Act of 2019 is just the first step of many more to come; and we won't stop until this national emergency is over.

THE TEXAS SKY HAS A NEW STAR

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, we all know an iconic Texas song: "The stars at night are big and bright, deep in the heart of Texas."

The sky of Texas has a new star, the brightest star ever. Her name is Marlee Hope Pack. She is glowing right beside me.

After a courageous fight with childhood cancer, God called Marlee home on February 23. Marlee's cancer would not be stopped. Her dad, Bill, kept asking Marlee: What is your wish with Make-A-Wish?

After a few weeks, sweet Marlee answered: "Dad, if I have to think about it this hard, I don't need a wish."

Marlee turned Make-A-Wish into make a gift. She opened Marlee's Bear Workshop and partnered with Build-A-Bear to give kids with cancer teddy bears and hope.

Thank you, Bill and Shelly, and all who loved Marlee for giving us such a special person. She made our world better.

□ 1600

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF DOMINICAN INDEPENDENCE FROM HAITI

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 175th anniversary of Dominican independence and the birth of the first country I call home.

On February 27, 1844, the founding fathers of the Dominican Republic, great statesmen and lovers of freedom and democracy, raised the flag of a new republic in Santo Domingo and proclaimed their independence from Haiti, bringing another democratic republic into the family of nations.

In the words of Dominican icon and independence leader Juan Pablo Duarte: "Love of country led us to make sacred commitments with the

next generation," and the commitments that he and his fellow patriots made 175 years ago live on in the hearts of every Quisqueyano, whether they are still on the island of their birth or whether they have made a new home abroad.

Today is the day for all of us to celebrate the contributions of the Dominican people, just as my compatriots celebrate their independence throughout the country.

RECOGNIZING JALISA PETERSON

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Jalisa Peterson from Liberty County High School on being a finalist for the 2019 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards.

One of 29,000 students across the country who participated, Ms. Peterson was one of only eight high school students acknowledged in the State of Georgia for exceptional projects of community service. Specifically, she volunteered at a local orphanage, playing games, crafting art, reading, and building relationships with children, all the way from newborns to 18-year-olds.

I am very proud of Ms. Peterson's work and glad to have someone like her in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

I am glad to see this award is encouraging more community service, a crucial aspect in order to make our world a better place to live.

GUN VIOLENCE: WE NEED TO DO MORE

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

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, we just voted on H.R. 8. It is the first gun control measure we have taken up in years. It is progress, but we still have so far to go. There are so many lives that have been taken from too many communities.

On February 15 in Aurora, Illinois, on the edge of my district, that was the community where a man with a gun took five innocent lives: Trevor Wehner, Clayton Parks, Vicente Juarez, Russell Beyer, and Josh Pinkard.

They were fathers, brothers, sons, uncles, friends, and they joined a long line of Americans who have been going about their daily lives and got killed.

Here is what is really sickening: Most of the Members of this body don't even know their names. A week from now, you are going to forget their names, and you are going to replace them with another set of names, not because they don't deserve to be remembered, but because every day in America, 100 people get shot.

Can we remember all their names? I can't. And shame on us for allowing that to happen.

Occasionally, one of those shootings captures our attention, and we offer some thoughts and prayers. Leave that to families. Leave that to people of faith. We are lawmakers. Our job is to write the laws, fix the laws.

If we took 100 million guns off the street tomorrow, we would still have more guns than any other country. We need to do more.

GREATER BRANDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the Greater Brandon Chamber of Commerce, an institution that has helped small businesses and business owners in the Tampa Bay area succeed for over 60 years.

I think specifically of Ron Pierce, a very good friend of mine who started his own consulting firm 10 years ago. Over the past decade, he has grown his small business to include four other consultants and now provides advice to some of the largest interests in Tampa, including the Tampa Bay Lightning and the Port of Tampa Bay.

On top of managing his own successful business, he is also an upstanding member of our community. He regularly volunteers to bring food and clothing to families in need. He has worked on youth drowning prevention and provided advice to leaders in Tampa Bay on how to improve our local economy.

In recognition of his service, the Chamber recently bestowed upon him the Community Leadership Award, the highest honor granted by the organization.

The Greater Brandon Chamber of Commerce is a model organization in my district, and it helps small businesses succeed in their work so that they can then help others.

I am proud to be a member of the Brandon Chamber of Commerce. As a member of the Small Business Committee, I look forward to working with them to create a stronger economy for Tampa Bay.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I just voted for H.R. 8, and I stand in support of H.R. 1112.

It has been 1 year since Parkland. It has been 6 years since Sandy Hook. It has been 19 years since Columbine. It has been 25 years since the Long Island Rail Road massacre, when Congresswoman Carolyn McCarthy lost her husband and her son was shot in the head.

It has been 37 years since President Reagan was shot.

Think of all the suffering that each of these shootings has caused. Think of the missing seats at the dinner table and other family events.

Countless families have been torn apart because of gun violence, including that of one of my constituents, Linda Beigel Schulman.

Linda's son, Scott, was one of the 17 innocent people who lost their lives in Parkland that day last year. Scott, a geography teacher and a cross-country coach, gave his life protecting his students. Scott died heroically while locking the door to his classroom, where students were hiding from the approaching gunman.

Since that date, we have been pushing more and more for commonsense gun reform, and H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112 are just that.

Last week, Linda said to me, "If a universal background check prevents just one shooting, it has served its purpose."

She inspires me. And I am inspired by my colleagues who are fighting for commonsense gun reform, whether they be Democrats or Republicans.

EUREKA BASKETBALL

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Eureka College men's basketball team, which last weekend clinched their first ever Division III NCAA tournament bid.

On Saturday night, the Red Devils knocked off top-seeded Webster 70-69 on the road to secure their conference championship, assuring their spot in the Division III tournament.

With just a few weeks remaining in the regular season, the Red Devils needed to win out their remaining four games to enter the conference tournament, and they did just that.

The never-give-up spirit embodied by the team is a testament to the great work done by Coach Chip Wilde, and I have no doubt it will carry them through the NCAA tournament.

Our community in central Illinois is immensely proud of the historic accomplishments of this year's Eureka men's basketball team, and we will be cheering them on as they take on the number-one-seeded Nebraska Wesleyan this weekend.

Congratulations, and go Red Devils.

RECOGNIZING MAMA LILA CABBIL

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, as we recognize Black History Month, I rise to celebrate the life and contributions of a remarkable Detroit community activist.

While I was at the Macomb County Celebration of Black Excellence last Saturday, the Michigan activist community received news of the loss of Mama Lila Cabbil.

A close friend of Rosa Parks for 30 years, Ms. Cabbil was a national leader in the fight against racism and a powerful Detroit activist, particularly in the struggle for clean and accessible water.

At Rosa Parks' funeral service in 2005, Ms. Cabbil invoked Matthew 7:16: "You shall know them by their fruits." When I read those words today, I think of Mama Lila's commitment to Michigan's Black community and to all communities that have suffered the theft of their voting rights and the unjust loss of their homes and their water.

During Black History Month, it is my honor to highlight Mama Lila's contribution to Detroit and our region and the example she sets for all of us as a passionate servant leader.

RECOGNIZING JOHN WILLIAM TYSON

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

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Arkansas businessman and Tyson Foods founder, the late John William Tyson.

John spent his life building Tyson Foods into one of the world's leading food companies and was equally committed to serving northwest Arkansas.

In 1931, John Tyson moved his family to Springdale with only a nickel in his pocket. There, he laid the foundation for a future Fortune 100 company.

John transformed the poultry industry. He developed a novel in-transit feeding system, hatched chickens, and produced commercial feed himself. With each new venture, John diversified and grew his business.

In 1947, Tyson Feed and Hatchery was incorporated. Over time, the business expanded to become the successful company that we know today.

He exemplified the entrepreneurial spirit of our State, and it is for his contributions to the Arkansas economy that he is being posthumously enshrined in the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame.

I congratulate his family for this terrific honor.

TOLL OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, as a Member of the House representing a district disproportionately affected by gun violence, I know firsthand the toll that it takes on our community. That is why, earlier today, I voted on H.R. 8.

Just a year ago last October, a 27-year-old man was killed in a senseless

act right in front of my house in Little Village in Chicago. As of Sunday, our city had witnessed 241 shootings in 2019 so far, including two in my neighborhood in the last week.

In fact, in Chicago, five of six homicides remain unsolved, but Chicago has some of the most stringent gun laws in the U.S. What we need is Federal legislation that makes it harder to access guns.

It is our responsibility to stand up for the safety of our communities we serve. I am proud to have voted for the passage of the Bipartisan Background Checks Act moments ago. Tomorrow, we will vote to close the Charleston loophole, and I urge my Senate colleagues to advance these efforts immediately.

REQUIRE NICS TO REPORT TO ICE

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I was disappointed in the passage of H.R. 8 just a few moments ago, which will do nothing to address the rash of mass shootings that have occurred across this country in recent years but will place impediments in the way of law-abiding citizens acquiring firearms and in defense of their Second Amendment rights. But I was pleased that the motion to recommit was adopted.

That motion was based on an amendment I offered in committee to require the national instant background system to report to ICE when an illegal immigrant tries to obtain a firearm in violation of current law. I was pleased that it received 220 votes.

I have drafted it as a standalone bill. I will offer it for cosponsorship. I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring the bill and ensuring those not here legally who try to purchase a gun are reported to ICE and deported before they commit additional crimes.

YOUTH ACTIVISM AGAINST GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, Newtown, Charleston, San Bernardino, my hometown of Orlando, Vegas, Parkland: Young Americans have grown up associating these cities with pain and tragedy. They have only known a Congress that is unwilling to address gun violence or be moved even by the senseless murder of innocent children.

After car accidents, gun violence is now the second leading cause of death among young people. This is a staggering statistic, and my young constituents know it. They live in fear that their classmates, friends, family members, or neighbors could be the next target. But instead of sitting on the sidelines, young Americans have marched, mobilized, and found purpose.

Today, their collective voices reverberated across the Halls of Congress as the House, for the first time in decades, answers their calls for commonsense gun safety measures.

I am proud to support legislation that will strengthen our background check system to help keep dangerous weapons away from dangerous people.

By passing these commonsense measures, we are finally taking concrete steps to defend the lives of these young Americans and guarantee them a safer future.

As chair of the Future Forum, I thank every young leader who has helped us get to this historic moment. We hear your pleas. We value your activism. And we will keep fighting with you to end gun violence once and for all.

□ 1615

NO MORE

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, after the Parkland shooting, high school students in my district told me a heartbreaking truth. They didn't believe that Congress cared about their lives or their future. Sadly, I understood why.

Compacency defined the Republican Congress' position on gun violence. They did nothing after moviegoers were slaughtered in Aurora, kindergartners were murdered in Newtown, and after one of our own colleagues, Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, was shot doing her job as a U.S. Representative.

After 46 people were gunned down at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, I sat on this very floor in protest. My colleagues and I sat in solidarity with a very clear but somber message: No more. No more moments of silence. No more inaction while Americans had senseless deaths due to gun violence. No more would the entirety of solutions to gun violence be tweets with our thoughts and prayers.

It has been 2 years since the sit-in and, finally, the inaction has come to an end. Thanks to the brave survivors, the students, the advocates, and the family members, we have been able to pass commonsense gun safety.

Today is a new day, and we will continue this fight.

HONORING THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE AND RECOGNIZING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader and all of those persons in leadership who make it possible for us to have these opportunities.

I am especially proud to be here tonight because we have two resolutions that will be presented. These two resolutions have been presented before. One is H. Res. 154. This resolution is one that honors and praises the NAACP, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The second is H. Res. 155. It is a Black history resolution.

It is interesting to note that the NAACP was founded during Black History Month. The NAACP was founded February 12, 1909. The NAACP has a proud history, and I will say more about it in just a moment.

Next, I would like to talk for a brief moment about the resolution that we have for Black History Month.

Black History Month didn't start out as Black History Month. The Honorable Carter G. Woodson initiated what was called Negro History Week. Negro History Week was a time for us to acknowledge the accomplishments of African Americans, at that time called Negroes. We have metamorphosed through many titles, many names, from Negroes to African Americans.

Black History Month was something that Mr. Woodson found to come into being in 1976. This was done by President Joe Ford. As it has been designated as Black History Month, we have celebrated it as such across the length and breadth of this Nation.

Carter G. Woodson was a person with great vision. He obviously knew that in 1926, when this was initially brought to the attention of the public, there was not a good likelihood that you would be able to have a Black History Month. But he knew that, if you can start someplace, you might finish in a greater place. So he started in 1926 with Black History Week, and it has metamorphosed into a month.

You and I know that every day is a day that we should celebrate all history, and Black history is no exception. I am not a person who believes that we should have Black History Month forever. I think that Black history, properly incorporated and celebrated within American history and world history, would be more than enough. But today, we are honored to celebrate Black History Month and the NAACP as an organization that was founded during Black History Month.

I would like to say just a few words about this NAACP resolution in terms of the first time we brought it to the floor of the Congress of the United States of America.

When we brought it to the floor the very first time, the cosponsor of the resolution was Mr. Henry Hyde, and the person who controlled the time was Mr. JIM SENSENBRENNER. Mr. SENSENBRENNER, at that time, was the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee. I recall Mr. SENSENBRENNER standing

over to my right and making his commentary about the NAACP. He spoke with a degree of fervor that I thought was needed at the time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, while he brought it to the floor and did direct the traffic, I would note that it was not an easy resolution to get past the House of Representatives. It did pass with consent of the House. It was agreed to, if you will.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. Hyde had a difficult time getting it through the House. I am proud that they did, and I am pleased that none of the Members at that time voiced objections to the resolution being agreed to. Mr. SENSENBRENNER I will always remember as a person who was a champion for this resolution, and Mr. Hyde was the cosponsor of the NAACP resolution.

The NAACP is celebrating its 110th anniversary. This is probably the Nation's oldest and best known civil rights organization, founded on February 12 of 1909, the date of the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, the centennial of his birth.

It is interesting to note that Black History Month was considered because of Abraham Lincoln's birth as well, so the two resolutions have this in common, Black History Month and the NAACP's being celebrated and recognized today.

It was founded by a diverse group of persons who were outstanding citizens. I would also add that it was not founded by a group of persons all of whom were African American. I will call off the names for you to give you some indication.

Ida Wells-Barnett, the well-known W.E.B. Du Bois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villard, and William English Walling—all persons who were founders of the NAACP.

The NAACP, for the early part of its history, had a minority of minorities, meaning African Americans were not the dominant force within its leadership. They had persons who were carrying the torch of freedom such that African Americans could be a part of it. But it is interesting to note that, early on, the leadership was predominantly Anglo persons.

The NAACP, as indicated, is the oldest, largest, and most widely recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization in the United States. The active membership is in all 50 States, including State conferences of branches and local branches, as well as branches in prisons and chapters on college campuses and high schools throughout the Nation.

The NAACP has its national headquarters in Baltimore, Maryland.

The NAACP is here to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination.

The NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence, including negotiation, litigation, and protestation.

The NAACP is well known for its litigation. The Honorable Thurgood Marshall, an African American to become Supreme Court Justice, was the chief litigator for the NAACP. Under his leadership, with the assistance of a good many other people, the NAACP was able to win many lawsuits before the Supreme Court. The lawsuit *Brown v. Board of Education* is one of the most notable lawsuits that the NAACP championed.

The NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to secure the voice for those who are considered voiceless in the United States of America.

The NAACP has been fighting segregation in public schools under the leadership of Thurgood Marshall, as I indicated earlier, and its greatest victories, of course, include, as I indicated, *Brown v. Board of Education*.

The NAACP, in 2005, launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help hurricane survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama to rebuild their lives.

So the organization has metamorphosed into one that does more than champion the causes of civil rights as they relate to persons being discriminated against. It also champions the causes of those who are among the least, the last, and the lost in our society: persons who have been locked out, persons who have been left behind, persons who but for the NAACP might not have a voice.

I was very honored to be a part of the NAACP's disaster relief help. I am also honored to have been a branch president of the NAACP in Houston, Texas.

The NAACP was instrumental in the enactment of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which generally and greatly expanded the legal definition of a hate crime. This was an important piece of legislation. I was honored to be here at the time we took up the legislation.

Hate crimes are still crimes that we have to not only acknowledge exist, but the law ought to have consequences for persons who commit these dastardly deeds.

Throughout its existence, the NAACP has led the charge to defend the constitutional right to vote. That is an important piece of commentary, the right to vote. The NAACP is still a part of the effort to assure every person the right to vote in this country.

The NAACP has taken on the challenge of dealing with the photo IDs that are required in an insidious way. It has also taken on the challenge of making sure that persons are properly registered so that they can vote, and also making sure that those who would thwart the efforts to register persons to vote are not successful in doing so.

The NAACP has led the effort to strengthen the Voting Rights Act and to protect the principle of one person, one vote. The NAACP led the charge in raising awareness about and challenging voter suppression laws in Federal courts across the Nation.

The NAACP board of directors unanimously elected Derrick Johnson as its President and CEO, who is doing an outstanding job. I am proud to be associated with him and the endeavors.

I am a proud member of the NAACP. I have been such for a good deal of my life. I am honored to have a life membership, to have a golden heritage membership, and to have a diamond membership.

I believe those of us who have benefited from the NAACP ought to be members of the organization that has made it possible for us to have many of the opportunities that we have. I always acknowledge my membership in the organization, and I encourage others to do so who happen to be members as well: the NAACP, a proud organization that we celebrate during this Black History Month.

The Black history resolution covers more than the NAACP. It talks about Black migrations. It emphasizes the movement of people of African descent to new destinations and new social realities. This focuses on, primarily, the migration of African Americans in this country. It focuses specifically on the 20th century through today.

It deals with patterns of movement, including the relocation of persons of African ancestry from Southern farms to Southern cities; from the South to the Northeast, Midwest, and West; and from the Caribbean to the United States. Black people have been in motion in the 20th century and up to this date, and this resolution acknowledges this.

□ 1630

It also talks about the interactions with law enforcement that often result in some ugly circumstances, imprisonment and convict leasing.

Convict leasing is something that we should give a little bit more emphasis to.

In the State of Texas, we recently discovered a grave site containing 95 bodies. These 95 bodies were of persons who were victims of the State's law that allowed convict leasing.

Many times persons were charged with minor offenses and while they were incarcerated, they could be leased to private parties for the purpose of having them work as convicts. And many times—too often, I might add—the persons who were leased out, were not treated properly. In fact, they were treated poorly.

Many times they were not given proper food, proper clothing, and proper shelter; and as a result, many of them died at an early age. In this grave of 95 persons, there are persons who were thought to have been teenagers at the time of that death.

We are not absolutely sure they were all African Americans, but the suspicion is that a good many of them were. Some of them were likely to have been Anglos as well.

After finding their bodies in Sugar Land, Texas, on the site of a school,

school property, the bodies were exhumed, and they were to be relocated to another place. And in so doing, a good many of the citizens, the activist community, decided that this was an inappropriate thing to do—the bodies being exhumed and reinterred at another location.

There was a serious meeting before the school board. And the school board and the county commissioners, the commissioners court decided that it would be appropriate to further study the possibility of inhuming these bodies in the place where they were exhumed.

And my hope is we would follow through on this and give them not only a burial site with a proper plaque to memorialize their being in this place, but also to do a little bit more and have some sort of structure or facility that would allow persons to acquire intelligence about what actually happened to these people, how they lived, and how they died, and why.

This country has come a long way, but, of course, we still have much more to do. But we want to make sure that we do not overlook the history associated with persons who were leased as convicts to private persons for the purpose of performing work for them.

This migration that I spoke of earlier, known as the Great Migration, was caused by a lack of economic opportunities because of harsh segregation laws in the south and because of the terror that was perpetrated against African American communities by the KKK.

The KKK, obviously, was active in the south; and the KKK, obviously, was in the business of terrorizing African American persons. And it is interesting to note that while this House has condemned a good many persons for their activities, I have not been able to find a record showing that the KKK has been condemned for its activities by way of a resolution that actually focuses on a person who has been associated with that organization.

The KKK has a horrible history in this country, and it is my hope that we in the House of Representatives will take up a resolution condemning this entity for what it has done.

I plan to bring such a resolution to the attention of the House.

This resolution on black history indicates that prior to 1910; more than 90 percent of African Americans lived in the south. And by the 1970s, 47 percent of all African Americans were living in the north and in the west.

This is why it is called the Great Migration. When you have this much of a population moving for opportunities, moving for reasons associated with concern for their well-being, that is a significant migration.

And during World War I, when slowing immigration from Europe created a labor shortage in the north, companies began recruiting African Americans to fill the assembly lines, to work in steel mills and railroads and factories. It

was not unusual to hear persons talk about “going up north,” going up north so that they could have opportunities in the north that they were unable to acquire in the south.

African Americans who migrated to the north still faced racial discrimination in the form of redlining, in the form of racially based housing ordinances, in the form of higher rent based on race, and for the resurgence of the KKK, and the rising instances of race riots.

African Americans were not always welcomed with open arms when they sought to migrate to these new destinations.

African Americans created their own cities and neighborhoods, free of discrimination, where their culture expanded.

For example, in Harlem, New York City, that housed over 200,000 African Americans, there was a culture that was created there in Harlem. And we are proud to say that that culture still exists. Harlem has been a very important part of African American history.

Efforts were made to provide educational opportunities for African Americans, including the founding of what is now North Carolina Central University.

Greenwood, Oklahoma, is another part of the history that we ought to acknowledge. It was a part of Tulsa, and became the home of a thriving black business—a section also known as Black Wall Street—until the Tulsa riot of 1921, in which a white mob literally burned down Greenwood.

U.S. history has some parts of it that we are not proud of, but we do have to acknowledge.

In Houston, Texas, there is an area known as Freedmen's Town. And freed slaves were given the opportunity to purchase land and build their homes along the bayou, known as Buffalo Bayou in Houston, Texas. And this was at the end of the Civil War.

And over six decades, the town thrived with churches and schools and stores and theaters and jazz spots—clubs, if you will. This was a thriving area dominated by African Americans.

I would also like to mention another personality;

Judge Frank M. Johnson, who was said to be one of the most courageous judges ever to occupy a Federal bench; he was a part of the effort to integrate the south. There are many people who have praised him, including Dr. Martin Luther King.

He is the person who issued the order to require the constabulary to allow the marches to proceed across the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery.

He is the person who filed the order—along with the other judges—to integrate the bus line, that was called the Montgomery bus boycott. He opened the doors to persons of all hues, especially those of African ancestry who had been locked out.

Frank M. Johnson will ever be remembered as a champion of human

rights. In fact, he will also be remembered as a person who did it under adverse circumstances, because he had to have, for many years, 24-hour security. His mother's home was torched at one time.

It was not easy to be on the side of African Americans in the early part of history.

Frank M. Johnson took such a stand.

We would also recognize Senator Edward Brooke, III, who became the first African American popularly elected to the United States Senate.

He was from Massachusetts, and he served there for many years. He was the first attorney general of African ancestry in any state.

In 1962, he cowrote the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which prohibited discrimination in housing. He was the first Republican to call for President Nixon's resignation in light of the Watergate scandal.

The history of African Americans in the north is one that is rich; the history in the south is one that is rich; but they all started, to a greater extent, with a migration that proceeded from the south to many destinations in the north, as well as in the west.

So today, we have a resolution that encourages the continued spread of knowledge regarding black history, and that it not be limited to one month, but that we do this throughout the entire year.

I am so honored that my colleagues have signed on to this resolution. We have had more than 60 colleagues to sign on to one, and I would hope that as we continue to present these resolutions, we will have more persons who will find favor with them.

In closing, simply this: The success that we have had as African Americans—if we look closely at our history—we will find that it was not something that was acquired by our own efforts alone.

Of course, we have done our part to extricate ourselves from some circumstances that were indeed unpleasant and very harmful and hurtful, but there were other persons who were there to be of assistance and help.

Many of the stations at the Underground Railroad had persons who were not of African ancestry that were there for us as we were traversing our way to freedom.

In many of the battles that were fought in the courtrooms, there were persons who were funding the litigation that were not of African ancestry.

The Spingarn brothers are such persons. The NAACP awards its highest medal annually in the name of the Spingarns.

When we have had few people to stand with us, the Jewish community has been there. When we have had few people to stand with us, the LGBTQ community has been there. When we have had few to stand with us, we have had persons of all stripes; Muslims have been there; persons of all faiths have been there.

At the March on Washington, if you take a close look at that march, you will see persons of many hues, many stripes, persons from many walks of life.

So we are here today, proud to be here in the well of the Congress of the United States of America, but we understand that we didn't get here by ourselves, and we are proud to celebrate black history. But we are also proud to acknowledge that black history includes the history of a lot of persons who were associated with our efforts to acquire our freedom, our liberty, and the opportunities that we enjoy today.

Madam Speaker, I thank you very much for the time, and I proudly yield back the time such that you may continue with the business of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools during fiscal year 2018, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 112 note; Public Law 109-469, Sec. 901(g) (as amended by Public Law 114-328, div. A, title X, Sec. 1012) (130 Stat. 2385); to the Committee on Armed Services.

237. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of TRICARE Select and Other TRICARE Reforms [Docket ID: DOD-2017-HA-0039] (RIN: 0720-AB70) February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

238. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Exceptional Family Member Program (EFMP) [Docket ID: DOD-2011-OS-0127] (RIN: 0790-A182) received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

239. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maryland; Garret County, Unincorporated Areas [Docket ID FEMA-2018-0002; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8565] received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

240. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Alas-

ka; Valdez [Docket ID FEMA-2018-0002; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8561] received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

241. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's interim rule — TSP Loan Eligibility During Government Shutdowns received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

242. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Construction Contract Administration [GSAR Change 98; GSAR Case 2015-G503; Docket No. 2016-0015; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 3090-AJ63) received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

243. A letter from the Executive Director, United States World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's periodic report for the period ended December 31, 2018, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, Sec. 5(b)(1); (126 Stat. 2450); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

244. A letter from the Executive Director, United States World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's report for the period ended September 30, 2018, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, Sec. 5(b)(1); (126 Stat. 2450); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

245. A letter from the Executive Director, United States World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's periodic report for the period ended March 31, 2018, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, Sec. 5(b)(1); (126 Stat. 2450); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

246. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Containment Installation, South of New Orleans, LA, Gulf of Mexico [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0030] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

247. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River Rock Blasting, Marcus Hook, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0031] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

248. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of Chief Counsel, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revisions to Hazardous Materials Grants Requirements (FAST Act) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2015-0272 (HM-209A)] (RIN: 2137-AF19) received February 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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 Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1384. A bill to establish an improved Medicare for All national health insurance program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Rules, Oversight and Reform, and Armed Services, 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. KIM (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1385. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to preserve the option of States to implement health care marketplaces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 1386. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for additional requirements with respect to the navigator program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 1387. A bill to require the President to develop a national strategy to combat the financial networks of transnational organized criminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1388. A bill to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 1389. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to include an act of unregulated custody transfer in the definition of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1390. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to promote the ability of individuals entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B of the Medicare program and individuals enrolled under a State plan under the Medicaid program to access their personal medical claim data, including their providers, prescriptions, tests, and diagnoses, through a mobile health record application of the individual's choosing, 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1391. A bill to provide regulatory relief for conventional marginally producing oil and gas wells from the Environmental Protection Agency's "Methane Rule"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1392. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify the authority for pay and work schedules of border patrol agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1393. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of dental, vision, and hearing care under the Medicare program; 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. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1394. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain reforms with respect to medicare supplemental health insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1395. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve mental health services for students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 1396. A bill to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award

Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race; 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. CLINE (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. RESCIENTHALER, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. ROY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 1397. A bill to require the national instant criminal background check system to notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement of firearm transfer denials by reason of illegal or unlawful presence in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 1398. A bill to delay the reimposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2021; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 1399. A bill to expand the use of E-Verify, to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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. COHEN (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 1400. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a

motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1401. A bill to establish the Commission on Long Term Social Security Solvency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1402. A bill to transfer functions related to the preparation of flood maps from the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to the Director of the United States Geological Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. CRIST:

H.R. 1403. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the lessor of housing, acquired or constructed under the Military Housing Privatization Initiative and that is located on a military installation, to operate and maintain such housing to certain standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DEMINGS (for herself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 1404. A bill to strengthen the United States response to Russian interference by providing transparency on the corruption of Russian President Vladimir Putin; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico (for herself and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1405. A bill to improve the collection and publication of statistics relating to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Reform, Education and Labor, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Financial Services, 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. LAWSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 1406. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to include the setting of reference prices for aluminum premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GONZÁLEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. NORTON,

Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. KATKO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. MENG, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of California, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1407. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1408. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to eliminate the applicability of such Act to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 1409. A bill to promote transparency in health care pricing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Reform, for 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. REED (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1410. A bill to prohibit the continuation of an executive emergency declaration under the National Emergencies Act absent approval by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Foreign Affairs, 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. SIREs (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to allow former volunteers and officers and employees to use the seal, emblem, or name of Peace Corps on death announcements and grave stones; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 1412. A bill to require the national instant criminal background check system to

notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the relevant State and local law enforcement agencies whenever the information available to the system indicates that a person illegally or unlawfully in the United States may be attempting to receive a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 1413. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. WEXTON (for herself and Mr. RIGGLEMAN):

H.R. 1414. A bill to amend the duties of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) to ensure FinCEN works with Tribal law enforcement agencies, protects against all forms of terrorism, and focuses on virtual currencies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 1415. A bill to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 401 Southeast 1st Avenue, Gainesville, Florida, as the "Maurice M. Paul Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1416. A bill to protect the legal production, purchase, and possession of marijuana by Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution requiring Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate to participate in random drug testing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CRIST, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. MENG):

H. Res. 153. A resolution supporting the development of guidelines for ethical development of artificial intelligence; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KEN-

NEDY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 154. A resolution honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 110th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VELA, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 155. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the significance of Black History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Ms. CHENEY):

H. Res. 156. A resolution calling for accountability and justice for the assassination of Boris Nemtsov; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

4. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 280 Joint Resolution, requesting that the United States Congress take immediate steps to reach a compromise and end the partial shutdown of the Federal Government and restore financial security to the live of citizens; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

5. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 52, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1384.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 1385.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:
H.R. 1386.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:
H.R. 1387.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution for the foregoing Power and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 1388.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANGEVIN:
H.R. 1389.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 1390.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 1391.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. HURD of Texas:
H.R. 1392.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section VII

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 1393.
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. DOGGETT:
H.R. 1394.
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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee
H.R. 1395.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, clause 3

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 1396.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CLINE:
H.R. 1397.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BERA:
H.R. 1398.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:
H.R. 1399.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 1400.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COLE:
H.R. 1401.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:
H.R. 1402.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 1403.
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. DEMINGS:
H.R. 1404.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:
H.R. 1405.

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

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 2, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution (as amended by Article XIV, Clause 2), which provides:

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, [. . .]. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct. [. . .]

The Congress also has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]—And

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.

In addition, the Congress also has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

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; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:
H.R. 1406.

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

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. MOULTON:
H.R. 1407.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 1408.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:
H.R. 1409.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. REED:
H.R. 1410.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, specifically:

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 defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Clause 11: The Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Article I, Section 9, specifically:
Clause 7: No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. SIREs:
H.R. 1411.

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

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1412.

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

Article 1, Section 8
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to

Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Ports, Magazines, Armaments, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

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. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1413.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 1414.

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

Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 1415.

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

article 1 section 8 clause 17

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1416.

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

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 20: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 33: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 35: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 99: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 141: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 208: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 220: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 230: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 273: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 383: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 497: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 500: Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 510: Mr. LAMB, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 530: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 555: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MENG, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 560: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 613: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 643: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 652: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 663: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 717: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 737: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KIM, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. Rouda, Mr. RUSH, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 738: Mr. BURCHETT.

H.R. 748: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 803: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 808: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 842: Mr. TONKO and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 861: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 862: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 868: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 873: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 891: Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 911: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 919: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 961: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 962: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 998: Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1004: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1018: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. DEAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1019: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1025: Ms. OMAR and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1030: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1046: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1055: Ms. PORTER, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. CROW.

H.R. 1108: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOST, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FOSTER, Miss GONZALEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1131: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1156: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1166: Mr. RYAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1170: Mr. RUSH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1171: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1174: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1175: Mr. EMMER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. STUBE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY,

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. COMER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1179: Mr. BUDD, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1184: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1185: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1192: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1225: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1231: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1232: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1233: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VELA, and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 1236: Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. DEAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1241: Mr. KILMER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1257: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1297: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1298: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SHALALA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1309: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1321: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1327: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1328: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1346: Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1351: Ms. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1357: Mr. COHEN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1360: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1364: Mr. RUSH and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 1368: Mrs. TORRES of California and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1380: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. RASKIN and Ms. PINGREE.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 23: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LATTI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 72: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H. Res. 106: Ms. HAALAND and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 107: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. WALTZ.

H. Res. 124: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 152: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. MENG.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 787: Ms. WILSON of Florida.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2019

No. 36

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.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.

Precious Lord, take our hands. Lead us forward, and help us to stand.

We praise You for the gifts and talents You have given our Senators. Continue to bless them with influence that can make a difference. Lord, give them the wisdom to cut through the complex issues and discover solutions to the challenging problems that threaten our freedom. Remind them to be good stewards of the abilities You have so generously given them. Prepare their hearts to respond to You with gratitude as they strive to live for Your glory.

We pray in Your great 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. CRAMER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael J. Desmond, of California, to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate confirmed the 31st new circuit judge since January of 2017. Eric Miller came to the Senate for our consideration with a stellar resume and a sterling legal reputation. We had every indication he would interpret our Nation's laws and Constitution as they are actually written. This is exactly the kind of judge the American people deserve to sit on our Nation's courts of appeals. That is why the Senate will continue to make judicial nominations a top priority.

This week, however, we need to make more progress on the backlog of important executive branch nominees whom Democrats' delaying tactics and obstruction have left literally languishing on the Senate calendar.

The first is Michael Desmond, the President's choice to serve as Chief Counsel of the IRS. Mr. Desmond has put his legal expertise to work through years of public service, including at the Department of Justice Tax Division and at the Department of the Treasury. He has an impressive private sector background as well.

So listen to this: In the last Congress, the Finance Committee recommended Mr. Desmond to the full Senate by a vote of 25 to 2. That was last August. Yet this noncontroversial nominee never got a floor vote and had to be sent back to the White House. Well, Mr. Desmond was renominated. Earlier this month, our colleagues on the Finance Committee reported him favorably yet again—26 to 2.

I am sorry my Democratic colleagues required us to file cloture on this thoroughly noncontroversial nominee. It is a good example of the unreasonable tactics that have, sadly, become their standing operating procedure in many cases, but I am glad we voted to advance the nomination yesterday, and I urge everyone to join me in voting to confirm him soon.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. President, on another matter, the Environment and Public Works Committee, led by Chairman BARASSO, is meeting today to consider legislation that would help reduce, capture, and find productive uses for carbon dioxide emissions. It is an important subject and deserves a serious approach, but, as we all know, some on the far left have recently offered other ideas on this subject. That is right—the much heralded Green New Deal. Nothing says forward-thinking and fresh ideas quite like borrowing the name of an 80-plus-year-old policy program and just adding the color “green.”

So what is this thing all about? That turns out to be an interesting question. It depends on whom you ask. The Democrats who authored it say it is a massive reorganization and government takeover of our Nation's economy and our culture. Some have argued it is the only way to stop the world from ending in about a decade.

This was interesting news, even to many of their fellow Democrats. Our colleague Senator DURBIN reacted this way:

I have read it, and I have reread it, and I asked [Senator] Ed Markey: “What in the heck is this?”

That was the assistant Democratic leader.

But it looks like, one way or the other, the Democratic Party as a whole is eager to get behind this great idea.

So what is in it? Here are just a few of the hits in the 16-page resolution the Senate will soon be voting on.

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1497

Here is one you will like: “Upgrading all existing buildings in the United States and building new buildings.”

Don't want a Federal bureaucrat to decide how your house should look or what size it should be? Don't want to pay to rebuild the entire downtown? Don't want to tear down your small business so it can be replaced by the government? Too bad. These new social planners know best.

Here is another quote: “Meeting 100 percent of the power demand in the United States”—listen to this—without using any American fossil fuels or nuclear power whatsoever.

That is right. It is the War on Coal on steroids. Say goodbye to all of those jobs, and say hello to a new wave of cronyism that would make the half a billion dollars in taxpayer losses from Solyndra look like pocket change. Everything in your garage will have to go too. A lengthy background document that this plan's authors have since tried to scrub from the internet helpfully explains that a Green New Deal would mean “replac[ing] every combustion engine vehicle.”

How about this one: “Guaranteeing a job . . . to all people of the United States.”

That one is buried on page No. 14—a government-guaranteed job for everyone. That may sound like a good utopian goal, but their handy background document makes the real intention known, promising “economic security for all”—listen to this—even for those who are “unwilling to work.”

That is a lot of magic wand-waving, but I have only scratched the surface. The background document also called for a plan to “build out high-speed rail at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary.” As our colleague Senator HIRONO pointed out, this might be a tough sell in Hawaii or in Puerto Rico or in other places. The Governor of California just scaled back a high-speed rail project in California because, as he put it, it “would cost too much and, respectfully, take too long.” Even with heavy Federal subsidies, it is billions over budget and behind schedule.

That document also promised to, magically, “remove pollution and . . . emissions from manufacturing” just like that. I wonder why nobody has thought of that before.

So it is clear what we have here. It is the far left's Santa Claus wish list that is dressed up to look like serious policy.

Bad ideas are nothing new, and silly proposals come and go, but the philosophies and the ideas behind this textbook socialism are not just foolish; they are dangerous. Their ascent in the Democratic Party is a real threat to American prosperity and to working families.

Chairman BARRASSO reported that one analysis found that this proposal could increase the average household's power bills by as much as—listen to this—\$3,800 a year. Another estimate predicted that families would have to

spend hundreds of billions of dollars just to replace common household appliances with Washington-approved models.

What about the total cost to the government for this socialist shopping spree? One recent estimate has that pegged at a cool \$93 trillion over the first 10 years—more than the combined GDP of the entire world. Let me say that again. Their plan is predicted to cost more than the entire economic output of every country on Earth combined.

Remember what the American people are supposedly getting in return—a sprawling socialist state to rule over us, a host of good jobs and key industries ripped away, and an end to every energy source that the middle class can actually afford. Remember, China has already sailed past the United States in terms of carbon emissions. The far left still wants us to unilaterally disarm our whole economy—lots of pain for us and no meaningful gain in containing global emissions. We will go bankrupt, but at least it will be great for China. I bet they are cheering in the streets.

So the way I see it—the way most Republicans see it—is this proposal is either a brilliant piece of comedy or a disastrous socialist vision that is totally alien to the United States of America.

What about our Democratic colleagues? Where do they stand?

Recently, I announced that Senators will get to go on record and vote for or against all of this, but curiously enough, this planned vote was met with outrage from the very people who were claiming to champion the proposal.

Last night, our colleague from Rhode Island said it was “truly preposterous” for me to schedule a vote on the Green New Deal. That is not exactly a ringing endorsement of a plan the Democrats claim to support. He does not seem to be alone in his uneasiness. At one point, the Speaker of the House dismissed her party's own plan as the “green dream.” The senior Senator from California worried publicly the other day that there is no way to pay for it. As I noted, the assistant Democratic leader summed up a lot of people's thinking when he asked: “What in the heck is this?” I think a great many Americans all across the country are asking themselves the very same thing—what the heck is this?

Before much longer, every Member of this body will have a chance to go on record, loud and clear. Do our Democratic colleagues really support this fantasy novel that is masquerading as public policy? Do they really want to completely upend Americans' lives to enact some grand socialist vision? Do they really want this to be their Democratic Party? Well, before long, the Senate will vote, and these questions will be answered.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I heard Leader MCCONNELL knocking the Green New Deal. I would ask the leader—and we are going to keep asking him and every Republican in this Chamber—what they would do about climate change, about global warming.

So, Leader MCCONNELL, do you believe that climate change, global warming, is real? Yes or no.

Second, do you believe that climate change, global warming, is caused by humans?

And, three, do you believe that Congress should take immediate action to deal with the problem?

Until Leader MCCONNELL and his Republican majority answer those questions, the games they are playing here will have no meaning. This is not a debate. It is a diversion. It is a sham.

Democrats will be introducing a resolution in a few days—shortly—that says we believe in these three things, and we will be asking our Republicans if they support or oppose that resolution.

The silence of the Republican majority on climate change is enormous. Is it because the oil industry gives so much money to our Republican friends? Is it because they are antisience? What is the reason?

Not a single bill has been brought to the floor to deal with climate change or global warming in the 5 years Leader MCCONNELL has been the majority leader. What is your plan, Leader MCCONNELL? What is your answer? We know what you don't like. What do you like? Anything?

NORTH KOREA

Now, the Trump administration is in the middle of two crucial negotiations with foreign capitals, the result of which will have ramifications for decades.

In Vietnam, President Trump will meet with Chairman Kim to continue discussions over the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, while at the same time administration officials continue negotiations with Beijing over a major trade pact. In both instances, President Trump would have the best chance of having success if he articulated clear objectives and maintained a hard line until those objectives were achieved.

For a time, that approach—the right approach—seemed to hold sway at the White House, as sanctions and tariffs brought both North Korea and China to the negotiating table. Recently, however, President Trump seems headed

down the path of capitulation on both North Korea and China, prepared to trade away our leverage in exchange for flimsy agreements. The President can't seem to stick to a policy, even when it is beginning to work. So eager is he for that quick photo op.

There is an old expression that March comes in like a lion and goes out like a lamb. Well, based on all reports, when it comes to North Korea and China, spring is coming a little early at the White House. President Trump, on both China and North Korea, came in like a lion, with tough rhetoric and hard-line policies, but now President Trump is poised to go out like a lamb, meekly accepting half-baked agreements from both capitals for the sheer sake of it.

In North Korea the highest priority of U.S. foreign policy has been the complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, as well as the cessation of human rights abuses by the brutal, despotic, and murderous Kim regime. But just this weekend, before leaving for Hanoi, President Trump said: "I don't want to rush anybody; as long as there's no testing, we're happy." That is a far cry from the complete denuclearization that he called for in the past, and it signals a dangerous softening of our position before the talks even started.

The irony of ironies is that for all the talk of "maximum pressure" and "fire and fury," President Trump's stance on North Korea may wind up far weaker than Hillary Clinton's. I know he doesn't like to hear that, but the truth is the truth.

President Trump seems more interested in touting his warm relationship with Chairman Kim as an accomplishment in and of itself. President Trump's calling a brutal autocrat a friend on Twitter is no substitute for actually achieving something for the American people in Hanoi.

I hate to say it, but it would be absolutely incredible and even pathetic if President Trump were giving in to North Korea for the sake of a photo op to knock Michael Cohen's hearing from the front page, but if the past behavior of the President is any guide, something like that is, unfortunately, totally conceivable.

CHINA

Now, Mr. President, the same situation is playing out in China. After starting down the right path, press reports indicate that President Trump appears to accept something far short of his initial aims. President Trump has already started promoting a "signing summit" at Mar-a-Lago before an agreement has even been inked. Just imagine how that undercuts our negotiators—to say already he is going to sign something when we are eyeball to eyeball with the Chinese. That is not the art of the deal. That is the art of capitulation.

As the Times reported this morning, "Mr. Trump has grown impatient with the talks, and a consensus is growing

in Washington that Mr. Trump will ultimately accept a weak deal." Shame on him if he does.

China is robbing and stealing our family jewels: American industrial know-how, American information technology, Americans' ability to do things.

When we are good at it, China doesn't let us in and compete, unless we give them all of the knowledge of how to do it themselves, and China steals our intellectual property. Just 2 weeks ago, there was another hacking—and now we are going to capitulate?

What the Times goes on to say is that "the Chinese have so far declined to make concrete commitments to reform their economy that the administration has demanded"—these are the words of the New York Times—"including ending China's practice of subsidizing companies, engaging in cyber-theft and forcing American companies to hand over intellectual property to Chinese partners in order to do business there."

Even our business community does not want the President to capitulate. I met with a bunch of them. They want him to stay strong. Everyone wants him to stay strong. Now he is caving.

This President cannot take a policy and pursue it to its end. His attention span is so small, his desire for immediate gratification seems to be so large that the American worker loses. If we capitulate to China, that American worker will lose for decades. That American worker's children will lose.

So I say to President Trump, it would be a momentous failure if you relent now and don't receive meaningful, enforceable, and verifiable commitments on structural reforms to China's unfair trade policy. Simply buying more soybeans or buying more materials or planes is not going to solve the structural problem, and in a few months China will continue to unfairly gain on us—not right.

So, I wonder, where are all the supposed hawks? Where is Secretary Pompeo on China and North Korea? Where is Ambassador Bolton? Do they feel they can argue internally with the President and he overrules them and that is that? What good is it for them to be there? Oh, yes, they can say: It would have been even worse if we weren't there. That is no way to do policy when either American safety, in regard to North Korea, or American economic prosperity in the future, in regard to China, is at stake.

I believe Ambassador Lighthizer has made a sincere effort to do the right thing on China, but his efforts are constrained by a President who seems intent on weakening his hand every few weeks. Again, where is Bolton? Where is Pompeo? Where are they? They have been hawks on these two issues their whole lives. Now they get in the administration; they just go along, when they were among the loudest critics of President Obama and President Clinton? Not right. Not good for America.

It just so happens that two of President Trump's signature foreign policy issues will come to a head at roughly the same time. There are historic opportunities here to make America safe by removing nuclear weapons from a rogue regime and to end two decades of rapacious Chinese trade policy. We can finally put American companies on a level playing field with our largest competitor. If the President, having brought the Chinese to the table with tough sanctions and tariffs, takes 10 percent or 20 percent of what we can get, that would be very bad for this country, American workers, and American incomes. As they continue to stay flat or decline, one of the main reasons is unfair trade practices by China. We have to be strong and tough. We can win this fight if we can stay strong.

The bottom line is this. If over the course of the 1 month President Trump capitulates to both Beijing and Pyongyang, the foreign policy of his Presidency will be in shambles. It will zig and zag to no real accomplishment. More importantly, the national security and economic security of the American people will greatly suffer as a consequence.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in a document later removed from her website, one of the Green New Deal's sponsors had this to say about the Green New Deal: "The question isn't how we will pay for it, but what we will do with our new shared prosperity."

"The question isn't how we will pay for it . . ." That was the quote. That is a pretty staggering statement when you consider that the Green New Deal plans to upend most of American society as we know it, from transportation to healthcare, but I suspect there was a simple reason the Green New Deal authors didn't want to talk about how to pay for it—because they couldn't figure out how.

This week, one think tank released a first estimate of what the Green New Deal would cost, and here is the answer: between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years—between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion. Those numbers are so large that they are almost impossible to process.

Just for perspective, consider the fact that the entire Federal budget for 2019 is less than \$5 trillion. That is the entire Federal budget—defense spending, domestic priorities, Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, everything.

The Green New Deal could end up costing \$9.3 trillion each year—double the current Federal budget—and the government would still have to pay for a lot of other priorities on top of that. That money wouldn't cover defense spending, or Social Security, or a number of other urgent needs.

The Green New Deal would assuredly raise Americans' energy bills, but that is just a tiny fraction of what Democrats' Green New Deal, which goes far

beyond mere energy policy, would cost American families. It is difficult to even imagine the staggering tax hikes that would be required to pay for this plan.

This plan would never be paid for just by taxing the well-off. That is always the argument we hear. Taxing every household making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would leave the Democrats far short of \$93 trillion. Taxing every family making more than \$100,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would still leave Democrats far short of \$93 trillion. In short, actually implementing this so-called Green New Deal would involve taking money not just from the well-off but from working families in this country—and not a little bit of money either.

Ninety-three trillion dollars breaks down to over \$600,000 per household. That is over 10 times the median household income in my State of South Dakota.

Should the Democratic Green New Deal come to pass, ordinary Americans would see incredible tax hikes. Middle-class Americans would see a substantial and permanent reduction in their standard of living.

When we talk about Democrats' socialist fantasies, we tend to quickly fasten on the staggering costs of these programs, but it is important to also remember what else they would cost Americans.

Socialism just doesn't come with a staggering pricetag; it also comes with less freedom, fewer choices, and less control of your own destiny.

Socialized medicine like Medicare for All wouldn't mean just big tax hikes; it would mean giving up your private insurance plan, even if you like your coverage. It would mean being forced onto the government's healthcare plan, whether you like it or not. It would mean waiting in long lines. It would mean long wait times you can't do anything to avoid.

The Green New Deal would mean higher electricity bills and higher taxes, but it would also mean limited transportation choices, including no airplane travel, increased government control over your housing options, less reliable energy, and the list goes on.

Democrats' socialist fantasies would cost Americans untold amounts of money and permanently damage our economy, but the loss of choice and freedom would cost Americans even more. Democrats' green dream would be a green nightmare for Americans and American families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if you are a student of history, the speech you just heard is not a new speech. It is a speech that has been given repeatedly in the Senate Chamber. It was back in the 1930s, when a President named Franklin Delano Roosevelt had an idea, and the idea was radical at the time.

Here was the radical idea: Shouldn't we allow people, during the course of their work-life, to put a little money away and to invest for their retirement so that when they reach the age of 65, they will have a program called Social Security?

That was considered a radical socialist idea, taking money from everyone to create a positive program to help retirees across America when they reach retirement age. It takes away our freedom, they said. We ought to be able to make our own choices in life. They resisted it, but, fortunately, they failed and in their failure allowed the creation of the Social Security Program, which is the single most popular government program in America today. Over 95 percent of Americans count on Social Security to make sure that when they reach retirement, there is something there to take care of them, but that wasn't the end of the speech you just heard. It was repeated again in the 1960s because another Democratic President by the name of Lyndon Baines Johnson came up with a notion that, perhaps, if people are going to live a little longer and have Social Security, they should also be able to have affordable healthcare. So Lyndon Baines Johnson suggested the creation of Medicare.

What did the critics say about Medicare? Socialism; that you would collect money from people all across America just to provide for the benefits to those who are retired; that you would take away our freedom to make our own savings plans for our future by saying we have to pay into Medicare. It is an attack on our freedom, they said. It is a socialist idea, they said. Thank goodness they lost in that debate as well.

What happened, of course, was a creation of a Medicare Program, and we can see what came about as a result of it, a dramatic increase in the number of hospitals in America and doctors in America. We started taking healthcare seriously when it came to senior citizens. What is the proof in the pudding? Senior citizens started living longer and longer lives. They were healthier, they were independent, they were strong because of this so-called socialist program of Medicare.

So if you listened this morning as Republican leaders came to the floor and decried socialism again, what is their point now? Their point now is, they believe that if we make a national effort toward dealing with climate change and global warming, it is socialism. It takes away our freedom.

I would agree with them in this respect. If we do something as a nation, a sensible approach that is moderate, constructive, and positive, it is going to change the future. It is going to take away the opportunity that some of us will have to leave a planet for our children that is uninhabitable.

Does anyone doubt—does anyone doubt—that we are dealing with some change in the climate that we face around this world? Does anyone doubt

that the scientific evidence, year after year after year, about the increased temperature of this planet has had a negative impact on the world we live in—more extreme weather events than we have ever seen, tornadoes in Taylorville, IL, in December?

Listen, I grew up in Illinois. I was awakened many times in the summer to get down in the basement because there was a tornado warning. My parents were worried about it. It was part of growing up in the Midwest, part of growing up in Illinois. I don't recall ever going down to the basement around Christmas. It turns out that tornado season in Illinois, and many other places, is now becoming a year-round event and flooding and fires and flooding in the city of Miami. All of these things are evidence to me that something is going on, and we have the scientific explanation. Greenhouse gas emissions are creating a different environment, warming our planet, changing our weather patterns.

I have come to the floor repeatedly over the last several years and asked one basic question, can anyone name any major political party in the world today—any major political party in the world today—that, like the Republican Party of the United States, denies climate change?

I make that open challenge over and over again on the floor and have never had a Republican come to me and say: No, there is another party somewhere that takes our position on the issue that climate change is a fallacy and a fiction. I will tell you, though—maybe I am not supposed to repeat this—but one Republican Senator, after I made that challenge over and over again, drew me aside in the elevator, looked in both directions, and said: I think there is a political party in Australia that also denies climate change. That is as good as it gets—one more party somewhere halfway around the world.

When Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, comes to the floor and challenges the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, with the basic questions, I believe we have the right to ask for an answer.

To the Republicans, to my friend from South Dakota who just spoke, to Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the first question is this: Do you believe that there is such a thing as climate change and global warming? That is a pretty easy question. The scientists overwhelmingly believe it. I do too.

The second question that Senator SCHUMER has posed to them is this: Do you believe that our human activity has something to do with it? Well, the scientific evidence is overwhelming again. Once we got into the industrial age and starting spewing all of the smoke and chemicals into the air, things started warming up on this planet Earth.

The third question that Senator SCHUMER has posed to the Republicans is basically fundamental, as well: What

are you going to do about it? The answer is obvious. For the 4 years the Republicans have been in control in the Senate, they have done nothing—nothing. Now they have a President who has the United States as the only country in the world—the only Nation on Earth—that has withdrawn from the Paris accord, which tried to create a global strategy to deal with climate change.

The President is enthralled by the notion that climate change is a fallacy, a fiction, and so are the Senate Republicans. So any effort to address this is socialism. Any idea that we should come together as a nation and work toward a planet that our kids can live on is taking away our freedom. Well, we know better.

Under President Obama, we started moving toward more fuel-efficient cars and trucks. A gallon of gas is giving us more mileage because of government policy. Well, I guess it took away the freedom of gas guzzlers, but we can at least say we made a positive step forward, and this administration is stepping backward, and they are doing it for the fossil fuel industry—for oil and gas and coal interests. They are coming to the floor and trying to get us into a fight, once again, over socialism when we talk about government policies that would guide us in the right direction for the future.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to give the first of what may turn out to be many speeches on a subject that affects every single American. The question is the rising cost of prescription drugs in this country.

The first drug that I wanted to address, I wanted to choose carefully because I wanted to choose a drug that really is important to the largest number of Americans. So I thought to myself, what is the most commonly used life-or-death drug in America today? There is some debate about it, but I am going to suggest that it is insulin.

In 1923—almost 100 years ago—researchers were awarded the Nobel Prize for the groundbreaking discovery of insulin to treat diabetes—1923.

The chief scientist in the discovery was Dr. Frederick Banting. He believed that insulin should be accessible to everyone. His team sold the patent to the University of Toronto for \$1 so that “no one could secure a profitable monopoly” on the production of insulin. That might seem hard to believe today, with the price of insulin having increased more than 600 percent over the past two decades.

Take a look at the chart, which maps the increases in price. Eli Lilly’s blockbuster insulin drug, Humalog, was introduced in 1996 at a cost of \$21. By 2019, the cost went up to \$329.

Sanofi’s Lantus was \$35 when it came to the market in 2001. It now costs \$270. The insulin drug, NovoLog, cost \$40 in 2001. By 2018, it went up to \$289—for insulin.

How many Americans are affected by this? There are 30 million Americans

who live with type 1 or type 2 diabetes—almost 10 percent of our population. Approximately 7.5 million of them rely on insulin to manage their blood sugar levels. It is a matter of life and death. Yet patients are suffering because of these dramatic price spikes.

A recent study found that one-quarter of patients who rely on insulin have been forced to ration their doses due to cost, basically in contravention of the advice of their doctors.

This is a story that many of us have heard here. Last year, we heard from the mother of Alec Raeshawn Smith. He went off his mom’s health insurance. Under the Affordable Care Act, he could remain covered until he reached the age of 26. He had diabetes. He had coverage for his insulin until he reached the age of 26. Then he couldn’t afford to buy health insurance. So when he went off of that insurance, he was faced with the monthly cost of his insulin out of pocket. That monthly cost was \$1,000.

He managed a little restaurant, and he couldn’t come up with \$1,000. So he decided that he would ration his insulin and not take as much as was required by his doctor, trying to make it last between paychecks. Alec died as a result of that decision.

How is it that in the richest country on Earth, patients are having to ration their insulin or start GoFundMe websites just to survive?

Insulin was a cure found in the 20th century that patients now cannot afford in the 21st century. Pharma’s war on patients with diabetes must come to an end.

Yesterday, there was a hearing, widely televised, where seven or eight of the CEOs of major pharmaceutical companies faced the music before the Senate Finance Committee. Senator GRASSLEY, Senator WYDEN, and many others asked questions about the issue I am raising today: What is going on? Why are you raising prices so high? There were no good answers coming from these executives.

Today, I am going to start highlighting on the floor of the Senate the egregious cases of pharmaceutical greed in the United States.

Years ago, there was a Senator from Wisconsin named William Proxmire. He was an unusual man. He was far different than most Senators today. He was the type of fellow who would show up at the University of Wisconsin games, passing out cards. That was his style of campaigning. He didn’t spend a lot of money on television and radio.

He really was a grassroots politician, and he was a tenacious fellow. He started something called the Golden Fleece Award—Proxmire of Wisconsin’s Golden Fleece Award. Once a month or more, he would come to the floor and talk about waste—taxpayer waste—in our Federal Government. It developed a national reputation.

In deference to Senator Proxmire, whom I had a chance to meet when I was a college student, I am going to

try to follow in his tradition by pointing out egregious examples of greed by the pharmaceutical industry in the United States on a regular basis with the Pharma Fleece Award.

My first Pharma Fleece Award is for the pharmaceutical industry’s extortion of 7.5 million diabetic patients in America who depend on insulin. This is a lifesaving product that has been around for almost a century.

How can the most common life-and-death drug be so expensive? First, the United States is an outlier. The same companies I am talking about sell exactly the same drug in other countries around the world for a fraction of the cost.

The United States represents only 15 percent of all of the global insulin market; yet we generate more than half—more than 50 percent—of Pharma’s revenue for this drug.

How can Lantus cost \$372 in the United States? The exact same drug made by the same company costs \$46 in France and \$67 in Canada. Why? Why are we paying five, six, and seven times more in the United States for exactly the same drug? It is because the governments of France and Canada care about the cost, and they say to the company Sanofi, in this case, that makes Lantus: If you want to sell Lantus in Canada, we are not going to let you hike the prices and raise them to the high heavens. We are going to keep the prices reasonable so that the people of Canada can afford this life-saving drug. What do we do in the United States? Nothing. We let them charge whatever they wish.

How can Lantus cost \$372 for Americans, while the same, exact drug for the French is \$46, and just across the border, in Canada, it is \$67?

Our problem is that our system doesn’t function as a free market. There is virtually no competition. Three companies control the insulin supply in America: Eli Lilly, Sanofi, and Novo Nordisk.

Typically, in a free market, three competitors would lower the prices, wouldn’t they? But in America, these three charge as much as they can and get away with it because they are protected by government-granted monopolies.

We should reward innovation, we should promote research, and we should ensure that companies do make a profit for their good work, but abusive manufacturers should not be protected from competition by our government.

Lantus has been on the market since the year 2000. Sanofi has received 49 secondary patents on insulin. What does that mean? They have created a fortress around this lucrative drug for a 37-year monopoly in offering this drug for sale in America.

Unfortunately, there is no effective deterrent today against Big Pharma’s greed and price gouging on these and so many other drugs. That is why, earlier this month, I introduced a bill called

the Forcing Limits on Abusive and Multimutuous Prices Act, or FLAT Prices Act. This legislation will discourage and deter the pharmaceutical industry from raising prices by reducing the government monopoly periods when they do.

You see, companies are awarded monopoly periods from 5 to 12 years by the Food and Drug Administration for drug approval beyond the patent protection. My FLAT Prices Act would reduce this FDA-granted exclusivity period for a drug whose price increases more than 10 percent a year, bringing generic competitors into the marketplace, creating real competition, and trying to lower prices for Americans.

That brings us to another issue. Today, there remains no generic, no biosimilar insulin that can be substituted in a pharmacy. Think about it. Almost a century after the discovery of human insulin and even half a century after the discovery of synthetic and analog insulin, we still don't have a generic insulin for sale in America that is affordable.

I will acknowledge that these changes in insulin have improved the quality of life for patients. They have made them safer, more effective, and more convenient, but these changes have delayed the development of generic substitutes.

There are other reasons the FDA has regulated insulin as a drug rather than as a biologic, placing insulin under a framework with a much higher bar than generics to prove they are substitutes. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—the Food and Drug Administration is supposed to be shifting its regulatory process for insulin to enable copycat versions, known as biosimilars, to be approved quickly. Unfortunately, FDA's plan to implement this law will not bring relief to patients any time soon.

I do believe that the Food and Drug Administration Commissioner, Dr. Gottlieb, truly wants to lower costs and spur competition. I wasn't convinced when his nomination came up for a vote, but I have had subsequent conversations with him, and I think he is genuine. I think he wants to see the prices come down.

However, the Food and Drug Administration's current plan will effectively freeze the approval process for lower cost insulin and force generic insulin makers who are under review to resubmit their new applications each year.

This creates a 2-year lockup where it is unlikely that any new insulin competitors will come to market. America's diabetic patients cannot wait.

That is why Senator CRAMER, a Republican from North Dakota, and I are sending a letter urging the Food and Drug Administration to revise and bring flexibility to this process so we can get the lower cost insulin on the market approved sooner.

Two weeks ago, I received a little note from a constituent in Mount Vernon, IL. That is downstate, near

where my father was born. He wrote that both he and his daughter had been diagnosed with type 1 diabetes in 1997. At that time, their Humalog insulin cost \$10. Today, he writes that the cost is \$300 a bottle, and he needs six bottles a month.

His monthly costs have risen from \$600 to \$1,800. Here is what he said in this letter:

At some point, drug companies must be held to account for the actions they are taking. These cost increases are costing American citizens to choose between insulin and eating in many cases. I'm tired of listening to all the excuses. . . . what is it going to take for Congress to do its job?

I agree with my constituent. Congress needs to step up and demand real change. The sky-high cost of life-or-death insulin is literally killing Americans.

My work with Senator CRAMER to speed FDA approval of lower cost insulin and my bill to shorten monopolies for abusive pharma companies are a start. This pharma fleecing of insulin patients across America must end.

I yield the floor.

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

PROPOSED RULES CHANGE

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined today on the floor by my colleagues to discuss the unprecedented levels of obstruction aimed at President Trump's nominees. This issue plagued the 115th Congress, and it is one I am hopeful we can remedy moving forward in this new session.

The Senate is tasked with the critical role of providing advice and consent on many of the President's nominations, including executive branch officials and Federal judges. Vetting these officials is a task that I take extremely seriously, and I have often welcomed discussion regarding these critical appointments with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as my constituents.

We can all agree that these positions must be filled by our Nation's most qualified candidates, individuals who are committed to public service and upholding the values and principles that make our Nation so great. We should also be able to agree that these positions should be filled using an expedient and timely process.

As any Iowa small business owner can tell you, if you don't have employees, you can't function. Iowans and many others across this Nation expect the Federal Government to run on the same commonsense principle.

The recent levels of obstruction for the President's nominees have not only kept the executive branch and our Federal courts from staffing critical positions but have also prevented the Senate from moving forward on other critical legislative priorities and initiatives.

In the past, the Senate has been able to disagree on certain nominations and still move forward in a respectful and expedient manner to ensure that the

Federal Government operates efficiently. However, during President Trump's first Congress, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have utilized a series of procedural tactics to eat up time on the Senate floor and to stall the President's nominees.

To put this in perspective, during President George W. Bush's first Congress, the Senate forced a cloture vote on nominations only 4 times. That was during President Bush's first Congress. So it was 4 times.

During President Clinton's first Congress, this increased to a mere 8 cloture votes—8 cloture votes for Clinton.

During President Obama's first Congress, the use of this tactic still remained minimal, with only 12 cloture votes on nominations. So it was Bush, 4; Clinton, 8; and President Obama, 12.

Compare that to the use of cloture votes during the 115th Congress. My Democratic colleagues forced cloture votes 128 times—128 times. That is 10 times more often than during President Obama's first Congress.

Despite that President Trump submitted nearly the same number of nominees as President Obama, 29 percent more Obama nominees than Trump nominees were confirmed during each President's respective first Congress. Yet these delays have often not been used to raise objections to controversial or unqualified nominees. That is just not the case.

In fact, nearly half of all recorded cloture votes—48 percent, to be exact—received 60 or more votes to end debate. Furthermore, nearly a third received 70 or more votes to end debate. These nominees were confirmed with widespread bipartisan support.

Cloture was not invoked in order to extensively debate the merits or the qualifications of those candidates. Instead, this procedural tactic has been used to run down the clock and prevent the Senate from moving forward with other important business.

Many nominees from my home State of Iowa have been fortunate enough to escape some of these political games. I was proud to see the Senate reach an agreement in September to move forward and confirm Judge C.J. Williams to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Iowa by a 79-to-12 vote. I am also glad that multiple U.S. marshals and U.S. attorneys have been able to fill critical Federal law enforcement positions in Iowa after being confirmed by a voice vote in the Senate.

However, while many of these positions have been filled back in my home State, Iowans are still greatly harmed when the Senate fails to efficiently fill executive branch positions whose duties do impact the entire Nation.

Furthermore, many States across our Nation have faced unnecessary challenges to filling critical positions after cloture was invoked for noncontroversial nominees.

Take a State like Alabama, for example. Judge Annemarie Carney Axon received bipartisan support from both

of her home State Senators for her nomination to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. However, Democrats forced a cloture vote on her nomination before confirming her by a vote of 83 to 11.

Similarly, Judge Terry Doughty was confirmed to be a judge on the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana by a 98-to-0 vote after a forced cloture vote.

These are not isolated examples. Just last year, multiple district judge nominees in Kentucky and Texas received the support of more than 90 Senators, but only after their nomination was first stalled, again, by an unnecessary cloture vote.

We cannot continue to allow the Senate to be bogged down by unprecedented obstruction tactics. The American people expect and deserve a fully functioning government with the right personnel in place.

That is why I want to thank Leader MCCONNELL for continuing to make nominations such a priority and managing to confirm so many Federal judges, despite these tactics. I also thank my colleagues, Senators BLUNT and LANKFORD, for introducing a proposal that accelerates the nomination process for lower level nominees.

This commonsense proposal builds on the previous Reid-Schumer rule affecting Senate considerations of Obama nominees during the 113th Congress—a rule that garnered widespread bipartisan support, including the agreement of 35 of my Democratic colleagues who still serve in the Senate today.

I urge my colleagues to support this reasonable proposal that enables us to move forward in a timely manner while still encouraging input and debate on those candidates. It is time for the Senate to put a halt to these delay tactics and get back to fulfilling our commitments to the American people. Again, I urge support of the proposal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, maybe the fastest way to put people to sleep is to give a speech on cloture here in the Senate, but I hope that is not the case, because, as my colleague from Iowa just pointed out, this is an abuse of the Senate rules to do nothing but to obstruct and to slow down President Trump's well-qualified nominees for important positions.

This is not about their qualifications. This is not about exercising the constitutional responsibility of advice and consent. In virtually every instance in which the clock has been burned to get to an eventual vote, these largely non-controversial nominees have been confirmed overwhelmingly.

Call it part of the "Trump derangement" syndrome or the "never Trump" effort. It is very clear to me that rather than take these nominees one at a time, treat them fairly, assess their qualifications, and vote on their nomination, these people are being delayed

and denied an opportunity to serve, and many of them have just simply given up because of the backlog of nominations. It is unfair to them, it is unfair to this administration, and it is completely an abuse of the Senate rules.

We know that our Democratic colleagues have unnecessarily blocked nominees, put them through the ringer in hearings, and, in one particular case—the Kavanaugh nomination—engaged in an all-out smear campaign.

This treatment has grabbed headlines, but the story that doesn't get much attention is what I want to talk about now—this practice of eating up time on the floor, using every second of the rules to essentially eliminate the possibility that we can take up other bipartisan legislation or consider these nominees on any sort of efficient and effective basis.

As a result of the work, these nominees are being denied an opportunity to serve, the floor is being occupied by nominations that are uncontroversial, and we are unable to get to other important work that the American people want us to do.

Now, it is true that the Senate is not known for speed, and, more often than not, there is a good reason. When we are appropriating taxpayer dollars or debating sanctions on hostile governments or negotiating changes to our healthcare system, speed is not always an asset.

But when it comes to confirming nominees—those who already have had a hearing, who aren't controversial, who have already received a vote in committee—the process should be able to move rather quickly and efficiently.

But, as I said, this is part of a concerted effort to undermine the Trump administration, to deny them the appointees necessary for them to conduct the Nation's business, and, in many instances, these are Ambassadors who should be representing the United States of America in foreign countries where it is important we maintain good communication with those other countries.

Over the last 2 years, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have forced votes on nominees who in previous years would have sailed through the Senate.

Let's look at some of these numbers. You can see how much red there is on this chart—cloture votes in the first Congress. President Trump had 128 cloture votes, President Obama had 12, President Bush had 4, and President Clinton had 8. What that means is that, for example, in the Clinton administration, there were 120 nominees who were confirmed without the necessity of even going through the procedure of cloture. Frequently, these nominees are either passed by voice vote or unanimous consent or at some agreed upon time. Even fewer required a cloture vote under President George W. Bush. There were 12 under President Obama and 128 under President Trump.

If we were to continue down this same path, we would not be able to do anything else except consider nominations by this President, and we still wouldn't get to the end of the list.

Our Democratic colleagues don't want to hold votes on these nominees to support or oppose a nomination; they simply want to waste the Senate's time and to test the patience of the American people. The majority of these nominees, as I said, aren't controversial. Nearly half received the support of 60 or more Senators during the cloture vote, and more than one-third got 70-plus votes.

As I said, the delay and obstruction have led to a long list of vacancies across every Department and Agency. Critical leadership positions have gone unfulfilled while the nominees await confirmation votes from the Senate. As I said, many have simply given up, unwilling to accept any more disruption in their personal lives in the vain hope that perhaps someday, somehow, they will get a vote in the Senate. This list includes Ambassadors, Federal judges, Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and inspectors general. The list continues to grow while our Democratic colleagues insist on votes that will not change the outcome.

It is one thing to have a nominee whose qualifications are controversial or where a debate would enlighten the Members of the Senate on how best to cast their vote, but that is not what is happening here.

Despite our repeated pleas for Democrats to cooperate, things aren't going to change. That is why the rules change we are contemplating is so important. It would expedite the process for many nominees to receive a vote on the floor. It won't change the number of votes they need to get confirmed—they will still need to get a majority of votes—or tilt the scale in their favor in any way; it will simply make sure we are not wasting time that is not being used in order to delay or defeat nominations.

Ironically, we have been told by our Senate colleagues on the other side that if we were to pass a rule limiting the postcloture time to 2 hours and we would start it in 2021, at the end of President Trump's current term of office, they would vote for it. So this is really an unprincipled and nakedly partisan approach, because while they are willing to do it for the next President—and that could well be a second Trump term, or it could well be another President—they won't do it now, which demonstrates the hypocrisy they are exhibiting.

What would happen is, a nominee would get a hearing in front of the appropriate committee. That would be debated, and there would be a vote up or down. If the nominee was passed out of the committee and made available to come to the floor, the Senate majority leader could still file a paper asking for a cloture vote. If that was obtained, then the postcloture time would be reduced from 30 hours to 2 hours. In the

meantime, there would be an intervening day during which debate would occur. Every Senator would still enjoy the right to vote against any nominee they don't support, but to just burn time for time's sake is an abuse of the Senate rules and needs to stop. It is not just hurting these nominees; it is not just hurting the Senate; it is hurting the country. These Ambassadors, judges, and appointed officials who serve in the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the inspectors general who make sure that taxpayer dollars are spent legally and efficiently and that people are doing their jobs—none of those positions are able to be filled.

I would point out that this rule change does not apply to all nominees. High-level Cabinet positions and Supreme Court Justices would still receive the 30 hours of debate time after 51 Senators have voted to proceed to that vote.

It is important to note that this type of rules change isn't new. Actually, in 2013, there was a negotiated, bipartisan standing rule when Majority Leader Harry Reid and the current Democratic leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, introduced a similar change to speed up the process, and this simply builds on the foundation they laid down. So if we asked them to do now what was done then on a bipartisan basis, their answer will be no—for no good reason other than it is President Trump who would presumably benefit from this restoration of that same process.

As I said, the real hypocrisy of their position is indicated by the fact that they said they would vote for this rule, but they don't want it to take effect now. They want it to take effect in 2021. In short, they appear to believe that what we are trying to do is an important rules change to make, but they don't want to do it if it benefits a President they clearly despise.

This political theater is being orchestrated by Senate Democrats and is impacting our ability to carry out our constitutional duty of advice and consent. I believe this is a necessary step to get the Senate back on track, and I will support this rules change when it comes to the floor for a vote and would encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today as one of a number of our colleagues to talk about something that really bothers me. We are seeing historic obstructionism in the Senate today. It has been going on for the last 2 years.

One of the fundamental responsibilities in the Senate is to provide advice

and consent on Presidential nominations. When President Trump took office, he acted with urgency to fill positions in his administration with highly qualified and highly skilled, experienced individuals from the real world—not just people from the bubble but people from America. Unfortunately, Democrats have slow-walked this confirmation process every step of the way. In my view, this is historic obstructionism, and it needs to stop.

This is the first time in U.S. history that the minority party has not waived the 30-hour debate rule to this degree. As a result, of the 1,200 nominees to be confirmed by any new President, only 714 have been confirmed to date. At the end of last year, because of this historic Democratic obstructionism, we had 386 nominations in line waiting to be confirmed. At the end of Obama's first 2 years, only 5 nominees were outstanding, compared to the 386 for President Trump at the end of last year.

Let me say that again. At the end of President Obama's first 2 years, only five nominees had not been confirmed. That means that out of everybody he sent to the Senate, only five at that point had not been confirmed. However, at the end of December this past year, President Trump still had 386 nominees in the pipeline right here in the U.S. Senate, waiting for us to get to them.

Of the last three Presidents, we have collectively only had 24 cloture votes required by the minority party—only 24. However, during President Trump's first 2 years, Democrats forced 128 cloture votes on nominees on the Senate floor. Each one of these cloture votes requires 30 hours of debate. We can't do anything else on the floor while we are doing that. That means the normal business of the Senate cannot be transacted because we are waiting, due to the 30-hour debate rule, to get to the vote. Basically, under those realities, the Senate is able to do only one confirmation per week. Do the math—386 weeks is a long time.

What is going on here has nothing to do with the nominees' qualifications, either. Every single one of Donald Trump's nominees who received a recorded vote was passed. Not one has failed to pass in this body—not one. The vast majority of these nominees are noncontroversial and get more than 70 or 80 votes and in some cases more than that.

This chart shows that of the cloture votes we have had to take, 48 percent got more than 60 votes, and 37 percent got more than 70. That means 70 percent of the nominees got more than 60 votes. These are not controversial nominees. That is not the issue.

My own cousin, who is now Secretary of Agriculture, waited 4 months. I know this personally because he bunked in my place for 4 months while we were waiting to get his confirmation. When he finally got to the floor of the Senate, he got 87 votes.

It is clear that the Democrats will stop at nothing to obstruct the Senate

from working on real issues. Every hour we have to spend in the 30-hour waiting period is time we can't utilize to take up the country's business and the priorities Americans want us to be working on. If this obstruction continues, President Trump will not have his full team in place until the end of his second term.

These delays are petty, and the American people have had enough. I hear about it every time I go home.

For the last 2 years, several of my colleagues and I have pushed to keep the Senate in session during the traditional August State work break in order to confirm nominees and make progress on funding the Federal Government. In August of 2017, the leader of the majority party, Senator MCCONNELL, agreed to keep us here for the month of August in order to work on several things we were working on, including confirming these nominees. The minority party agreed, after 4 days, to basically confirm 77 nominees on that one day. What makes that important is that prior to that time in August, in all of that year, we had only been able to get 44 nominees confirmed. While staying here last August, in 2018, we confirmed 43 nominees and completed 75 percent of the government funding bills.

As I speak today, there are 249 nominees before the U.S. Senate waiting to be confirmed. Basically, that would require 249 weeks to do if we follow the rule we have been following over the last 2 years. These nominees include the Assistant Secretary of Readiness for the Department of Defense, who has been waiting to be confirmed for 8 months. This is in the Department of Defense, the Assistant Secretary for Readiness—one of the crisis areas we have in our military. For 8 months this nominee has been waiting to be confirmed. The Under Secretary for Food Safety in the Department of Agriculture—one I hear a lot about—has been waiting 9 months in line to be confirmed.

The people on the other side are saying: The President is just not sending up nominees fast enough.

Well, what happens with these folks who have been sitting here for 9 months waiting to be confirmed?

The Assistant Secretary for Economic Development at the Department of Commerce has been waiting to be confirmed for 8 months.

These are not low-level nominees; these are Assistant Secretaries who are waiting to be confirmed.

This has to stop. This President is not even able to form his own Cabinet in complete terms because these Assistant Secretaries are not in place. We should be working around-the-clock to get these people confirmed.

If this obstructionism continues, we should try to change the existing rules for confirming nominees by reducing the 30-hour debate rule at minimum. There is a plan in the Senate right now that would reduce the 30 hours of debate to 8 hours for most and 2 hours for

some. Reducing the debate time required would speed up the confirmation process and allow us to focus on other business in the Senate that people want us to address. Every single Democrat in the Senate today who was also here in 2013 supported reducing debate time on nominees, and they should do so again right now.

I will close by saying that despite this historic obstructionism, the Senate has, indeed, over the last 2 years—because we focused on this as a priority, even with this 30-hour debate rule being enacted—we confirmed 63 district court judges, 31 circuit court of appeals justices, and two Supreme Court Justices. These judges will have an impact on the judiciary for years to come.

By the way, these are not activists with political agendas or motives. They are accomplished, experienced jurists, dedicated to upholding the Constitution and adhering to the rule of law. It is criminal that we waited that long to get these people confirmed.

I applaud the President for nominating such outstanding individuals to these positions. If this historic obstructionism continues in the Senate, I believe President Trump will not have his full team in place until the end of his second term, if then. This obstruction needs to end. The resistance movement threatens the security of our country and our ability to deal with the problems facing America today. It is time to rise above this partisan gridlock, change the rules, confirm these nominees, and finally begin to get results for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the IRS and tax issues and the tax bill last year, but following on what Senator PERDUE said, I want to, first of all, compliment him for not only this speech but several times he has talked about how the Senate has stalled time after time on nominees.

I want to bring to my colleagues' attention that at one time, there was a lot of concern by President Obama that his nominees were not being confirmed fast enough. We started hearing that in January 2013. All of a sudden, there was a feeling that we ought to have a bipartisan solution to this issue to speed along President Obama's nominees. At one time, the Democratic leader then was talking about using a nuclear option to accomplish a change in rules. Both Republicans and Democrats thought that wasn't a very good idea, so Republicans and Democrats got together and agreed to reduce postcloture debate time for the rest of the 113th Congress, although, before that Congress ended, Senator Reid decided to use the nuclear option anyway, and he did that at a later time.

If Republicans and Democrats could get together in the 113th Congress to speed up the time and have less

postcloture debate time, why can't we do it now? The problem, of course, is for the Trump nominees being held up in the Senate, the time is far worse than it was under President Obama or, for that matter, any other President before that.

It seems to me, as we are talking about changing the post-debate time again—because there is a resolution out of our Rules Committee—I think it is about time that we think that what is good for the goose is good for the gander, and we ought to reinstate that bipartisan agreement. I hope we can get the support of Democrats to do that like they had the support of Republicans to do that when we had a Democratic President.

I thank Senator PERDUE for what he spoke about on a longer basis than I just did, but I want to back him up fully.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, we are in the fifth week of the tax filing season. Based on all reports from the IRS, the filing season is running smoothly. All systems are operating as expected. Returns are being processed and refunds are being sent out without any major complications.

According to IRS Commissioner Rettig, his Agency has even set a couple of internal records for the speed at which returns are being processed. At one point, the IRS processed 1.9 million returns in an hour. That is 536 every single second.

Of course, you don't hear much about how the filing season is running smoothly from our mainstream press. There is a lot of positive news, but positive news doesn't seem to make good headlines. Instead, an obsession has developed around the size of the tax returns, not the exact tax that might actually be paid.

Let's set aside that the available Treasury data is merely in the first few weeks of a very unusual tax season due to the partial government shutdown. Never mind that the size of the average tax refund can vary greatly from week to week, making year-over-year comparisons early in the filing season essentially meaningless. Let's ignore the important fact that less than half as many child tax credits and earned-income tax credits have been issued as compared to the last year based almost entirely on calendar factors, and, most importantly, we ought to somehow forget about the fact that the size of one's tax refund tells you absolutely nothing about a taxpayers' overall tax return.

I have been amazed by how many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who should know better, have sought to equate incomplete information about lower average refunds—telling us all that means people have not received a decrease in their taxes.

I want to quote Howard Gleckman, who should be well respected by people on the other side of the aisle because he is a senior fellow at the liberal Tax Policy Center. He characterized the

current obsession with tax refunds as “wrong-headed,” noting that it is “not how big a refund check filers get this year but how much total tax they paid for 2018.” That is common sense. I thank Howard Gleckman for his common sense.

Yet my colleagues—again, on the other side—continue to try and push the false narrative that a smaller refund is synonymous with tax increase. That doesn't meet the commonsense test.

Just such a claim by a Senate Democrat running for President was observed by the Washington Post's Fact Checker as being “nonsensical and misleading.” The claim was awarded four Pinocchios. Four Pinocchios is a rating the Post reserves for the biggest whoppers.

Here are the straight facts. Anyone telling the American public that a smaller refund is the same as a tax increase is being intentionally misleading and doing a disservice to the public. I classify that as a big lie. The size of one's tax refund merely reflects what that taxpayer overpaid the IRS in your paychecks last year. For the vast majority of Americans, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of December 2017 delivered larger paychecks starting last February. The liberal Tax Policy Center confirms that 90 percent of middle-income taxpayers will receive a tax cut. That is right. Taxes went down, not up, for the vast majority of American families.

This tax relief stems from the combination of pro-middle-class and pro-family provisions, including a nearly doubled standard deduction, an increase in the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000, and overall lower tax rates. That is how you give the middle class a tax cut.

Some may believe that we would have been better off depriving taxpayers of their tax cuts until the IRS sent them a refund after the end of the year, but this thinking gets things exactly backward. The excess tax withheld from paychecks throughout the course of a year doesn't belong to the government; it belongs to the taxpayers who earned that money. It is the taxpayers who should be able to decide whether they want to put their weekly or monthly tax savings in a retirement account, pay down a credit card bill, enroll their children in some club, sport, music, or dance lessons, or maybe even make an extra car payment.

I encourage all taxpayers interested in how tax reform affects their bottom line to compare this year's tax return with last year's tax return. That is the commonsense way of figuring out whether your taxes went up or down as a result of the tax bill of 2017. When they do that, the vast majority will see less of their hard-earned money being sent to Washington, DC. Really, that is what ought to matter.

I encourage those in the media who are actually interested in how tax reform has affected taxpayers to take

into account the positive signs we see all around. It is a positive sign when we write about how blue-collar employment has surged; positive signs about how low-income workers experienced the highest wage growth in a decade; positive signs when we report how new business startups are climbing and how U.S. manufacturers had their best year since 1997; and positive signs as you discuss how the economy grew almost 50 percent faster in 2018 than as President Obama's economists predicted when they predicted slow growth would be the new normal.

All of these subjects are far more important than what has thus far, in most all respects, been an uneventful filing season. Compare this year's tax bottom line with last year's tax bottom line to decide whether you got a tax decrease or a tax increase, not the size of your refund.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROPOSED RULES CHANGE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, 2 years ago, I came to this floor of the Senate to talk about the rules process and nominations in particular because, even 2 years ago, we were experiencing the beginning of what I saw to be a trend.

When elected to office, every President has about 1,200 nominations that have to come through the Senate for what is called advice and consent. Those individuals go through background checks at the White House, they go through interviews through the White House, and they go through the extensive review of references. Then they are recommended to the respective committees here, where they again go through background checks, have conversations, interviews, public hearings, questions for the record after the hearings are over, and go through any followup from any individual American who wants to give input whether that input be from outside groups here or from anywhere else in the country. Then they come to the floor of the Senate.

In the past, those individuals moved through quickly because there were 1,200 of them, but the minority has always had the right to have one last, little slowdown when they have gotten to the floor. They can make what is called a cloture vote request. The minority—any individual—could always make a request for a cloture vote to say: I know they have gone through all of these extensive checks, that they have already passed the committee, that they have gone through all of the process, but at the end, I want an additional 30 hours of debate on these peo-

ple. Yet it is not just 30 hours of debate; it is actually what is called a full intervening day. After that, there is an additional 30 hours of debate for that person.

That has been done in the past but very rarely in the first 2 years of a Presidency because there are so many nominations that have to go through the process. If we go back to President Clinton, there were eight of those requests. For President Bush, there were four of those. For President Obama, there were 12 of those. For President Trump, there have been 128 of those.

Two years ago, I saw the trend of where this was heading. This was a new structure for the beginning of a Presidency. I was concerned at that time, but I have an even greater concern now. It is the trend of where we are headed as a Senate. Is this going to be the new normal? This used to be what was normal: Occasional nominees would come through if they were very controversial. Yet most of these nominees were not really all that controversial. In fact, 48 percent of those nominees who had the additional cloture time then got more than 60 votes. In fact, 37 percent of them got more than 70 votes. These were not controversial individuals coming through; it was just an intentional slowing down of the process.

I have heard folks say: There are so many of these judges who are coming through at the district court level that they become very controversial.

Quite frankly, every single judge who comes through has to be approved by the two Senators from that State through what is called the blue-slip process. This is for all of those district court judges. It is a process that has been honored by previous administrations and by this administration. This Senate has honored those same blue slips for all of the district court judges. If the judges are from a Democratic State, both of those Democratic Senators have to approve of them before they come. If the judges are from a State that has one Democrat and one Republican, it has to be split. If there are two Republicans, they both have to agree to it. This is for all of the district court judges. Yet they are still being slowed down. They have gone through the background checks, and they have been approved by their home State Senators regardless of party; yet they are slowed down.

So whether they are executive nominees or whether they are judicial nominees, these 128 individuals being slowed down has created a new slowdown in the Senate.

Two years ago, I made a proposal to go back to something that Harry Reid proposed and was passed by this Senate in 2013, which was long before I was here. It was a 2-year agreement to just say: Here is how we are going to deal with what is called postcloture debate time. If there is a controversial nominee, here is how we will handle it.

I went to my colleagues and said: Let's revive that rule. Instead of mak-

ing it for 2 years, which was the Harry Reid rule, let's just make it from here on out. I made that proposal in the last Senate. We took that to the Rules Committee. It passed the Rules Committee, but it could not pass on this floor.

I thought it was eminently kind and bipartisan to say that I would go back and grab Harry Reid's rule and that if it was good for the Democrats when they were in the leadership, it should be good for everybody regardless of whether it is the Republicans or the Democrats. It did not pass.

I have once again come back and made a proposal to say let's fix this and to not just fix this for now but to fix this from here on out. Whether there will be a Democratic President or a Republican President in the future, let's have a simple rule: If we get to a nominee who has gone through the background checks of the White House, has gone through the committee and passed the committee, and has gone through additional questions for the record—all of that—if people still want additional time, they can still request the intervening day, but then instead of 30 hours after that full day, it would be just 2 hours of additional time.

Quite frankly, during most of the time that we have had the 30 hours of debate, there hasn't really been debate on the floor for 30 hours; there has been debate on the floor for, say, 15 or 20 minutes. For the rest of the time, the floor has sat empty or we have debated other things other than the nominee.

So we would set aside 2 additional hours. We would do this for district court judges, and we would do this for most of the nominees for the executive branch, but we would still hold that 30 hours for things like nominees for the circuit court, the Supreme Court, and those at the Cabinet level. For those types of positions, sure, keep the 30 hours, but for the other 1,000-plus nominees who are to be the Deputy Secretaries or assistants of whatever it may be, allow them to go through the normal process and not slow it down.

The Chief Counsel for the IRS has not been confirmed. He went through the last Congress, but he didn't get there. He passed 25 to 2 out of committee. He passed 26 to 2 out of committee this time; yet there is a requirement of 30 additional hours of debate on the floor. He will probably pass overwhelmingly, but it is just a tactic to slow down this floor.

We have a lot of business to do. Let's make a rule that is fair, and let's make it work for everyone. My concern is, long-term for the Senate, this will be the new trend, and the next time there is a Democratic President, this is what Republicans will do to Democratic Presidents, and this will be the new way that we operate.

This isn't helpful for any President; this isn't helpful for the Senate; and this is something we need to fix.

We have 2 years of muscle memory on this now—of doing it over and over

and over. I don't think this gets better because I think the political pressure will be there just to keep doing this and slowing things down for everybody.

So we put a rule out there. It has gone through the Rules Committee. I have encouraged my Democratic colleagues to join in with this because there will be a Democratic President someday in the future, and they will not want this coming back at them and will say this is unfair, and I will agree. But it will happen, so let's fix it now. Let's resolve this in this Senate in this time from here on out—not a short-term rule but long-term, permanent—to take us back to this being the norm, when we could work better together.

I love hearing everyone say that we should be more bipartisan as a body. I would love to get this body working again. That is this proposal. This proposal is not a partisan proposal. It is not trying to get leverage on anybody. It is trying to get this body back to working again, and I hope in the weeks ahead, when this rule actually comes to the floor of the Senate, we can get overwhelming bipartisan support for it so that we can get back to working together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW R. WHEELER

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a vote that we will be having in just a few minutes on the process of moving Andrew Wheeler forward as the EPA Administrator.

This is not a time for talk; it is not time for theoretical debates. This is certainly not the time for an EPA Administrator who, during his time at the EPA, has ignored climate scientists, rolled back climate regulations, and taken action that will lead to more carbon pollution.

Instead, this is a time for bold, decisive action. We need to act today because life on our planet depends on it. The fate of our Nation depends on it. Our children's and grandchildren's futures depend on it.

For those reasons, I cannot support Andrew Wheeler for the critical position of EPA Administrator.

Climate change is real. In fact, it is more than real. It is an existential crisis, and it is already having real impact on Michigan families and Michigan's economy.

Some call it global warming. Katharine Hayhoe, a climate scientist from Texas Tech, has a better term. She calls it "global weirding." Ask anybody in Michigan. Things have been weird.

Our lakes are heating up. In fact, Lake Superior is getting about 2 degrees warmer each decade. That could make the lake a happy home for invasive species, like sea lamprey.

As the waters warm, these parasites grow and kill off more trout and salmon and other fish that are key to the Great Lakes' \$8 billion recreational

fishing industry. It is believed that warmer temperatures contributed to algal blooms on the lake last summer.

Other changes we are seeing are life-threatening.

Thanks to the polar vortex in January, Michigan experienced temperatures colder than Antarctica. Scientists believe that climate change has caused the jet stream to become wobbly—that is a technical term, "wobbly"—pushing dangerously frigid air south.

Folks say: Well, how can it be global warming when we see the polar vortex? It is about what is happening to destabilize the atmosphere and the planet and the changes that are occurring.

Last weekend, a bomb cyclone hit my State, leaving tens of thousands of Michigan residents without power.

We are having to come up with new terms. I had never heard of a bomb cyclone—60-mile-an-hour winds, ripping up homes and farms and roadways.

The intensity of what is happening is incredible. The travel was so treacherous in Otsego County that all roads were closed—all of the roads were closed. Even drivers on Interstate 75 were getting stuck in drifts. That is our major highway.

We can't link any specific storm to climate change. However, we do know that overall climate change is making storms more intense. They are longer. They are more intense. They are happening more frequently with more intensity.

Last summer in Houghton County, more than 5½ inches of rain fell in 6 hours. It caused at least \$100 million in damage to infrastructure, and a 12-year-old boy died when the basement of his home collapsed.

Our climate is changing, but you don't have to take my word for it. Just ask insurance company executives. Their companies paid out a record \$135 billion—billion dollars—from natural disasters in 2017 alone. That is almost three times as much as the historic annual average, and their projections show it getting worse.

We need to take action on climate change. While it is not widely recognized, I want to speak about something positive that we have done, and that was last year's farm bill.

As you know, the farm bill passed the Senate with a vote of 87 to 13—the most votes in history. While the bill was historic for a number of reasons, one of those is that it includes the most ambitious Federal climate-smart agricultural and forestry policies to date, working with farmers and ranchers as partners.

It helps farmers implement climate-smart policies by revamping USDA conservation programs to prioritize investments in soil carbon sequestration, incentivizing the planting of cover crops, and expanding USDA support for farmer participation in carbon markets.

It also invests in the Rural Energy for America Program, which helps

farmers and rural small businesses install renewable energy systems and creates a joint USDA-Department of Energy education grant program to drive carbon capture projects across rural America.

We must also protect forests and farmland, which serve as vital carbon sinks that hold carbon rather than releasing it and making the destabilization even worse.

The farm bill amends the popular Healthy Forests Reserve Program to prioritize carbon sequestration practices programs and discourage the development of forestland. It authorizes new programs to restore national forest landscapes, protect carbon-rich, old-growth trees, and prevent uncharacteristic wildfires and their emissions. It establishes a landmark soil health demonstration trial to keep carbon in the ground and promote healthy and productive farmland.

I am proud of what we did. It was done with the partnership of farmers and ranchers, and I have to say that our farmers understand the importance of protecting our land—their land—air, and water, I think, as much as, if not more than anyone else. No one's business is more impacted by severe and erratic weather than our farmers. They are caught right in the middle of it, and I appreciate their working with us to be part of the solution.

I am also working with my colleagues on policies to ensure that the United States, not China, is the global leader on advanced transportation technologies like electric and hydrogen vehicles.

Meanwhile, Andrew Wheeler and the Trump administration are upending fuel economy and carbon regulations in a way that hurts the auto industry, consumers, and our environment. We need to invest more in renewable energy and the research that is making it more affordable all the time.

Electric utilities in Michigan have committed to dramatically increase renewable electricity, reduce carbon emissions by 80 percent, and stop burning coal.

Meanwhile, Andrew Wheeler and the Trump administration have rolled back the historic Clean Power Plan.

I am proud of the fact that Michigan utilities are moving forward anyway because they know it is the right thing and they know what is at stake. But this administration—Andrew Wheeler—has rolled back the historic Clean Power Plan, the Nation's first regulation of greenhouse gases from the power sector.

We need to be laser-focused on climate change and the existential threat it represents. Meanwhile, Andrew Wheeler and the Trump administration are doing their best to pretend that climate change is no big deal. That is even as the Pentagon recently concluded that two-thirds of critical military installations are threatened—two-thirds of critical military installations are threatened—by climate change.

Climate change is a big deal, and it is time to do something about it that is real—not play political games, but to actually do something thoughtful and real about it.

In the wise words of Hank Williams, Jr., “We need a little less talk and a lot more action.” Andrew Wheeler has repeatedly shown no interest in acting. In fact, he wants to take us backward—and is taking us backward—on climate change. He has no interest in reducing, let alone eliminating, carbon pollution. We need to act, and it is clear that Andrew Wheeler is the wrong person to lead the EPA at this critical time for our country.

I urge a “no” vote on Andrew Wheeler for EPA Administrator.

NOMINATION OF NEOMI RAO

Mr. President, one other brief comment, as some colleagues will be coming to the floor in a bit, and I want to join them in speaking about the DC Circuit Court nominee Neomi Rao. I stand with them in opposing this nomination.

In the era of #MeToo, when women are sharing their stories about assault and abuse, we don’t need a judge who has written that women who drink are to blame if they are then sexually assaulted.

We do not need a judge who blocked a critical equal pay measure intended to help close the wage gap.

So I join with colleagues in encouraging, at the appropriate time, a “no” vote on this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both Senator MENENDEZ and I be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each prior to the roll call vote on the Desmond nomination.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am delighted to join the Senator from Michigan today, to add to her comments about the replacement for now-Justice Kavanaugh after he was confirmed to the Supreme Court last year, and I want to remind my colleagues about the people who spoke up during Justice Kavanaugh’s nomination and the critical issues that they spoke about.

Women stood up. They rallied. They marched. They made clear they do not want to go back to the days before the *Roe v. Wade* decision affirmed their right to make their own healthcare decisions.

Incredibly brave survivors, such as Dr. Ford and so many others, said they wanted to be heard and believed, not silenced.

Families across the country said they wanted a Justice who would interpret the law fairly and objectively, without partisanship—someone whose priority is the Constitution and people across the country, not President Trump and his extreme agenda.

Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, it is clear that President Trump and Republicans in Congress aren’t listening to women or survivors or families, because the next nominee for the DC Circuit Court fails on each and every count I just listed.

As we speak, Neomi Rao is enacting the Trump agenda in her role as the head of the Agency that reviews and approves the Trump administration’s changes to regulations impacting so many people in communities who stood up to oppose Justice Kavanaugh’s nomination.

Under Ms. Rao’s leadership, the Trump administration finalized a rule that prevents healthcare providers from even informing patients who come to title X-funded health centers about where to go to get safe—safe—legal abortions and places new, burdensome, medically unnecessary requirements on title X-funded health centers, designed specifically to prevent Planned Parenthood from receiving these funds, meaning millions of patients may lose a source of quality, affordable, basic healthcare they trust.

Ms. Rao has helped put forward rules that would make it harder for members of the LGBTQ community and women to get the care they need by allowing providers to turn them away simply because of who they are or because they want birth control.

I also want to take a few minutes to address Ms. Rao’s deeply concerning comments about rape and sexual assault. While in college, she wrote that “a good way to avoid a potential date rape is to stay reasonably sober.”

Let’s be clear. It is never a survivor’s fault, ever, that someone raped or sexually assaulted them.

Ms. Rao was given an opportunity to explicitly reject those comments and failed to do so. She then sent a letter attempting to walk them back, but her actions speak louder than a letter sent during a nomination process, and her actions on this issue have been harmful.

In her role within the Trump administration, Ms. Rao has helped Secretary DeVos to roll back protections that help survivors get justice when they are sexually assaulted on campuses. In other words, at the same time that Ms. Rao claims her views have changed on sexual assault and consent, her actions are aligned with those who believe what she wrote in college. To the survivors I hear from and those who bravely spoke out against Justice Kavanaugh and so many others, Ms. Rao’s actions are what matters.

Ms. Rao is also listening to corporate lobbyists instead of scientists when it comes to climate and our public health and is advancing rules that would allow more discrimination in our Nation’s housing programs. Unfortunately, it seems that on many issues, where President Trump wants to do damage and hurt families, Ms. Rao is right behind him with a rubberstamp, just like Justice Kavanaugh and so

many others President Trump has nominated to the bench.

We need judges who will do what workers and families expect of a judge—to interpret our laws according to the Constitution and what is best for our country, not according to politics and what is best for President Trump. That is why I am strongly opposing her nomination, and I hope all of our colleagues will join us in doing so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. DESMOND

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to President Trump’s nominee for Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service, Michael Desmond.

This nominee comes before us just a week into this year’s filing season, when our need for an IRS that treats all taxpayers fairly is clearer than ever.

Already, thousands of taxpayers across America are grappling with the fallout of the Trump tax bill and its capping of the State and local tax, or SALT, deduction. Already, the IRS has reported an average 17 percent drop in the size of tax refunds this year. Already, the broken promises made by President Trump and his Republican allies are being laid bare.

They promised middle-class families thousands of dollars of tax relief and a \$4,000 raise in their salaries. Instead, they got \$1.5 trillion in more debt and an economy that is even more rigged for big corporations and wealthy CEOs.

As bad as the Trump tax scam is for the whole country, it is worse for New Jersey families. That is because Republicans paid for a big chunk of their corporate giveaways by gutting the State and local tax deduction that New Jersey and other States’ middle-class families depend on to write off their property taxes. In 2016, 1.8 million people—about 40 percent of New Jersey taxpayers—deducted their property and State income taxes. More than 80 percent of them earned less than \$200,000, and the average deduction totaled \$18,000—far above the arbitrary cap imposed by the Trump tax bill.

With tax season under way, many homeowners are just now realizing how badly their President ripped them off. To add insult to injury, the IRS issued haphazard guidance for the Trump tax bill that unfairly targets States like New Jersey, trying to simply lessen the burden heaped on them by the GOP.

In the final days of 2017, just days after President Trump signed the tax bill, New Jerseyans rushed to prepay their 2018 local property taxes and preserve their deductions before the new cap on the SALT deductions took effect. But then came Trump’s IRS, which issued guidance to try to limit their ability to deduct property tax payments made in 2017 on their Federal returns—a stunning backdoor attempt to retroactively apply the cap on property tax deductions without cleared legislative tax to warrant doing so.

Months later, the IRS again changed the rules on us by attacking New Jersey's new charitable deduction tax credit program. The IRS never had a problem when 32 other States offered tax credits for charitable donations. Only when New Jersey and other similarly situated States created a similar program did the IRS decide to change the rules.

Mr. Desmond would be the Chief Counsel of the IRS, the position directly overseeing the IRS's interpretation of these rule changes. Throughout his nomination, I was given no indication that Mr. Desmond would give fair treatment on these important issues affecting New Jersey and other States.

The full deductibility of State and local taxes has been a bedrock principle of our Tax Code since the income tax's creation in 1913, and that concept stretches all the way back to Alexander Hamilton's writings about the autonomy of States under the U.S. Constitution.

This commonsense policy allows States to invest in things like public safety, education, and infrastructure—the very things that make New Jersey a great place to live, work, and raise a family.

Make no mistake, the property tax deduction isn't just important for homeowners. It matters to all New Jersey families. It is why our public schools rank among the best in the Nation. It is why Save the Children named us the No. 1 State in America to raise a child. I want it to stay that way.

We must protect the investments that make New Jersey a place where families thrive. That is why last month I introduced bipartisan legislation to fully restore the State and local tax deduction. It is called the SALT Act, which stands for "Stop the Attack on Local Taxpayers." It is no secret that in New Jersey and in many of the Nation's most economically productive States, families face high property tax bills and a higher cost of living. Our bill is designed to provide some relief. Simply put, the more you pay in property and State taxes, the more relief you get from our bill, and we help pay for it by repealing some of Trump's most unnecessary tax breaks for the superwealthy. It is the exact opposite of what the Trump tax bill says, which is, basically that the higher the cost of living is in your State, the more you pay in State and local taxes and the more you will owe to the Federal Government. That makes no sense.

Make no mistake, President Trump and his administration and the IRS have it out for States like New Jersey. Mr. Desmond would be the arbiter of how the IRS would interpret important tax issues affecting these States. That is why I oppose his nomination.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Desmond nomination?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 31 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Baldwin	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Isakson	Shaheen
Cardin	Johnson	Shelby
Carper	Jones	Smith
Casey	Kaine	Stabenow
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Collins	King	Tester
Coons	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Lee	Toomey
Cotton	Manchin	Udall
Cramer	McConnell	Van Hollen
Crapo	McSally	Warner
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	Young
Enzi	Murray	

NAYS—15

Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Duckworth	Markley	Schatz
Gillibrand	Menendez	Schumer
Harris	Merkley	Warren
Hirono	Reed	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—2

Scott (FL) Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the cloture vote.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it is time to vote on the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to be the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

For the past year, Andrew Wheeler has served as the Senate-confirmed

Deputy Administrator of the EPA, and for the past 7 months, he has served as the Acting Administrator. He has done an admirable job in charge of the EPA.

Under his leadership, the EPA has put forward commonsense proposals to roll back punishing regulations and still protect America's air and water. He is committed to protecting both human health and the environment.

Andrew Wheeler's qualifications are without question. He has spent decades working in environmental policy at the EPA itself, here on Capitol Hill, and as a consultant to environmental and energy clients.

President Trump picked the right person to lead the Environmental Protection Agency when he nominated Andrew Wheeler. It is time for the Senate to confirm him to this important post. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Andrew Wheeler as the Administrator of the EPA. Under the provisions of the Federal Vacancies Act, Mr. Wheeler can continue to lead the EPA until August 7 of this year.

Rushing to judgment on his nomination will close the window of opportunity the Senate has now to ensure that he reverses course on a handful of important policies that protect our planet while creating American jobs.

I am not calling for delay for delay's sake. We have 161 days to ensure that Mr. Wheeler withdraws his proposal to put the mercury and air toxics standards rule in legal jeopardy. We have 161 days to hear him say that he supports Senate ratification of a treaty that phases out harmful HFCs while creating jobs. We have 161 days to ensure that he negotiates with a coalition, including California and 12 other States, on vehicle fuel efficiency standards and greenhouse gas emissions while giving the auto industry the certainty they need.

While progress is being made on these important issues, I am asking my colleagues to vote no today on cloture on the motion to proceed to this nomination.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, after careful consideration, I have decided to oppose the confirmation of Andrew Wheeler, the nominee for Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.

While Mr. Wheeler is certainly qualified for this position, I have too many concerns with the actions he has taken during his tenure as Acting Administrator to be able to support his promotion. I believe that Mr. Wheeler, unlike Scott Pruitt, understands the mission of the EPA and acts in accordance with ethical standards; however, the policies he has supported as Acting Administrator are not in the best interest of our environment and public health, particularly given the threat of climate change to our Nation.

I met at length with Mr. Wheeler, and we discussed many important environmental issues about which I care

deeply, from EPA's enforcement of landmark environmental laws to greenhouse gas emissions and mercury pollution. Since last August, the EPA has proposed to roll back environmental protections, including determining it is no longer "appropriate and necessary" to regulate mercury emissions from power plants, halting efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks, and replacing the Clean Power Plan.

These efforts are of great importance to the State of Maine, which is located at the end of our Nation's "air pollution tailpipe" and is on the receiving end of pollution generated by coal-fired power plants in other States. Moreover, there is no doubt that the greenhouse gas emissions driving climate change pose a significant threat to our State's economy and our natural resources, from our working forests, fishing, and agricultural industries, to tourism, and recreation.

Reducing harmful air pollutants is critical for public health, particularly for Maine, which has among the highest rates of asthma in the country. In Maine, cars, trucks, and other vehicles produce more than 50 percent of our State's greenhouse gas emissions. Controls for mercury, one of the most persistent and dangerous pollutants, are especially important for children and pregnant women. The Agency's recent efforts to halt progress in these critical areas takes us in the wrong direction.

In keeping with my past practice, I will vote to allow the full Senate to consider Mr. Wheeler's nomination so that every Senator can have a clear up or down vote on this important nomination of a member of the President's Cabinet.

However, due to the actions Mr. Wheeler has taken during his tenure at the EPA, I will vote against his confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant 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 nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Mike Rounds, John Thune, John Cornyn, Jerry Moran, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 32 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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 (SC)
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	McSally	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Enzi	Murkowski	
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
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—2

Scott (FL) Sinema

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, 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 Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak this afternoon about the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to become Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The day after Mr. Wheeler was named EPA Acting Administrator, I wrote him a letter. I reminded Mr. Wheeler of the opportunity he had to try a new course for that Agency after Scott Pruitt's scandal-plagued administration.

Yet in the 7 months as Acting Administrator, unfortunately, Mr. Wheeler has so far chosen not to reverse course at EPA in too many important instances. In some cases, he has even accelerated the environmental damage and regulatory zeal that his predecessor began.

I knew that Mr. Wheeler and I would not always agree on every issue, but like so many others, I did hope that he would moderate some of Scott Pruitt's most egregious and environmentally destructive policies, specifically on policies where industry and the environmental community are in broad agreement. Sadly, my hopes have not been realized.

To be clear, Mr. Wheeler is not the ethically bereft embarrassment that Scott Pruitt was. Mr. Wheeler has also engaged more frequently and substantively than Scott Pruitt did with both Congress and EPA career staff, but time and again, Mr. Wheeler has proven that his environmental policies are almost as destructive and extreme as his predecessor's, despite the explicit promises Mr. Wheeler has made to Members of Congress, both in private and in public meetings.

One of those promises was Mr. Wheeler's recent insistence that, when it comes to getting a deal on vehicle fuel economy and greenhouse gas standards with California and a coalition of 12 other States, including my State and the Presiding Officer's State, "no one wants a 50-State deal more than I do." That was Mr. Wheeler's promise during his nomination hearing in front of the Environment and Public Works Committee in January.

Just weeks later, the headlines told a different story. For months, Mr. Wheeler said repeatedly that he shared my goal of striking a deal—not just my goal, but the goal of many of us here—with the State of California and a dozen of other States on fuel economy and greenhouse gas emissions standards. Not long after he became Acting Administrator, however, Mr. Wheeler signed off on the Trump administration's proposal that freezes the standards for the better part of a decade, eliminates most of the air conditioning, electric vehicle, and other compliance credits that are supported by chemical companies, automobile and parts manufacturers, and utilities and preempts California's authority to set its own stronger standards.

What is more, the Trump administration reportedly plans to penalize rules that call for a 0.5-percent increase. That is a one-half of 1-percent increase in the stringency of those standards—one-tenth the pace called for in the rules that are already on the books.

Since that proposal was put forth, the entire automobile industry, many Members of Congress, and many other stakeholders have repeatedly asked the EPA to forge a compromise that avoids years of costly litigation and uncertainty for our automobile industry. So far, that is all for naught.

Just last week, unfortunately and inexplicably, EPA announced, with the

White House and the Department of Transportation, that they decided to end their so-called negotiations with the State of California and, effectively, with 12 other States. These negotiations were superficial, at best, or duplicitous and designed to fail, at worst. Between you and me, I don't see how these discussions could have ended or failed because they never seriously began in the first place. It is outrageous.

That brings me back to Mr. Wheeler's promise. After his emphatic insistence that he wanted to find a 50-State solution for these standards, the decision to end them without ever making a serious effort to ever reach a compromise sends a clear message that, sadly, Mr. Wheeler—at least, in this instance—is unable to keep his word. I say that with no joy, but I say it nonetheless.

A second example of Mr. Wheeler's failure to lead in an appropriate way lies in his unreasonable opposition to submitting to the Senate for ratification something called a the "Kigali Amendment" to the Montreal Protocol.

I mentioned this to one of our colleagues. He said: Talk to me in English.

I reminded him that we used to use something called CFCs. It was a refrigerator coolant that was broadly used in this country until we found out it had very serious consequences for our ozone layer. Science, chemical companies, and chemists came up with a replacement to CFCs. We call them HFCs, or hydrofluorocarbons, which are better for the ozone. They are still destructive to the greenhouse gas and destructive to our planet. Well, guess what. Scientists and chemists have, again, come up with a follow-on product to HFCs. It is not scientists and chemists in companies in other countries. They are right here in America. They have invested in a lot of money to come up with this discovery, this invention. They want to sell it. That requires the phaseout over time of HFCs.

We need the Kigali Amendment to be submitted to the Senate for ratification in order to open the door for our American companies to compete with a new technology that is good for jobs in America and good for our planet. Our country could gain 150,000 direct and indirect new jobs, and almost \$40 billion in annual economic benefits by 2027 because the safer substitutes to HFCs are made in Texas and Louisiana. These are good-paying jobs. These are green manufacturing jobs that could help our efforts to address climate change while bolstering our country's economy.

Ratification of this treaty is supported by an extraordinary list of stakeholders, including more than a dozen of our Republican colleagues here in this Chamber. From the American Chemistry Council to the Chamber of Commerce, to FreedomWorks, to the Sierra Club, it seems that just about everyone supports ratification of this

amendment, as best I can tell—everyone, that is, except EPA.

Under Mr. Wheeler's leadership, EPA also decided it is no longer "appropriate and necessary" to protect babies' brains from mercury and air toxic pollution emitted by electric utilities.

In the eleventh hour before the government shutdown, Mr. Wheeler signed a proposal that guts the legal foundation of the mercury and air toxics standards, also known as the MATS rule. Using outdated data and deciding that some benefits—like reduction in cancer, birth defects, and asthma attacks—are no longer important for the Agency to count, EPA is now setting a dangerous precedent and putting the mercury and air toxics standards rule in legal jeopardy. In fact, EPA has gone so far as to request public comment on whether the standards should be eliminated altogether.

Mr. Wheeler says that this action was necessary and that the proposal strikes a balance. That is just not true. In fact, the utility industry is in full compliance with these standards already, and they have done so at a third of the expected costs. That is why every stakeholder—from coal-fired utilities that comply with the rules to religious leaders, to environmental organizations, to the Chamber of Commerce—urged this administration not to take this step. In fact, utility groups and organized labor organizations wrote to EPA saying:

The industry already has invested significant capital—estimated at more than \$18 billion—in addition to these operating costs, and states are relying on the operation of these controls for their air quality plans. Therefore, we—

This being the group that wrote to EPA, including utility groups and organized labor groups—

urge EPA to . . . leave the underlying MATS rule in place and effective.

Yet Mr. Wheeler has chosen to ignore the chorus of stakeholders who all hoped he would chart a more responsible path—on this front, too—even though utilities are not asking for this action that he is taking and the EPA is taking, and the courts are not requiring it.

Yet, from the stakeholders, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the utility industry over here to all of the NGOs and environmental groups and health groups over here, everybody says to leave this rule alone. It was adopted 7 years ago, and it works. It has worked at half the cost or at one-third of the cost. Leave it alone. I just don't get this. This is just another example of when Mr. Wheeler has taken a recklessly and unnecessary extreme course of action at the EPA.

Here is another one.

In May of 2018, after meeting with a victim's mother, Scott Pruitt, the former EPA Administrator, announced plans to finalize the Obama administration's ban to prohibit consumer and commercial paint stripping uses for something called methylene chloride—

a hazardous chemical that has killed dozens of unsuspecting users in this country alone.

Despite explicit assurances provided to my office and others that the EPA would follow through with Mr. Pruitt's promise to protect both consumer and commercial users from methylene chloride, under Mr. Wheeler's leadership, the EPA sent a final rule restricting only the consumer uses of methylene chloride to the White House's Office of Management and Budget. There have been 56 accidental exposure deaths related to methylene chloride since 1980—56—including properly trained workers who have worn protective gear on the job. Yet the EPA, under Mr. Wheeler's leadership, has decided to exempt workers from the methylene chloride ban.

A number of people have said to me they think it is unconscionable. I think they are right. With Mr. Wheeler at the helm, the EPA cannot even manage to ban a chemical that is so harmful to human health that stores—and this includes Walmart, Sherwin-Williams, Ace Hardware, Home Depot, and others—have already voluntarily taken it off their shelves.

That is not all. Even the EPA's recently announced PFAS Action Plan, which was released with much fanfare 2 weeks ago, did not do much more than renounce the same measures announced by Scott Pruitt almost a year ago. PFAS is sometimes referred to as forever chemicals. The reason, my colleagues, is that they last forever in our environment. It took a public outcry to make Mr. Wheeler reverse the Agency's inexplicable decision not to set an enforceable drinking water standard for PFAS. At his hearing last month, I asked him if he would agree to set a clean drinking water standard in 2 years—not in 2 weeks, not in 2 months but in 2 years—and he could not do that.

In short, over the past 7 months as the Acting Administrator, Mr. Wheeler has perpetuated and in at least one instance I have cited here today has worsened the preexisting inadequacies and failures Scott Pruitt left behind. When faced with opportunities to protect human health and the environment in ways that also have the support of the industries that would be regulated, time and again, Mr. Wheeler has failed to act in a way that I believe is responsible and has, instead, listened to some of the most extreme voices around him.

As I have said before and will say again, I am not making some futile attempt at changing the hearts and minds about this nominee at the eleventh hour. I am not that kind of Senator and never have been, and I was not that kind of Governor. I am not grandstanding, trying to get any press attention, or the perfect sound bite. I am, however, trying to convince some of my colleagues to seize this window of opportunity we have now to ensure that Acting Administrator Wheeler reverses course and governs responsibly

at the EPA. That is what I am trying to do. That is what we are trying to do.

As the President's nominee to lead this Agency, under the provisions of the Federal Vacancies Reform Act, Mr. Wheeler can continue to lead the EPA as Acting Administrator until August 7 of this year. He is there, and he is going to be there. Rushing to judgment on this nomination will close the window of opportunity we have to ensure the Acting Administrator reverses course at the EPA and embraces the commonsense, bipartisan policies I just laid out—policies which make our environment cleaner and safer while they also create jobs and strengthen America's economy. I think we all want that. I think that is why people sent us here to negotiate those kind of win-win agreements.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on this nomination so we can achieve those win-win situations that are there for the taking.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I reserve the balance of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MR. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the Senate is today considering the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to serve as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. It is the job of the EPA to protect both the environment and human health. This critically important Agency needs Senate-confirmed leadership in place.

President Trump picked the right person to lead this Agency when he nominated Andrew Wheeler. Since April of last year, he has served as the Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and since July of last year, he has served as the Acting Administrator of the Agency. I believe Andrew Wheeler has done an outstanding job in leading the EPA over the past 7 months.

During the last administration, the EPA issued punishing regulations that would hurt the economy and raise costs on families. Under Acting Administrator Wheeler's leadership, the EPA has taken a different approach. The Agency is now putting forward proposals that both protect our environment and allow the country's economy to flourish.

Acting Administrator Wheeler has led efforts to issue commonsense regulatory proposals. These include the affordable clean energy rule and revising the definition of the waters of the United States. Both of these proposals show Mr. Wheeler is serious about clean air and clean water while they also show he understands there is an important role for States and local communities to play. It can't be a top-down, Washington-knows-best approach.

Acting Administrator Wheeler has played a critical role in implementing updates to the Toxic Substances Control Act and has taken steps to limit people's exposure to dangerous and toxic chemicals. These updates are the

result of major bipartisan legislation that came out of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee in 2016.

Andrew Wheeler is working to limit lead exposure as well. Last December, he helped to unveil the Trump administration's multiagency effort to reduce the number of children exposed to lead in drinking water, in consumer products, and in paint. During his tenure, the EPA has also worked to provide greater regulatory certainty to States, to Tribes, to communities, and to the industries it regulates.

Mr. Wheeler is well qualified for the position of EPA Administrator. He has spent decades—actually, over 25 years—working in environmental policy. He has served as a career employee at the EPA as an environmental protection specialist. This experience makes him uniquely qualified to serve as the head of the Agency.

After that time, he spent over a decade here on Capitol Hill. When he left the EPA, he came here to work on the Environment and Public Works Committee. He served as the staff director of the Senate Environment and Public Works' Clean Air and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee for 6 years. Then he spent another 6 years working as the Republican staff director and chief counsel for the full committee under Chairman JIM INHOFE. After his time on the Hill, he also worked as a consultant for a variety of energy and environmental clients. He is very well qualified, and that is a big reason his nomination has received broad support.

There are 63 agricultural and forestry groups that wrote a letter in support of Mr. Wheeler's nomination to be the Administrator: "It is hard to imagine a more qualified individual for the role of EPA administrator, and we respectfully request that the committee move to confirm his nomination so that he may be considered by the full Senate," they say, "at the earliest date possible."

Mr. Wheeler has received praise from the United Mine Workers of America.

Cecil Roberts, the union's international president, said the following about Mr. Wheeler: "[H]e will be a reasonable voice within the agency, and will recognize the impact on both the workers and mining communities that are directly affected as EPA develops future emissions regulations."

His experience and commitment to sound environmental policies has received recognition from the Democrats as well.

Senator CARPER, who is with me on the floor and was the ranking member of our committee at one point, said of Mr. Wheeler when he was nominated for the Deputy Administrator's role: "I think having worked in the agency, he actually cares about the environment; the air we breathe; the water we drink; the planet on which we live." I agree.

It is time to end the needless delays by the Senate Democrats. Andrew Wheeler's nomination to serve as the

Deputy Administrator was delayed for months and had to be reported out of the EPW Committee twice before he was confirmed. Now the Senate Democrats are calling to delay the process again. These delays only slow down the Agency from meeting its objectives of helping communities and protecting the environment.

The EPA needs a Senate-confirmed Administrator in office. The EPA Administrator plays a central role in developing and implementing programs that are focused on meeting the EPA's mission of protecting human health and the environment. Andrew Wheeler is well qualified to lead this Agency and to serve in the President's Cabinet. He is the right person to be the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and I strongly encourage every Senator to support the nomination.

NOMINATION OF JOHN L. RYDER

Mr. President, I also rise in support of the nomination of John L. Ryder to serve as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the TVA.

The TVA serves 9 million people in parts of seven Southeastern States. It provides affordable electricity for business customers and local power companies, for flood control, navigation, and land management for the Tennessee River system, plus economic development for the region. The TVA is credited with transforming the region into a growing population and a growing economic base.

With over 40 years of experience as a lawyer, Mr. Ryder will be a strong complement to the TVA's Board of Directors. The Environment and Public Works Committee attested to this fact when it reported his nomination favorably to the Senate by a voice vote twice—first, on May 22, 2018, during the 115th Congress, and the next on February 5 of this year after he had to be renominated during this Congress because of the delays in the nomination approval process last year. Mr. Ryder is another example of how the confirmation process has deliberately run aground. Mr. Ryder, in normal times, would have been confirmed and in office last summer. Instead, we have to go through a cloture vote on a well-qualified nominee who has twice been reported unanimously through the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Let's not delay this any longer. I urge my colleagues to vote with me in supporting the nomination of John L. Ryder to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS BILL

MR. MURPHY. Mr. President, later today, the House of Representatives will pass a proposal that will be supported by 95, 97 percent of Americans.

This is a proposal to make sure anybody in this country who wants to buy a gun in a legitimate transaction has to go through a background check—a background check that in 90 percent of the cases takes less than 5 minutes of time. That background check will assure that only people who should be buying guns and owning guns will be buying and owning guns—people who don't have violent criminal histories and people who don't have histories of serious mental illness. It is a popular proposal. It is an impactful proposal. It will save thousands of lives all across this country.

I have come down to the floor to just remind my colleagues as to why this is so important, and I want to tell a quick story to try to put a little meat on the bone when it comes to this conversation we are having about the importance of making sure people go through background checks before they buy weapons.

Mr. President, 2008 to 2012 was a period of time in this country's history where violence was declining. Homicides were declining. Gun murders were declining. They were declining across the country. Specifically during that period of time, they were declining in the Midwest. Yet there was one State that stood out as a curious outlier during that period of time, and that was the State of Missouri.

In the State of Missouri, there was a dramatic jump during this period of time in gun homicides. In fact, it happened right away after 2007. In 2008 and 2009, about 50 to 60 to 70 additional people every year were being murdered with guns inside Missouri. A researcher from Johns Hopkins went to try to figure out why this was, and I think it is important to tell that story on the floor today.

Let me give a little historical context first. During the Civil War, Missouri was one of the most violent, most dangerous places in the country because there were these outlaws, these renegades of Confederates who were out in the bush—they call them the bushwhackers—who were doing regular battle with Union troops. It was one of the first instances of true, sustained guerilla warfare in this Nation. When the Civil War was over, they didn't go home. They had been brutally put down by the Union, but they stuck, and they formed their own smaller criminal enterprises.

We know about this because Jesse James and his brother Frank were amongst those who made their name as bushwhackers fighting the Union and then turned into criminals who robbed stage coaches and banks and trains.

To combat this post-Civil War continuation of violence, Missouri decided to change its firearms laws, and it started with a crackdown on the ability of individuals to conceal weapons. It extended to a change in the Constitution to make it perfectly clear that Missouri politicians had the ability to limit who could own guns and who couldn't.

Eventually, a provision got passed that said that in order to own a handgun, you had to get a permit from your local authority. As time went on, that permit came to include a background check, so that if you wanted to own a gun in Missouri, you had to go and get a background check. You had to prove you did not have a serious criminal history or a serious history of mental illness.

What happened in 2007 was that, very quietly, that provision got repealed. It was part of a much louder effort to repeal a whole host of gun laws in Missouri. Missouri kind of became the epicenter of the NRA's focus in the 2000s. It was this Southern—semi-Southern State that still had pretty tough gun laws, and the NRA went all in and had their annual convention in St. Louis and spent millions of dollars trying to elect folks who would sign laws they were pushing through the legislature. In 2007, they finally got their way. They got all these laws that had been passed since the Civil War repealed. One of them was the law that required you to get a background check before you could buy a gun.

The researcher from Johns Hopkins sort of looked at all these laws, controlled for all sorts of other factors, and came to the conclusion—you should read the paper; it is very well done—that it was this provision which removed the background check that led to this dramatic spike in violence. He has all sorts of interesting data to show why that is. All the other violent crime in Missouri stayed flat from 2008 to 2012, but gun crimes spiked. All of a sudden, guns bought in Missouri were being used in crimes all over the region. Other States started to report an increase—a curious, sudden increase—in crime guns that were bought in Missouri. Well, guess why. It was because all of a sudden, you didn't have to get a background check if you wanted to buy a gun in Missouri. All of a sudden, criminals and people with serious mental illnesses could get guns through gun shows and internet sales—transactions on the private market—without that background check.

I tell this story because I hear opponents of this bill in the House saying: This isn't meaningful. It won't work. These mass shootings weren't perpetuated with weapons that were bought without background checks.

Well, that is true. This one public policy intervention won't stop every single bad thing that happens in this country. But the data is the data, and it shows us that States that have background checks have dramatically lower rates of gun crime than States that don't have them.

A little bit earlier than the changes made in Missouri, my State of Connecticut made the opposite change. My State of Connecticut made a change to go from being a non-background check State to a background check State. We put in a local permit that came with a background check requirement. So

even if you bought your gun outside of a bricks-and-mortar gun store, you had to get a permit, and that permit required you to get a background check.

Well, that same researcher went to Connecticut, ran all the numbers, and found out that in Connecticut, after that change was made, gun murders dropped by 40 percent. They increased in Missouri by about 25 percent and decreased in Connecticut by about 40 percent—and again controlling for all sorts of other factors that could explain those changes.

So on both sides of the ledger, there is what I would tell you is incontrovertible evidence that a State that has background checks is going to end up having many fewer gun crimes than a State that doesn't have them. The problem is, as we saw in and around Missouri, guns don't respect borders, so when Missouri dropped its gun background check requirement, those guns started moving into other States.

That is what happened in my State. The guns that are used to commit crimes in our cities—the guns that are trafficked out of the back of vans—are not bought from Connecticut gun stores; they are bought by criminals in other States because they know they can go to gun shows and they can turn to internet sales in those other States and buy those weapons.

The same thing happens as weapons move across our border. I have heard an awful lot from this President about how dangerous Mexico and Central America are. Well, there is some truth to that, but the guns that are being used in those crimes are trafficked from the United States of America, and the way they get to the southern border is through States that don't have background check requirements.

Just go online and check out what people say who have been arrested for gun trafficking. They tell you exactly how they did it. They go to gun shows in Texas. They buy guns at unregulated gun shows in Texas, and they take them back across the border and sell them in Central America.

So we have all the evidence we need—empirical evidence, anecdotal evidence—to pass this piece of legislation, but maybe the most important reason that we should pass it, that we should take it up here in the Senate when it passes the House later today, is that it is just so darn popular. There really isn't anything else in America today that is as popular as universal background checks. The minimum score is about 90 percent. There is plenty of really good polling that says that 97 percent of Americans support universal background checks. Grandma isn't that popular. Apple pie isn't that popular. There is nothing we debate here that gets 97 percent on agreement other than the issue of background checks.

So I am here on the floor today to try to fill in some of the details on why this is so important and to implore my colleagues, once it passes the House of Representatives, to bring it here. Obviously, I would love to have a vote on

the House bill, but I understand how this place works. We are going to send a letter to Chairman GRAHAM asking him to at the very least convene a hearing on background checks in the Judiciary Committee.

We came to a conclusion here in the Senate as to a bipartisan background checks proposal that could get 50 votes—in 2013—and I would love to start that process again. But there is no reason not to do it because all the evidence tells us that when we make sure that only the right people buy guns, a lot less people die from gun crimes.

This is not controversial anywhere except for Washington, DC. Everybody out there in the American public wants us to pass universal background checks. Maybe some other interventions in this space are a little bit more controversial, split folks a little bit more, but not background checks. This thing is decided outside of the Senate Chamber and the House Chamber. Popular in the public, deeply impactful, will save thousands of lives—that is a triple we don't get very often here, and we should take advantage of the opportunity.

Let me leave you with this: I convened a panel a couple of nights ago to talk about the importance of background checks, and there were a number of parents of those who were lost to gun violence. One of the parents was from Sandy Hook. Another was a parent of a child who was killed in Chicago, and she really wanted to make sure we knew what the real impact of gun violence in America was. She wanted to make sure we knew that the victims aren't just those who show up on the police blotter; the victims are the parents and the brothers and the sisters and the friends and the coworkers.

The average number of people who experience some diagnosable trauma when somebody in their life is shot and killed is 20. So when you hear the number that 100 people in the United States die every day from guns—which is a number 10 to 20 times higher than in any other high-income nation on a per capita basis—you have to understand that number isn't really 100; that number is 20 times higher than that because the people who have to live with that loss have to ask these questions: Why did they shoot themselves? What do I do about that individual who shot my son? How do I get over that combination of pain and anger? That is hard to understand unless you have spent time with the mothers and the fathers who will be dealing with this catastrophic, life-changing trauma for the rest of the time they are on this Earth.

So that is why this is so serious to me. It is because we have an answer for their pain—not an answer that will stop every gun crime in this country but an answer that will result in thousands fewer people dying. We know that because the evidence tells us that.

And I can't explain to these families—to that mother in Chicago—why something that has been proven to work and is supported by 90 percent of Americans can't get a vote or a debate in the Senate.

I will leave it at that for today. I hope that when this passes in the House with a big bipartisan majority, we will take advantage of the opportunity to get a big bipartisan majority here in the Senate. If the Republican majority commits to starting that process, I guarantee that will be the result.

I want to thank all of the people who made this possible in the House today.

For the record, I have introduced a version of H.R. 8 here in the U.S. Senate.

To Chairman NADLER, MIKE THOMPSON, Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and to their Republican cosponsors who helped bring it to the floor—I thank them on behalf of all of the folks they will never know, those lives they will save by their action today if we do the right thing and take it up here in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators LEAHY, KLOBUCHAR, KING, and TESTER be recognized in the next 40 minutes or so for a colloquy with me.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it was 1986, a third of a century ago. Six U.S. Senators wrote a letter to the Office of Technology Assessment, the office then charged with providing technical and scientific advice to Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that their letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT
AND PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington DC, December 23, 1986.

DR. JOHN GIBBONS,
*Executive Director, U.S. Congress, Office of
Technology Assessment, Washington, DC.*

DEAR DR. GIBBONS: The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has held three days of hearings this year on the massive and, to some degree irrevocable, alterations in the stratosphere commonly referred to as the "greenhouse affect", as well as ozone depletion.

The testimony convincingly portrayed a fundamentally altered planet, with shifts in ocean circulation and climate zones; altered

precipitation and storm patterns; more frequent and extreme weather events such as droughts, monsoons, and lowland floods. Individually and collectively, these changes bring about others, ranging from disruption of forest, crop, and ocean productivity to shifts in populations. Witnesses before the Committee testified that the Earth is now committed to a substantial greenhouse warming, projected to be about 2 degrees Centigrade, as well as an ozone layer depletion.

We are deeply troubled by the prospect of such a rapid and unprecedented change in the composition of the atmosphere and its implications for the human and natural worlds. It may be necessary to act soon to at least slow these trends or, perhaps, halt them altogether.

We therefore request that the Office of Technology Assessment undertake a study for the Committee on Environment and Public Works of policy options that, if enacted, could lead to the stabilization and minimization of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. These gases include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, tropospheric ozone and chlorofluorocarbons. This is a large and difficult task but fundamental and perhaps permanent alteration of the stratosphere has profound implications for the future of the world as we know it.

The Office of Technology Assessment has proven itself capable of policy analysis on difficult and complex issues. Despite this, OTA may find it difficult to immediately provide a set of options which both complete and detailed. However, the Congress must soon begin to weigh the alternatives facing the United States and other nations. For this purpose, we hope that you can provide information on omissions as well as other considerations relevant to those decisions.

Due to the likelihood that legislation will be seriously considered by the Committee early in the next Congress, it would be most helpful if this analysis could be undertaken without delay. If we or our staffs can be of assistance to you or your staff, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
U.S. Senate,
JOHN H. CHAFFEE,
U.S. Senate,
DAVE DURENBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
U.S. Senate,
GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
U.S. Senate,
MAX BAUCUS,
U.S. Senate.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. These six U.S. Senators were troubled by testimony they had heard about climate change in three separate hearings of the Senate's Environment and Public Works Committee. They wrote:

The testimony convincingly portrayed a fundamentally altered planet, with shifts in ocean circulation and climate zones; altered precipitation and storm patterns; more frequent and extreme weather events such as droughts, monsoons, and lowland floods. Individually and collectively, these changes bring about others, ranging from disruption of forest, crop, and ocean productivity to shifts in populations. Witnesses before the Committee testified that the Earth is now committed to a substantial greenhouse warming, projected to be about 2 degrees Centigrade, as well as an ozone layer depletion.

Well, that was quite a prediction. Who were these six Senators? Quentin

Burdick, Democrat from North Dakota; Max Baucus, Democrat from Montana; George Mitchell, Democrat from Maine; Robert Stafford, Republican from Vermont, the chairman then of the committee; Dave Durenberger, Republican of Minnesota; and Rhode Island's Republican Senator, John Chafee.

You cannot help but be struck that the prediction back then by these six Senators is now our reality. Everything they predicted is happening. The scientists they listened to had it right. Global temperatures have already risen by around 1 degree Celsius, and we are headed to over 2 degrees Celsius of global warming by the end of the century.

Their grim predictions, which we now live with as fact, motivated these six Senators to ask the Office of Technology Assessment for policy options that "could lead to the stabilization and minimization of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere."

Why did they want these policy options? They wanted to learn about policy options because, as they continued in their letter:

Congress must soon begin to weigh the alternatives facing the United States and other nations. . . . Due to the likelihood that legislation will be considered by the Committee early in the next Congress, it would be most helpful if this analysis could be undertaken without delay.

"Without delay." Since then, Republicans have demolished the Office of Technology Assessment; that office no longer exists. Republicans have relentlessly blockaded legislation to address carbon emissions and have trafficked in phony climate denial, all while accepting hundreds of millions of dollars of political contributions from the fossil fuel industry.

Today, five of those six States are represented again, having a reunion on the Senate floor. I see Senator TESTER from Montana here. I will yield to him now. We will also be joined by PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont, AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota, and ANGUS KING of Maine.

I yield to JON TESTER of Montana, taking the position of his predecessor, Max Baucus—whom, by one of the weird coincidences of the Senate, I just passed coming out of the trolley.

Senator TESTER, the floor is yours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE.

I could not in my wildest dreams be able to replace Senator Baucus in what he did. But what he did back in 1986, along with a number of other Senators Senator WHITEHOUSE just talked about, was visionary.

He signed a letter asking Federal researchers to study solutions for limiting the causes of climate change. This was in 1986, some 33 years ago. That same year, as I am today, my wife and I were farming in North Central Montana, a farm that then had been in the family for about 70 years.

During the time before 1986, and since 1986, we have seen a lot of changes on the farm. That is why it is interesting—because those changes have increased more than ever, I believe, in the last 20 years.

When this letter was sent off to study solutions in 1986, it was incredibly visionary because it was before climate change was even talked about much. Yet this group of Senators was able to see the negative impacts of this coming down the pike.

By the way, when we talk about negative impacts of climate change—you probably have this, Senator WHITEHOUSE, but somebody ought to put together how many hundreds of billions of dollars we have spent on natural disasters in the last 10 or 12 years compared to how much we spent in years previous. I can tell you, it was a few years ago that every State in the Union except one or maybe two had a natural disaster. That is because our climate is changing. It is because our climate is getting more erratic. I have seen it on our farm. I have seen August turn from the driest month to one of the wettest months. Over the last 20 years, I have seen a reservoir—a reservoir is a manmade area to hold water for livestock. I have seen a reservoir that never went dry from the time my father built it in the early 1950s to going dry for consecutive years. I have seen dangerous floods. I have seen water where we have never had it before. I have seen drought like we have never had it before.

I would just say, in regard to that, we just had a vote on a guy by the name of Wheeler, whom the President nominated to lead the EPA, who actually is one of these guys who doesn't believe in climate change at all. I don't know where the President finds these people, and I don't know how this body can support somebody who is this big of a denier, who wants to slow enforcement on polluters.

There is one thing we need to keep in mind in this country when we try to put people like Wheeler up for head of EPA. If you take a look at the third-world nations in this world, those are the nations that have destroyed their resource base. If you want to pollute our water and if you want to pollute our air, that is destroying our resource base. I guarantee you, that is not a way to make America great. It is not even a way to keep America great.

This nominee is rolling back the clean water rule. He has allowed more uses for asbestos in commerce when, in our State of Montana, Libby can tell you all about asbestos. People are still dying from its effects.

That aside—the Wheeler nomination, which is a catastrophe in itself—I could tell you that the Senators who stood on this very floor 33 years ago understood—understood—that we have a challenge in front of us greater than any other challenge we have faced before, and that is climate. As we talk about what they did in 1986—we are in

2019 now—now is the time to come up with some workable solutions—workable for our climate and workable for our economy—to get our arms around this very serious problem.

I am going to tell you what is at risk here. I love Nevada, but I don't want Montana turning into an ecosystem like Nevada has. We raise some of the best wheat and the best cattle and the best post-crops in the world, but it takes a predictable environment to do that. In some places in our State, we are on the edge of desertification, turning into desert.

The issue that revolves around climate change impacts each and every one of us in this body. Whether we are in denial or not, that is a fact, and it is incumbent upon us, as Senators who represent great States all around this Nation, to come up with solutions that our kids and our grandkids will be proud of.

I yield the floor back to Senator WHITEHOUSE.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank Senator TESTER.

I will turn to the Rhode Islander who was in that early bipartisan effort to understand and address climate change. Senator John Chafee's history of service to his State and country was remarkable. He saw bloody combat in World War II on Guadalcanal and Okinawa with the 1st Marine Division. He went back as a Marine rifle company commander during the Korean war with Dog Company, 2nd Battalion, 7th Marines. He served in Rhode Island's legislature and as our Governor. In 1969, he was appointed Secretary of the Navy. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1976 and chaired the Environment and Public Works Committee from 1995 until his death in 1999. In the small Rhode Island world, he was also my father's college roommate and lifelong friend.

The environment was an abiding passion for this man, and his devotion showed in his work in the Senate. His legacy includes the Superfund Program, the Oil Pollution Act, and the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act, and his legacy is his early recognition that climate change, driven by carbon pollution, caused by fossil fuels, poses an existential threat to humanity and the planet we call home.

At the 1986 hearing that led to this bipartisan letter, Chafee declared:

This is not a matter of Chicken Little telling us the sky is falling. The scientific evidence . . . is telling us we have a problem; a serious problem.

This is 1986, and the Republican chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee is saying that the scientific evidence is telling us we have a serious problem.

He went on to say:

Scientists have characterized our treatment of the greenhouse effect as a global experiment. It strikes me as a form of planetary Russian roulette. . . . By not making policy choices today, by sticking to a "wait and see" approach . . . [b]y allowing these

gases to continue to build in the atmosphere, this generation may be committing all of us to severe economic and environmental disruption without ever having decided that the value of “business as usual” is worth the risks.

Those who believe that these are problems to be dealt with by future generations are misleading themselves.

Senator John Chafee, 1986.

I yield now to the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and honorary Senator pro tempore, PATRICK LEAHY, here on behalf of the State of Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island.

I could not help but think—as I saw the picture of John Chafee, with whom I had the honor of serving here in the Senate—of John Chafee’s close friendship with Robert Stafford, who was my senior Senator when I came here, both having served in World War II, both with a naval background, both people who cared first and foremost about the country and the environment. I am going to speak a little bit further about Bob Stafford as we go.

When we laid John Chafee to rest in Rhode Island, I remember sitting there and listening to the eulogies. Both Republicans and Democrats were speaking about this man.

Also, referring to what the Senator from Rhode Island has said, more than 30 years ago we had cooperation and bipartisanship. It was a hallmark of the U.S. Senate. It was a bipartisan group of Senators who sounded the alarm about climate change. They made a very modest request to the Office of Technology Assessment. They said: Study the issue of climate change and make recommendations to avert global disaster.

Those Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, were concerned that human activity might directly cause permanent, destructive, and widespread changes to our planet’s climate system—changes that would put our entire economy, ecosystem, and, our very own existence at risk.

As I said, one of these Senators was my senior Senator, my mentor, when I came here and one of the finest Senators who ever served—Republican Robert Stafford, from Vermont.

Today, led by Senator WHITEHOUSE, I think that what many of us are trying to do is what Senator Chafee and Senator Stafford did. We want to recall that moment in 1986 and renew the warning those Senators issued 33 years ago.

Let me speak about Senator Stafford. When I came here at the ripe old age of 34, I was the only Democrat ever elected in my State. Robert Stafford was “Mr. Republican.” He took me under his wing. He had been a Congressman. He had been a Governor. He had been an attorney general. He served in World War II and in Korea. He was a mentor, but he was also an example. His legacy is one of sensible, pragmatic Vermont values that he brought to

Washington for decades. They weren’t Republican or Democratic.

Senator Stafford was—like most Vermonters—a champion for the natural environment. With his work on landmark environmental legislation, like the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Superfund program, Senator Stafford represented the best of Vermont’s commitment to sustainability.

His appeals to reason and for common ground, and his belief in sound science resonate even more today than when he left this body three decades ago. If he were here today, I believe he would be calling on both sides of the aisle to act now to ensure that we can pass on a secure and livable planet for generations to come and to act before it is too late.

Today, so many people still refuse to accept what is now an overwhelming scientific consensus—that climate change is real and that humans are the dominant cause of it. What is worse, for the last 2 years many in Congress have willfully accelerated the devastation caused by global warming by enabling the Trump administration’s erosion of our Nation’s bedrock environmental protections—protections that I have fought for throughout my nearly 45 years in the Senate.

As climate scientists warn of the urgent need to reduce emissions and reverse the global rise in temperatures, many Senators have refused to preserve even the status quo. Instead, in the last 2 years, we have seen the rollback of commonsense regulations, often at the behest of private interests that have spent decades misinforming the public and suppressing their own science on the long-term hazards of the fossil fuel industry.

Alarming, this week the Senate is poised to confirm someone to lead the Environmental Protection Agency—the Agency that is charged with safeguarding the air and water on which we depend—who, despite the scientific consensus, denies that climate change is the great threat we face today.

To growing numbers of Americans it is saddening—actually, it is maddening—and most of all, deeply alarming that the Trump administration and many others in leadership positions have made Trumpism’s anti-science, know-nothing agenda their default position. This poses existential threats not only to our children and grandchildren but to our generation.

More than three decades ago, long before protecting our planet became a partisan issue, the Environment and Public Works Committee held 3 days of hearings on climate change. Those 1986 hearings compelled a bipartisan group of Senators to acknowledge and warn the public about a “fundamentally altered planet” as a result of the “substantial greenhouse warming” that was projected.

They asked what could be done to prevent consequences “ranging from disruption of forest, crop, and ocean

productivity to shifts in population,” and “extreme weather events, such as droughts, monsoons, and lowland floods.” These words of warning were neither radical nor partisan. They were sensible.

So what has changed since then? The ice caps are melting—only faster. Certainly, the glaciers I saw when I visited Antarctica 25 or so years ago had been there for eons, and they are now fast disappearing. Our coastline is still disappearing but faster. Farmers and ranchers are still concerned about prolonged droughts and extreme weather, only, today, the fires and storms are more frequent and more devastating.

Just last month, the intelligence community’s “Worldwide Threat Assessment” offered a sobering conclusion. This is the intelligence community’s assessment: “Global environmental and ecological degradation, as well as climate change, are likely to fuel competition for resources, economic distress, and social discontent through 2019 and beyond.”

We know that bipartisan action on big environmental threats is possible. In fact, soon after the climate change hearings in 1986, Marcelle and I climbed Vermont’s Camel’s Hump with President Reagan’s EPA Administrator. We wanted to show him the terrible damage caused by acid rain. We could see that mountain from our home. We could see the changes up close. They were very obvious. With President Reagan’s EPA Administrator’s support, we moved ahead with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and they were signed into law by President George H. W. Bush. It was not a partisan issue. The result was a great reduction in the scourge of acid rain. We see these results every day.

Today we are in danger of taking such results for granted. It is up to us to protect this planet. If we don’t, who will? There is no more urgent responsibility.

There are bold ideas for how to address this challenge. The Green New Deal offers a valuable roadmap for debate and a pathway for action. The time for dallying around the edges of the issue is over. We all share responsibility for where we are today. So, likewise, we have an obligation to attack this issue, but not with cynical show votes, not with feel-good votes intended to demonstrate a political divide rather than what should be universal acknowledgment of what we know to be true—that climate change is real, and human activity is the primary cause of these threats to our way of life, our communities, and our planet.

We have to channel the American innovative spirit that has improved our lives for centuries. We have to find creative solutions for reducing carbon emissions, and then we have to invest in those solutions. We have to reorient our workforce toward the great opportunities that are opening for green economy jobs. We should invest in

leading the whole world in developing clean energy solutions. We have to address this real emergency head-on. Not only can we curb climate change, but, in doing so, we can transform the American economy.

Over 30 years ago, a handful of forward-looking Republicans and Democrats stood together in this Senate. I was proud to be here when they issued their challenge, but the time for delay is over. In fact, our time is running out.

Let this renewed vigor in addressing climate change, brought about by the bold proposed Green New Deal, be the catalyst for real change. Let's stand together.

Senator WHITEHOUSE has enlightened us on so many of these issues, but we have also learned, as he did, from our mentors—like Senator Chafee, Senator Stafford, and the others who got together in 1986. It is not partisan and it is not political. It is survival.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is not only a towering physical presence on the floor of the Senate but a towering historic presence on this floor, as well, and brings a rare and valuable perspective. I appreciate his words so much.

The sad thing that we face is that despite words like those uttered by Senator John Chafee—"allowing these gases to continue to build in the atmosphere . . . may be committing all of us to severe economic and environmental disruption"—or the words in the letter that John Chafee signed right here and that Senator LEAHY's mentor, Bob Stafford, signed right here back on December 23, 1986, no Republican Senator can utter those words today. Today's Republican Party will not even acknowledge that climate change is a serious problem—let alone put forward a serious proposal to tackle it. Republican Leader MITCH MCCONNELL's latest trick is to call, for the first time, a climate-related measure on the Senate floor for his side to vote against it. The leader has not brought a single piece of climate legislation to the floor for a vote, ever, until this vote, which he is bringing up for his side to vote against.

It actually gets worse. Since the infamous Citizens United Supreme Court decision almost 10 years ago, no Republican in the Senate has offered or sponsored comprehensive climate legislation to limit carbon pollution—none.

So we look back with some real sorrow to 1986, when this bipartisan letter was written. Of course, Minnesota was represented in that letter by Dave Durenberger, and Minnesota is represented here on the floor today by Senator KLOBUCHAR.

I yield to her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his leadership day in and day out on this issue.

I rise to join him and my other colleagues to talk about this letter and to look back at that moment in time but really to do it to look forward because we know it is long past time for bipartisan action on climate change.

As the Senator from Rhode Island has explained with a copy of that letter, back in 1986, a bipartisan group of Senators came together to voice their concerns about the future of our world.

This forward-thinking group of our predecessors, who were from the same States as my colleagues who are here today, held 3 days of hearings on climate change. That sounds like a pretty good idea for something we should be doing right now. It was chaired by, of course, the Republican Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. John Chafee.

Minnesota Senator David Durenberger was among that group of Senators. He was born in St. Cloud. He earned his law degree from the University of Minnesota, was the top-rated cadet in his ROTC class, and served as a lieutenant in the Army Counter Intelligence Corps and as a captain in the U.S. Army Reserve.

Senator Durenberger took over the seat left by Senator Humphrey, and during his 17 years of service in the Senate, Senator Durenberger proved time and again that he is a true believer in bipartisanship. He worked across the aisle to tackle big issues, and that included talking about climate change way back in 1986.

I called Senator Durenberger this week to talk to him, and our staff did, to get some sense of where he was on climate change years later. He reported to us that, in his words, he wanted to remind Americans there was a time in our very recent history when the U.S. Senate made it its responsibility to define and address some of the critical national and international policy issues that threaten the security of our communities, our Nation, and the world.

This is Senator Durenberger speaking in the year 2019. He said he could say "without reservation that it was bipartisan Senate leadership that encouraged the four Presidents with whom [he] served—Carter, Reagan, [George H.W.] Bush, and Clinton—to prioritize environmental problem definition and solution."

He also recalled working with his colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee to "challenge"—and these are his words—"challenge the scientific community and the business community to work harder at reducing the impact [of greenhouse gases] and suggesting what policies best incentivize alternative fuels."

It was in this bipartisan spirit that this group of Senators sent a letter to Dr. John Gibbons, who was then the executive director of the Office of Technology Assessment. In that letter, they talked about the need to meet "the massive and, to some degree irrevocable, alterations in the stratosphere commonly referred to as the greenhouse effect."

The letter goes on to discuss concerns about "altered precipitation and storm patterns," something certainly the Senator from Rhode Island knows we are seeing right now. These Senators were ahead of their time—altered precipitation and storm patterns.

"[M]ore frequent and extreme weather events," they talked about that. Look at what we are seeing with the hurricanes, with the rising sea levels, and with the wildfires in Colorado and in California.

"[D]isruption of forest, crop, and ocean productivity." That letter may have been sent in 1986, but certainly those Democratic and Republican Senators were ahead of their time. Americans are now increasingly feeling the effects of changing climate patterns and extreme weather events. Farmers are already living through these disruptions to crop productivity.

So what else did the letter say? Well, it said this: "We are deeply troubled by the prospect of such a rapid and unprecedented change in the composition of the atmosphere and its implications for the human and natural worlds." It also stated that "it may be necessary to act soon to at least slow these trends or, perhaps, halt them altogether."

Think of those words way back in 1986 asking us to act soon. They were right back then, and they are still right today. The true tragedy is that the final paragraph of the letter notes that any analysis should be undertaken without delay "due to the likelihood that legislation will be seriously considered by the Committee early in the next Congress."

Well, the truth is, we are still waiting for that legislation to be seriously considered. The bipartisan call in that 1986 letter came in the 99th Congress, and we are now beginning the 116th. Just as troubling, we have lost some of the bipartisan spirit that guided David Durenberger and those 1986 lawmakers. Our inaction has outlasted even the Office of Technology Assessment itself.

I ask my colleagues, in the spirit of bipartisanship—from back in 1986, my colleague Senator Durenberger, who I hope is listening today—let us continue that spirit, and let's get some serious climate legislation to the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me thank Senator KLOBUCHAR for her wonderful remarks, and of course Minnesota is a Northern State which sees this up close all the time.

The Senator spoke of bipartisanship. Do you know who voted with Senator Chafee for the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990? The Republican Senate majority leader did, as did a majority of the Republican caucus in the Senate.

In fact, those powerful 1990 Clean Air Act amendments passed 89 to 10. Where do I go to get a majority leader like that back? Where do I go to get a Senate Republican Party like that back?

As late as 2009, Donald Trump published an advertisement in the New York Times that said that the climate science was “scientifically irrefutable”—scientifically irrefutable—and that if we didn’t do anything about it, there would be “catastrophic and irreversible consequences for humanity and our planet.” That is Donald Trump in 2009.

Where do I go to get that Donald Trump back? What happened? In 2007, when I first joined this body, there were Republicans working on climate legislation all over the place. Senator KLOBUCHAR and I came together that year. We had, by my count, five pieces of bipartisan climate legislation that were working through this body in various stages in 2007, 2008, and 2009, when Donald Trump put this advertisement in the New York Times saying that the science was scientifically irrefutable and the consequences would be catastrophic and irreversible.

Then came January of 2010. Then came the Citizens United decision. Then came unlimited and often anonymous fossil fuel money sloshing around in America’s politics and all the threats and promises that unlimited money allows special interest to engage in. Now, those days, the Donald Trump of 2009, Republican cooperation of 2007, 2008, and 2009, and of course this letter from as long ago as 1986 seems impossible, but I hope we can get together. We have to do better than Republican political mischief on climate change.

Calling up bills that you intend to vote against—give me a break. Where is the plan, the Republican, conservative, serious plan for addressing the climate crisis? I will tell you where it is. It is nowhere. Zero. Nada. Nothing. That has to stop.

Here, on this letter, is one of the most distinguished, wonderful men ever to serve in the U.S. Senate, Mr. George Mitchell of the State of Maine, and here, representing him today, is Senator ANGUS KING from the great State of Maine.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise in sadness and somewhat perplexed because what we are doing in this colloquy is recreating a statement, a letter, as the Senator from Minnesota outlined, that was sent by six of our predecessors in December of 1986, warning about the dangers of climate change, warning about what this can do to our country and to our world, about costs, and about how we had to take action.

One of those Senators was George Mitchell of Maine, one of the great legislators of the 20th century. I am honored to be in the seat that once was occupied by George Mitchell and also by his predecessor, Edmund Muskie. I think the story of the major environmental legislation of the 20th century, sponsored principally at the beginning

by Edmund Muskie, the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act, is worth mentioning, if only briefly.

The most important point is that the Clean Air Act, one of the most important and comprehensive environmental pieces of legislation in our Nation’s history, passed this body unanimously. It passed this body unanimously.

It disturbs me that we couldn’t agree on the time of day around here unanimously these days. I don’t know when this issue became a partisan issue, but I deeply regret it because it is causing harm to our country.

What I would like to do is step into George Mitchell’s shoes for a moment and read a statement that he himself wrote and made back in 1986, and you are not going to believe how prescient this statement is. It could have been written yesterday. Here are George Mitchell’s words:

The problem of global warming is one of immense significance. It is the most serious and more pressing than anticipated. Previously, most of the models forecasting the rate of global warming focused on the air pollutants produced by the combustion of fossil fuels. More recent data suggest that trace gases may also increase the rate of warming by a factor of two. This means that warming may be increasing twice as fast as previously thought.

The data produced to date suggests there may be an average increase in temperature of 1°C since the beginning of the industrial revolution.

This was in 1986. We are now at about 1.5 degrees centigrade.

Considering how much warmer this June has been than average, a 1 degree difference may appear to be insignificant, but an average of 1 degree increase could be devastating, so the experts tell us. A 1 degree increase in the average global temperature would melt glaciers—

That is happening—

and such melting would increase the sea level.

That is happening.

There are uncertainties in predicting how much the sea level would increase in a particular area. In some cases, it could be an average increase of a few feet; in others, much more. For a coastal State like Maine and to other States along the coastline, such an increase would be devastating.

To deviate from George’s words for a moment, this is what we see happening. We are now seeing what are called rainy day floods, flooding in areas of our country along the coast that were rare. Six-month events are now every high tide.

George Mitchell says:

An average of 1 degree increase in temperature could have major impacts on agriculture. This country’s Midwestern bread basket could again become a dust bowl. More heat would mean less water for crops and variations in growing seasons. It is important to keep in mind that this average increase is global in nature. It is not a national or regional problem. If American farmers suffer for lack of water, so will farmers all over the planet. If shorelines along our coasts are flooded, so will shorelines everywhere in the world.

The enormity of this phenomenon is staggering, and we have a responsibility to limit

emissions of pollutants that trap the heat in our atmosphere. As difficult, as immense, and as seemingly remote as the problem is to our daily lives, we cannot delay.

This was George Mitchell in 1986—we cannot delay.

There will be those who argue that more research is necessary to completely understand the phenomenon and to answer every scientific question.

We are still hearing that argument today—we need more science; we need more studies; we are not sure.

George goes on:

As in the case of acid rain, such complete understanding will come only after we flounder in the weight of our shortsighted policies. This is one more indication that the benefits of industrialization carry with them the burden of controlling pollutants. These pollutants threaten our lakes, fish, health, and forests today in the form of acid deposition.

We will hear today that these pollutants also threaten the future of our planet, which cannot tolerate such a sudden and dramatic increase in temperature and survive in a form familiar to us.

In 1986 George Mitchell said:

Solutions are possible and available. The statement released at the conclusion of the Villach Conference in Austria last October—

This was in 1985—

addresses the common nature of some of our environmental problems. That statement said in part that “climate change and sea level rises due to greenhouse gases are closely linked with other major environmental issues, such as acid deposition and threats to the Earth’s ozone shield, mostly due to changes in the composition of the atmosphere by human activity.”

Reduction in coal and oil use and energy conservation undertaken to reduce acid deposition will also lower concentration of greenhouse gases. Reductions in emissions of chlorofluorocarbons—

Which we achieved—

will help protect the ozone layer and will also slow the rate of climate change. The rate and degree of future warming could be profoundly affected by governmental policies on energy conservation, use of fossil fuels, and the emission of greenhouse gases.

Those words were written 32 years ago.

The rate and degree of future warming could be profoundly affected by governmental policies on energy conservation, use of fossil fuels, and the emission of greenhouse gases.

The testimony that they were intending to hear at the hearing that George is describing demonstrated “that such governmental policies are needed . . . nationally and on a global basis.”

I pause on “a global basis”—the tragedy of leaving the Paris climate accord, because the only solution to this problem has to be local, national, and global.

The testimony from Federal Agencies will be that the current government policy is to conduct more research, a familiar refrain on issues of this type. George Mitchell said:

What is missing in the Federal effort is action. The problem of global warming brings another round of scientists before us decrying the folly of waiting until it is too late to

prevent irreversible damage. In the case of acid rain, research has been offered as a substitute for much-needed action. This policy has produced more bodies of water that cannot sustain life, more trees that are dying, and more people who find it hard to breathe.

The policy has produced more studies, not any meaningful change in policy. I hope these two days of hearings will help persuade the administration—

And the people of the country—

that inaction has its own costs, almost invariably higher than the cost of action.

George Mitchell was right. The cost of inaction is invariably higher than the cost of action.

George concluded by saying:

I represent a State that already has been affected by acid deposition. I want to do all I can to keep Maine, the rest of our country, and our planet from facing potentially more dramatic environmental damage from global warming. The best way to avoid these undesirable outcomes is to begin taking action now to prevent further damage rather than spending twice as much time and later money repairing damage.

George Mitchell was right in 1986. Tragically, he is even more right today because we did not heed his call. We did not take action. We have avoided action.

I don't want to be the generation that our children and grandchildren look back on and say: Where were you and what did you do when the climate was deteriorating, when the glaciers were melting, when the ice sheets were melting, when the sea level was rising, when the storms were increasing in intensity, when the wildfires were burning our States? What did you do, Senator?

I, for one, want the answer to be "I took action." The answer should be "we took action."

Today, this is a challenge even greater—significantly greater—than it was in 1986, but the very fact that people like Quentin Burdick, George Mitchell, John Chafee, Bob Stafford, and David Durenberger saw the future and predicted it so succinctly and profoundly should spur us to the type of action that is necessary to meet, confront, and overcome this most serious of challenges before us.

Thank you.

I yield to my colleague from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I will close out this colloquy by pointing out that the Republicans of 2007, 2008, and 2009 who were working on climate legislation before the Citizens United decision have left or died or gone to ground. It is sad to see. These Republicans of 1986, a third of a century ago, would be shocked at what has become of their party. So, today, we, their successors in five of these six States, gathered on the floor to honor their memory, to mourn what has become in the intervening years of the Republican Party, and to grieve for what this body has lost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

S. RES. 70

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, on February 13 the Rules Committee approved S. Res. 70, which authorizes funding for the Senate's committees from March 1, 2019, through February 28, 2021. For this 24-month period, the 18 committees covered by this resolution are authorized to spend up to \$214,055,860. This is a small increase over the funding authorized by the current committee funding resolution, S. Res. 62. For the information of my colleagues, committee funding authorized by S. Res. 70 remains 13 percent below levels from a decade ago.

Committees are the lifeblood of the legislative process. It is in our committees that policy is created and programs and agencies are overseen. Our committees are where the Senate first exercises its advice and consent function over the executive branch's nominees. Well-functioning committees are crucial to the Senate's role as a separate but equal branch of the government.

The resolution before the Senate is the result of a bipartisan process Senator KLOBUCHAR, the Rules Committee's ranking member, and I undertook this year to solicit more input from committee chairmen and ranking members. The resolution reflects the needs identified by our colleagues and will help ensure our committees are able to carry out their responsibilities and duties.

I would like to thank Fitz Elder and Rachelle Schroeder from my committee staff; Lizzy Peluso and Lindsey Kerr from Senator KLOBUCHAR's committee staff; and Cindy Qualley, the Rules Committee's chief clerk. Additionally, I would like to thank Ileana Garcia and Ted Ruckner from the Disbursing Office and John Henderson from the Office of Legislative Counsel. I greatly appreciate their hard work in developing this resolution.

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR PERIODS MARCH 1, 2019 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019, OCTOBER 1, 2019 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2020, AND OCTOBER 1, 2020 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2021

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 25, S. Res. 70.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 70) authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, and October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in the RECORD of February 13, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL S. 47

Mr. BLUNT. Continuing as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 47.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. BLUNT. Thank you, Mr. President.

One of those items was an enrolling correction and the other was funding for committees. Our committees are beginning to do their work, and this makes it, obviously, appropriate and possible for them to do that.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I just listened to the other debate on the floor, and it reminded me of the fact that our friends on the other side of the aisle introduced a resolution calling on the Federal Government to adopt what they call the Green New Deal.

From my point of view, the legislation is pretty far outside the mainstream in what it is proposing and how it is proposing the problems we should be debating. I don't have any problem with that. Those problems should be solved, and even though it seems pretty far outside the mainstream of thought, at least 12 of our colleagues in the Senate have cosponsored it. The majority leader thought it would be fair if we had that idea out there—it is

getting a lot of public attention—to have a chance to debate this legislation and vote on it in the Senate.

The Democrats have called it a sham. They said: Why should we have debate on this piece of legislation? Why would we want to vote on this piece of legislation?

Now, it is not cosponsored by a majority of the Members of the Senate, but it is cosponsored by over 25 percent of the Democrats in the Senate, and one would think that if 25 percent of their conference is sponsoring a bill, they would be glad to come to the floor and talk about that bill and talk about what it does.

So let's talk for just a couple of minutes about what that bill actually says. One of the things that it does is that it calls for the United States to use 100 percent renewable energy by 2030. That is just a little more than 10 years from now. It says, basically, that we want to have a zero-carbon-dioxide emissions by then.

I know there was some discussion in the rolling out of this bill that that would mean that ground transportation and air transportation would either be eliminated or minimized—at least the way we travel right now would be. At some point in the future that may happen, but it is highly unlikely it is going to happen in the next 10 years, which is what the bill calls for. Maybe that is why they don't want to debate it. Even President Obama's former science adviser says that this is not feasible. Harvard University professor John Holdren was quoted in the New York Times saying: "As a technologist studying this problem for 50 years, I don't think we can do it."

So that is a pretty good source who indicates that what we are talking about here can't happen. So that big headline goal appears to be impossible, but we probably could debate it anyway. Let's hear from the other side, particularly the 12 cosponsors, to say why it is possible, why we should be able to do that, and why that is in the legislation that they filed.

The rest of the legislation goes really beyond things that don't relate to the environment. There is a laundry list of policies that appear to be popular right now in the so-called progressive discussion. One is a single-payer health system and the other is a Federal job guarantee. The talking points suggested that that would be a Federal job guarantee for people who can't work or aren't willing to work. Of course, that was so controversial that immediately people began to say: Well, maybe that is something that the Republicans snuck into our talking points. But it turned out that wasn't true.

There is a provision calling for "repairing the historic oppression of . . . youth." That is sort of what this whole Green New Deal seems to focus on—accepting responsibility in a debate for things that really don't make the kind of sense one would want them to make as you move toward legislation. They

don't really say what the "historic oppression of youth" was. Probably that is not related to the economy or the environment or the greenness of the Green New Deal.

But even if we agree that these ideas are good ideas, the other question is this: How much is it going to cost?

The American Action Forum looked at the biggest parts of the legislation, and they estimated that the total would run anywhere from \$51 trillion to \$94 trillion over 10 years. To put this in perspective, the Congress right now appropriates about \$1.5 trillion a year. We spend more than that through programs that are in place like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but we appropriate \$1.5 trillion a year. If the estimates of the Green New Deal are right, that would suddenly become \$5 trillion to \$9 trillion a year. That is a pretty good multiplier of \$1.5 trillion a year—six times, in fact, of what we are spending now—at the \$9 trillion level. That works out to be about \$65,000 per family per year. That would probably be more government than we could afford, but that is how it works out.

There is nothing that talks about how families are supposed to come up with their share of the bill.

While some of the ideas in the Green New Deal—Medicare for all or a job for everybody, guaranteed by the government—sound like good ideas, I don't think they are going to stand the test of the debate. I think that is one of the reasons that maybe the other side doesn't want to have the debate.

Some talk about: Well, maybe we will all vote present or we will not vote at all.

I think it is pretty hard to defend what you are out there talking about when you are not willing to come to the floor and talk about it. That is a debate we are going to have. I suspect we are going to have it sometime this month, and I look forward to engaging in that debate.

This week, we are having another debate on nominees. Right now, the debate is on the nominee for the Administrator of the EPA. There has been some discussion of the environment in the debate on the Administrator of the EPA. Next, we are going to go to someone to serve on the TVA commission. This is somebody who has been voted out of committee two times in bipartisan voice votes and never allowed to have a vote in the Senate.

I will remind my colleagues again that under President Reagan, the average time in days from when a person was voted out of committee—and remember, as all of us on the floor would know, the committee is where questions are asked, and the background check has been completed. That may take a substantial amount of time, depending on the nominee and how complicated their information is—sometimes less time, sometimes more. That has all happened in the committee.

Under President Reagan, the average number of days from the time a person

was voted out of committee until they were voted on, on the floor was 5. The total number of times the majority had to file cloture to get that vote was less than a handful in the entire first 2 years.

For President Trump, the average number of days for a nominee to be voted on is 55, and the majority leader had to file cloture 128 times even to get a vote. We are going through some of those votes this week. The 30 hours of debate almost never includes debate about the nominee who is using up floor time that could be used for debating how we spend our money, how we defend our country, or what our foreign policy oversight responsibilities are going to be.

We are going to continue to look at the options and continue to talk to our friends on the other side about how 60 Senators can work together to change the rules in a way that they would be changed going forward to get the rules back more to the days of Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, Bill Clinton, and all of their predecessors, where nominees were never used as a way to use up time. Nominees were never held hostage so that other legislation or debate couldn't occur.

We are working hard to find 60 of us who want to return to a time when legislative priorities in the Senate still had the protections of the minority that have always been there, but those protections couldn't be used to the disadvantage of people who have stepped up and are willing to serve and are often voted out of committee on a bipartisan basis, only to be held up on the floor.

I look forward to the debate on the Green New Deal. I look forward to the other debates we are going to have on the floor of the Senate this year.

For the people who are willing to serve, who have been reported out of committee, who have been thoroughly questioned and investigated but can't get that vote and get to work, that is not what we want to do. That is not who we should want to be. I hope we can work together to find a way to change that rule as well.

I see my good friend, the Senator from Hawaii, is here. We are working on some things together right now that we would like to get to the floor and have those bills voted on later.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Hawaii.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri. I thank him for his leadership and levelheadedness.

As he is on his way out, I will say that I think the current way we deal with nominees is not tenable. I imagine a scenario where we have a Democratic President, and it will take even longer than it is currently taking to confirm nominees. I think there are a number of us on both sides of the aisle who are open to modifying the way we operate.

For me, the blue-slip question is a redline. I think what they are doing with the blue slips undermines the individual ability for any Senator to have their say, especially as it relates to the circuit courts, but I think there is an opportunity to have a conversation.

On climate generally, I am looking forward to a debate, but it is very difficult to debate in the Senate when only one party proffers a proposal. I don't mean this as rhetorical flourish. I don't mean this as a personal accusation or a partisan attack. It is just a fact that there are no climate proposals coming from the Senators who are Republican. There are zero. So they are trying to have a debate about a resolution which was nonbinding and which was signed by 12 Senators. I get it, but I think, given that this is the world's greatest deliberative body, we ought to have a proper debate about climate change.

We are actually in a climate emergency. This is the most important moment in the world's history as it relates to this particular crisis. We are sitting here trying to score points about an FAQ that was posted on a new Congresswoman's website and trying to make fun of each other and say: They are going to ban cows and ice cream. It is very silly, and it is not worthy of the seriousness of the moment.

I would ask my Republican colleagues—I see a number of them who take the debt, foreign policy, cyber security, personal privacy, and the rules of the Senate very seriously. They are very levelheaded human beings with a seriousness of purpose. Yet when it comes to climate change, it gets into this goofy thing where they are doing everything except debating climate change and what ought to be done about it.

We spent 5, maybe 10 years trying to get most Republicans to concede that this problem exists at all. Now a lot of them are feeling comfortable saying: Yes, this problem exists, but all of the solutions proposed by Democrats are wrong.

That is fine, but I ask this question in all sincerity: What do Republican Senators propose to do about the climate crisis? What is your plan? If you don't like cap and trade; if you don't like a fee on carbon; if you don't like massive investment in green technology and clean technology; if you don't like the extension of the investment tax credit and the production tax credit; if you don't like our solution; if you don't like being part of the Paris climate accord—which, by the way, is nonbinding, which means we get to decide what our pathway is to clean energy. It is not as though the U.N. gets to tell us what to do. It gives us leverage to make sure that as we move forward toward clean energy, the other countries don't cheat. It actually gives us leverage in this situation.

If you don't like our solutions, that is fine. This is the world's greatest de-

liberative body. This is where the greatest debates in U.S. history have happened. Yet, maybe 19 times out of 20, I have come down to the floor to talk about climate change, and there were Members on this side of the aisle and zero Members on the other side of the aisle. Again, I don't mean this as an attack; I just want a real debate.

I am looking at the Senator from Georgia. We have had robust discussions about debt and deficits and the way we try to avoid shutdowns and sequester and all the rest of it. When it comes to climate change, everybody gets really goofy. Everybody puts on their partisan uniform and refuses to engage. If this debate about the Green New Deal offers us an opportunity to talk about the planetary crisis, then I am happy for it.

We are in debate time on the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to lead the EPA, so it might be helpful to know the origins of the Agency.

In the 1960s, the state of the environment was catastrophic. Millions of freshwater fish and rivers around the country were being poisoned by insecticides, hurting consumer trust and the countless fishermen and families who made a living that way. Pollution was so bad that debris floating in the Cuyahoga River actually caught on fire, causing thousands of dollars in property damage. The water in Lake Superior became so toxic from companies' dumping asbestos-laden waste that local communities had to start filtering their own water. Think about that. People could drink the water from their local reservoirs unfiltered until industrial pollution came along.

This was the path our country was on. Pollution was destroying many of the most beautiful places in the country and, maybe more importantly, putting the health of the public at risk.

A scientist named Rachel Carson came along and changed everything when she wrote a book that helped the United States see that we couldn't go on like this. Her book was a call for change, and millions of Americans, on a bipartisan basis, demanded change.

There was a predictable backlash. Here is what one industry spokesman said as public opinion began to coalesce around addressing pollution:

The major claims of Miss Rachel Carson's book "Silent Spring" are gross distortions of the actual facts, completely unsupported by scientific, experimental evidence, and general practical experience in the field. Her suggestion that pesticides are in fact biocides destroying all life is obviously absurd in the light of the fact that without selective biologicals, these compounds would be completely useless.

This controversy went on for the next few years. The public, the science, and the reality pointed toward the truth, but a few loud voices tried to stop the country from making progress. They said that Rachel Carson distorted the facts, that the science wasn't there, and that there was no need to rush judgment.

The U.S. Government moved forward anyway and began to lay the founda-

tion for a new America—one that would preserve and protect our country and its resources for the next generation.

In 1970, President Nixon united several offices and bureaus already in the Federal Government into one single agency, the EPA. The EPA was charged with protecting the Nation's health and being the steward of the environment. It has a legacy of fulfilling that mission. The Agency ended the use of a dangerous pesticide called DDT. It found a solution to acid rain, which was once a major issue for fish, forests, and farming. It took on secondhand smoke, banning smoking in indoor public places.

Thanks to the EPA, Rachel Carson's "fable for tomorrow" did not become a reality, but here we are decades later facing another environmental crisis, one that affects the United States and every other Nation on this planet, and I am worried that we are not going to do the right thing this time.

Instead of facing head-on and in a bipartisan way the biggest crisis in the planet's history, the party in power is not just ignoring the problem; they are making it worse. And they are doing it by nominating and confirming people like Andrew Wheeler. This is someone who said: "Manmade global warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people." This is the guy to head the EPA. He says manmade global warming is a hoax. This is someone who was formally the vice president of the Washington Coal Club, who lobbied for coal companies.

We are in a planetary emergency, and Republicans want someone who is advancing the interests of top polluters to be the Nation's chief environmental steward so that he can continue to advance the interest of the top polluters. Again, it is not just that they are ignoring climate change, which would be bad enough; it is that they are aggressively, proudly, gleefully sometimes, making it worse.

Researchers at Harvard found that the EPA's recent plans to gut the Clean Power Plan will lead to more greenhouse gas emissions. Their plan will be worse for climate than if they did nothing at all. Think about that. If the EPA did nothing at all, it would be better than what they are doing now. This is the result of Mr. Wheeler's leadership, which has until now been in an Acting Director capacity.

During the Presidency of Ronald Reagan, the EPA was led by Anne Gorsuch Burford, who ended up resigning in scandal. President Reagan nominated as her replacement William Ruckelshaus, whom people trusted to do the job and stabilize the EPA. He was a moderate. He was a steady hand. The EPA could use a steady hand after Scott Pruitt, who promoted the interests of polluters over the health of the American people and who crossed many ethical lines. Yet Andrew Wheeler is no Ruckelshaus. That much is clear from his time at the EPA. Under his leadership, EPA inspections are at a 10-year

low. EPA fines are at a 25-year low. Restrictions on new coal plants have been eliminated. Limits on methane pollution are in the process of being rolled back. In other words, polluters are getting their way. That is great news for people who own oil and gas companies, but it is horrible news for people with asthma, for farmers who are trying to get through the worst drought season seen in a century, and for small businesses that are losing customers because of fires.

Listen, climate change is here. It is hurting everything from local economies, to public health, to national security, and the Republicans have decided that the best person to lead the Agency to do something about it is a coal lobbyist. It would be funny if it were not so outrageous.

The Democrats have a plan for climate change. We have ideas to invest in clean air, clean water, and smarter infrastructure. We have bills on investment and production tax credits, solar energy, wind energy, conservation and efficiency, carbon pricing, and planting trees, and we have stood together against nominations like this one. It is time for the Republicans, if not to stand with us, to at least then stand on the other side against us and engage in this great debate. What are we going to do with climate change? We have proposals, and they have none.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to talk about a crisis in my home State and indeed five other States across the Southeast. I rise to talk about disasters in California and to talk about our friends in Puerto Rico.

On October 10, 2018, Hurricane Michael made landfall on the Florida Panhandle as a category 4 hurricane. It was one of the strongest storms to ever hit the United States. Over the next few hours, Hurricane Michael barreled through Florida and tore through southwest Georgia. In a matter of minutes, homes were flattened, tracks of timber were destroyed, and farmers' crops lay down in the field. People's lives were radically affected forever.

This hurricane hit at exactly the time of year when most crops were ready for harvest. It doesn't matter if they were peanuts, cotton, or pecans—they were all just beautiful this year. As a matter of fact, in the State of Georgia, I grew up working on our family's farm there, and I have to say the cotton crop last year was probably the best I had ever seen. It was almost cruel. Today, agriculture is Georgia's top industry and our No. 1 economic driver. Before the hurricane, farmers in my State were expecting a record harvest. Instead, their crops were completely destroyed.

Shortly after the hurricane hit, President Trump, Vice President PENCE, and Secretary of Agriculture Perdue all came down to Georgia. To-

gether, we toured the devastation and heard from farmers and local officials about the tough road of recovery ahead. Some farmers said they could clean up, replant, and have a crop next year as long as they had adequate resources. Other farmers were not so lucky.

Georgia is the top pecan-producing State in the country. One of our largest pecan farms is owned by two brothers in Bainbridge, which the Vice President and I personally visited. We personally saw the damage in their fields. Some 800 acres of pecan trees were gone. I cannot describe to you what that looks like. On the ground was a solid carpet—if you can imagine this—of mature, beautiful, inch-long pecans that were ready to be harvested but were on the ground, ruined.

One brother said:

The farmer in me wants to farm this land, but there's no way I can make it. Next year is the year I'll lose it, because we're not like the cotton guy. Nothing against them, but they get to replant a seed next year and have a crop. I don't.

The problem is that the pecan crop can be annually insured, but there is no insurance product for insuring pecan trees. If these two brothers replant, it could take 7 to 10 years for the trees to mature enough to even generate a minimum revenue. Most likely, full production would take over 12 years. For them, this is truly a generational loss.

The other brother said:

My brother and I built this business from nothing. We will make it. We may not be in the pecan business anymore, but we will be doing something else. We are fighters. [Our families are committed to this land.] You just have to go on.

When they saw the devastation, President Trump and Vice President PENCE stepped up to the plate and made a commitment to our agriculture community.

President Trump said: "Farmers really got hurt here, especially in Georgia, but we're going to get it taken care of."

Vice President PENCE said:

We will rebuild these crops and these communities. We will restore southwest Georgia. We will restore the Sunbelt region bigger and better than ever before.

This afternoon, I am here to say that the Vice President and the President are living up to their word. After this disaster relief was caught up in the political nightmare of funding the last 25 percent of this year's budget, we now have the opportunity to put this stand-alone supplemental appropriations bill on the floor of the Senate. The President and Vice President have been absolutely resolute in their support of getting aid to the victims of these disasters. They are now asking Congress to pass this all-inclusive disaster relief bill right now.

The State of Georgia has already stepped up and offered tax credits, short-term financing, and other forms of direct assistance to those who have

been impacted, but they have only scratched the surface. The people of Georgia have come together and helped their neighbors, served meals to each other, and assisted first responders in their recovery efforts.

In Florida alone, then-Governor RICK SCOTT, who is now our colleague here on the Senate floor, was in the race for this Senate seat, and he actually suspended his campaign to devote all of his time, in his responsibility as the Governor, to lead the effort of analyzing the damage in Florida and determining what needed to be done. He can speak directly to the need. He is a co-sponsor of this bill, I might add.

However, despite efforts by Senator ISAKSON and others and me in our State, this Senate body has yet to take action on disaster relief for the agriculture community in the Southeast. Our farmers simply cannot wait any longer. The situation in my State is dire. I would say it is the same across the South. Because revenue from the 2018 harvest was destroyed, bankers can't lend money to farmers who right now are asking to borrow money to put seed in the ground, to fertilize the ground, and to prepare the ground for next year's crop. It is as simple as that. Growers cannot replant because they can't get their financial houses in order because we haven't adopted a resolution for last year's harvest that they were not able to achieve. Rural communities are suffering, and in many places, economic activity is at an absolute standstill as it waits for the Federal Government—this body and the House of Representatives—to do its job.

For some in my State, the timing of assistance is not just a matter of putting a crop in the ground this year; it is a matter of potentially never putting a crop in the ground again. If we do not help these people right now, they may lose their businesses and livelihoods through no fault of their own. That is the reality we are facing here. The people in my State have asked me to utilize every sphere of influence, turn over every stone, and exhaust all options to get disaster relief right now.

We are past the time when this should have gotten done. I have spoken with the President many times about this. His commitment to our farmers is unwavering. Just last Monday night, he said: DAVID, get it done. He called me again on Saturday night before he left for Vietnam. He said: DAVID, what do we have to do to get this bill across the Senate floor? Talk to our friends in the House, and make sure that everything that is needed is in.

Senator ISAKSON, I, and several other Senators have introduced a supplemental disaster relief bill on the floor of the Senate, and President Trump has agreed to sign it. Our bill includes disaster relief for agriculture. It also provides additional funds for Georgia and other States like Florida, Alabama, the Carolinas, Alaska, Hawaii, and California that have battled natural disasters over the last year on

their own. It also builds on the Trump administration's past efforts and includes the remaining funding for Puerto Rico.

Both the House and Senate have previously supported similar proposals. They should be even more inclined to do so now that it is not tied up with the overall 2019 budget drama. This is a standalone supplemental bill that includes those things that people on both sides of this body agreed to and voted for just last year. This bipartisan package is a win for our farmers. It is a win for families and businesses that were devastated by historic hurricanes in the Southeast and wildfires in the West. It is a win for the people of Puerto Rico whom the President has previously helped. He was committed to including that in this bill.

I sincerely hope this body will move quickly and pass this disaster relief bill without further delay. I humbly ask each of my colleagues in this body for their individual support and for their vote in this disaster relief package that will save hundreds, if not thousands, of farming families in my home State from having to give up what they love, and that is farming the land that in many cases they inherited from their families. In other cases, people who graduated from HBCUs—some of our brightest young people—borrowed money to buy the land or are leasing the land, and they are in danger of losing this dream of making a living on the ground in Georgia.

Our country and our people are counting on us to get this done, and time is of the essence.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I come to the floor in opposition to Andrew Wheeler's nomination to lead the Environmental Protection Agency.

Americans across this country depend on EPA to protect their public health, yet under this administration, EPA has failed again and again to reassure my constituents that their basic rights to breathe in clean air and sip clean water are being prioritized.

Listen, I am proud that EPA's Region 5 office is headquartered in Chicago. Region 5 has led the country in enforcing the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and other bedrock environmental policies that Congress has passed. But under Mr. Wheeler and this administration, EPA has made it harder for the scientists, engineers, and public health experts in Region 5 to do their jobs.

EPA is severely understaffed and underfunded, and in 2018, major enforcement actions dropped to their lowest

levels in more than 10 years. Last year, EPA competed fewer than 11,000 inspections and evaluations of polluters across the country—the lowest number in almost two decades.

In 2018, EPA sent just 123 civil pollution violation cases to the Justice Department for prosecution. That is about 40 percent less than the annual average during the Obama administration. So, sadly, it should come as no surprise that a report from the Environmental Integrity Project this month found that communities across the country are now being put at risk of exposure to dangerous contaminants.

To make matters worse, the EPA's enforcement workforce has been shrinking for years, and the Trump administration wants to cut it back even further.

These cutbacks are leaving communities, especially low-income communities and those of color, exposed to public health risks. Meanwhile, polluters are being let off the hook for serious violations of the law.

I have seen firsthand what happens when EPA fails to enforce our laws and protect public health. It causes fear and confusion. For months, residents in Willowbrook, IL, have lived in fear that the air they breathe in has been making their family sick.

Here is a little background. A facility in their community has been releasing cancer-causing emissions for decades. Unfortunately, even since EPA discovered just how toxic this chemical was years ago—years ago—they have refused to issue new regulations updating safety standards based on the latest science.

Making matters even worse, EPA officials refused to notify local public health or elected officials about their discovery, leaving communities in the dark even while their health is at risk, leaving more families more likely to get sick, leaving more children more likely to die.

As a mother, this is heartbreaking. As a Senator, this is outrageous.

When Willowbrook residents first started to raise concerns, EPA wasn't the least bit transparent. The Agency had to be pushed by Senator DURBIN, other Members of the Illinois congressional delegation, and me just to hold community forums.

My office also received alarming information alleging that senior political appointees instructed EPA personnel not to inspect any facility in Region 5 that emits the same carcinogen found at this facility. If true, this type of political interference is beyond unacceptable. If true, it is happening on Mr. Wheeler's watch.

I have asked EPA to take several steps to fix this crisis, and I am still waiting for their response.

In the absence of leadership from EPA, Senator DURBIN and I have authored two pieces of legislation to ensure that this kind of crisis never happens again.

Here is what Gabriela, a resident of Willowbrook, said when she saw the list of health problems associated with this facility: "It was like reading our medical history."

Since she moved to her home in 2009, Gabriela has suffered from intense headaches, dizziness, nausea, inability to concentrate, and memory loss. She has found it difficult to read through briefs and almost instantly forgets movie plots and even some conversations.

Both of her children, who have lived in the house for most of their lives, have had respiratory problems since they were little. Her 12-year-old daughter has often coughed to the point of vomiting and has developed a bone cyst.

One of her 9-year-old daughter's classmates was recently diagnosed with leukemia, as was Gabriella's next-door neighbor, an otherwise healthy man in his early fifties.

Another woman I have gotten to know from Willowbrook is named Neringa. She told me that when she and her husband were moving to Chicago 5 years ago, they picked their home because it seemed like a place where their children would be safe.

She went on:

You look for sexual predators, good schools, taxes. You don't think you would have to look at air and water. You feel like it is the one thing in our country we wouldn't have to think about.

Exposure from toxic pollution is a matter of life and death for these residents. It was uncovered only when career civil servants did their job and flagged a risk they observed in a routine model that EPA publishes.

I am extremely concerned that other areas in Illinois could face similar issues and that other kids in other communities could be breathing in air full of cancer-causing chemicals when they are playing on the swings at recess or walking home from school later that afternoon.

I need EPA to respond to the requests I have made on behalf of Lake County and actually conduct the kind of monitoring that exposed the problem in Willowbrook there and in every community that may be at risk.

Not far from Willowbrook, residents in Chicago have also been facing several public health threats for decades.

Chicago, IL, is the birthplace of Hazel Johnson, the "Mother of the Environmental Justice Movement," a pioneer of environmental justice activism on the South Side of Chicago.

She founded People for Community Recovery in 1979 in an effort to get asbestos out of the buildings in her community. Soon she managed to trace air and water pollution in her community to nearby industry, which was using the predominantly lower income African-American community as a dumping ground.

Hazel Johnson knew what I know: Every American has a right to breathe in safe air, drink clean water, and live

on uncontaminated land, no matter where they live, no matter the color of their skin, no matter their tax bracket.

Yet I still hear about manganese pollution, petcoke, particulate matter, and lead exposure from these residents on a daily basis.

Chicago residents deserve—no, they need—environmental justice. But for some reason, this administration has dismantled the office that is supposed to lead this work, even trying to eliminate EPA's environmental justice funding and drive out the office's top talent.

Lead exposure is an issue that impacts low-income families and communities of color disproportionately. I had high hopes that I would be able to work with Mr. Wheeler on the administration's response to this crisis. Yet after months and months of delays, I am very disappointed by their so-called plan.

Mr. Wheeler's lead action plan falls short of what was promised and the "war on lead" his predecessor declared. This is not a plan with goals, strategies, and deadlines. Instead, it is a repackaged version of a report published under the Obama administration. Little has changed, other than the window dressing.

What disappointed me most was that the administration appears to be walking back our goal of eliminating lead exposure, settling simply for reducing it. That is unacceptable.

Even to this day, in a post-Flint crisis world, too many in power are sitting idly by as countless Americans are exposed to lead. More than 6 million homes get water from lead service lines, and 24 million homes have lead hazards in paint, dust, or soil. Nearly half a million children have elevated levels of lead in their blood.

Let's be clear. For children, there is no safe level of lead allowable in drinking water. Even low levels can cause permanent brain damage in kids, lowering IQ, and inflicting other cognitive damage. Imagine if your child were one of those who had gotten sick because the EPA refused to take action on such an obvious crisis. Imagine how infuriating, how devastating that would be.

We must make meaningful progress in tackling sources of exposure, and EPA must take up an aggressive, comprehensive, and practical strategy.

I know we can make real progress in reducing lead in our society, but the new lead action plan is a missed opportunity to advance those efforts.

I also believe that Mr. Wheeler has far too many conflicts of interest to be running the EPA. As a former lobbyist for Murray Energy, Mr. Wheeler has worked closely with the industries he would regulate as the leader of the EPA. It is well reported that Mr. Wheeler's former firm lobbied the EPA on efforts Wheeler now oversees.

Even after he took temporary reins of the EPA, he made no secret of meeting with former clients and fossil fuel industry representatives. CNN and

Reuters have both reported that Wheeler is heavily prioritizing meetings with industry over anyone else and has attended more than 50 meetings with companies or industry groups that EPA regulates.

If this news doesn't alarm you, it may be because corruption is becoming routine under this administration. After all, just earlier this week, the Washington Post reported that the Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Bill Wehrum, has been routinely meeting with former clients in the fossil fuel industry from his not-so-long-ago lobbying days.

I placed a hold on Mr. Wehrum's nomination because I did not think he could be trusted with our Nation's air. I feel the same way about Mr. Wheeler's leading the EPA.

According to the Sierra Club, every third day during his first 100 days as Acting Administrator, Mr. Wheeler either, one, rolled back a new climate policy; two, ignored or contradicted science; three, met with big polluters; four, limited the EPA's ability to protect us from pollution; or, five, gave in to corporate polluter demands—all of that in just his first 3 months and change. Imagine what would happen if we gave him the reins for good.

Mr. Wheeler's position on climate change policy alone is disqualifying. Consider, for example, his attack on the Clean Power Plan. Climate change is a major threat to our environment, our economy, and our national security—something that even Donald Trump's own intelligence officials admit.

My home State of Illinois is already experiencing the consequences of inaction. Growing seasons are changing, heat waves are increasing, and extreme floods are becoming more frequent and more severe. Just this December we had a hurricane. Mitigating these effects will require sensible policies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and invest in clean energy.

Under the Clean Water Act, EPA is legally required to limit carbon pollution from powerplants, pollution that we know is the primary driver of climate change.

That is why the Obama administration established a Clean Power Plan—to provide States the flexibility they need to meet a national goal of 32 percent reductions in carbon pollution by 2030. This plan was the culmination of robust and rigorous public participation, and EPA received millions of comments supporting the program from States, through its utilities, communities of color, Tribes, environmental groups, labor unions, and the public at large.

The Clean Power Plan was not only good for the environment; it was good for the economy, too. In Illinois, residents are expected to save an average of up to 4 percent on electricity bills by 2030. Illinois energy efficiency investments alone are estimated to grow our economy by \$2 billion in that same

year, and we lead the Midwest in clean energy jobs.

But no matter the obvious global, national, and economic benefits, Mr. Wheeler has led the administration's efforts to roll back the Clean Power Plan. His replacement proposal would adversely impact public health and lead to as many as 1,400 premature deaths from increased soot, up to 15,000 new cases of upper respiratory problems, and 100,000 missed school and work days annually by 2030.

Internationally, this proposal would leave the United States further behind our allies that have taken aggressive action on climate change. The proposal also fails low-income communities and communities of color, which bear the brunt of our environmental and public health burdens. Unlike the Clean Power Plan, this platform doesn't even require States to engage environmental justice and community groups in their plan development processes. It also fails to encourage States to conduct environmental justice analysis of their own as they develop implementation plans.

EPA should be working to strengthen policies like the Clean Power Plan. It is more than troubling that Mr. Wheeler and the Trump administration are instead seeking to repeal them entirely. Now is not the time to move backward.

Here is what Evan, who grew up in Libertyville, IL, shared with me:

I write because I am concerned about the future. The future of the world, the future for the United States and my own future. At this time, I feel that perhaps the greatest threat to that future is climate change. The current Administration's stance towards the issue has discouraged me to no end, and I can't help but despair as the President makes light of this existential threat to the wellbeing of the planet.

I know, of course, that not all lawmakers share the President's stance towards this issue. Please, make some noise.

Evan, I hear you. I hear your fear, and I want you to know that I believe the Nation should be focused on building a clean energy economy and a climate-safe future for your generation. I hear you, and I am going to make that noise for you.

I am also angry at EPA's abuse of the small refinery waiver program under the renewable fuel standard. The RFS includes a policy to help small refineries that cannot afford to comply with the RFS. Before Donald Trump took power, this policy was rarely used. Under the Trump administration, however, nearly every exemption application has been secretly granted. This includes applications from large, multi-billion dollar companies like Exxon and Chevron that are earning record profits. These companies' CEOs have even pointed to hardship waivers on earnings clauses as contributing to their profitability.

The administration's stance reduces incentives for blending—slashing demands for biofuels and feedstocks—actively hurting farmers and biofuels

companies. These waivers could hurt the markets for years to come, holding back homegrown biofuels while creating windfall profits for large oil refiners—the exact opposite of this administration's promise to voters.

Let's be blunt. EPA is taking money out of farmers' hands and giving it to billionaire oil companies. These actions come at a time when biofuel producers and farmers across our country are already hurting. Farm income is at its lowest since 2006, and retaliatory trade measures from China threaten to deepen the crisis.

Yet early reports indicate that the small refinery waivers EPA has granted under President Trump and Mr. Wheeler will reduce demand for biofuels by billions. Over the past 6 months, we have seen more ethanol plants sold, idled, or closed than ever before. When I asked Mr. Wheeler during the confirmation hearing about EPA's apparent change in policy to now seemingly granting every exemption application, he made excuses justifying them. We need a leader at the EPA who is going to stand up for our farmers, not capitulate to the demands of Big Oil.

We also need a leader at the EPA who is going to protect the Great Lakes. The 1,000 employees in Region 5 work tirelessly to protect the environment, health, and safety of Americans living in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. They live, work, and raise their families in the communities they protect, and they are leaders in the fields of water quality, Superfund cleanup, and Great Lakes restoration.

Region 5 is also home to the Great Lakes Program Office, which ensures that we keep the promises we made to Canada under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. It also leads the Nation's Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which has funded more than 2,000 projects that improve water quality, protect wildlife, and clean up toxic pollutants that threaten our water supply.

To date, the program has invested more than \$2.2 billion in Great Lakes restoration projects. Coordinated in both the United States and Canada, GLRI sets the standards for interagency and international cooperation. Every \$1 invested in Great Lakes restoration results in a \$2 return in the form of increased fishing, tourism, and home values. But in addition to enduring a shutdown, the employees in Region 5 who lead these programs have been bought out, undermined, and reorganized into positions they are not suited for, and that is unacceptable.

What is also unacceptable is Mr. Wheeler's attacks on science and science integrity. Science does not have a political affiliation. Science is about learning, and it never stands still. It gives us the building blocks to help us increase our knowledge over time and to find ever-better solutions to the challenges we face. Unfortu-

nately, this EPA has led the administration's attacks on science when it doesn't fit with their pro-polluter agenda.

What is at stake is not just our health and future but also America's standing and influence in the world. Just this month, EPA released the names of eight new members of its science advisory board. I am concerned that several of the new members represent interests who seek to undermine the independence and quality of the scientific advice given to the EPA. University researchers are now in the minority on the board, while the number of industry-affiliated members and members listed as consultants has increased.

Here is how the Union of Concerned Scientists summarized the new appointments made by Wheeler to the Science Advisory Board. Take Dr. John Christy. He has a reputation for controversial climate research and denying the evidence of global warming.

Then, there is Dr. Brant Ulsh, a consultant who argues that radiation at low doses isn't a big deal, contrary to the conclusions of the National Academy of Science.

New member Dr. Richard Williams has received compensation from the American Chemistry Council's formaldehyde panel, which was set up to obfuscate the health impacts of this carcinogen. He is also on the board of trustees of the International Life Sciences Institute, an industry-funded organization that is notorious for pushing out shoddy nutrition science.

Dr. Barbara Beck is a consultant with Gradient, which has itself earned a reputation for helping industry defend their products with favorable scientific studies. Beck herself helped to write a paper arguing that exposure to lead at low doses is not necessarily harmful to children, which is in stark contrast to the CDC's assessment that there is no safe level of exposure to lead.

The common thread among these individuals is that they are practitioners of the widely used disinformation playbook. They frequently work to inject uncertainty into science by criticizing risk assessments and underlying models. They argue that exposure to pollutants at low doses is not worth worrying about. That is not true. Pollution is pollution, and it is bad for communities, and it is bad for public health.

I also want to spend some time discussing the administration's new clean water rule. For more than 45 years, the Clean Water Act has preserved, protected, and restored our Nation's most important natural resource and radically transformed how our Nation uses water. That is why admirers of CWA appropriately labeled this law as one of the most successful public health initiatives ever enacted. Continued success of the CWA requires developing a clear, concise rule for determining which bodies of water are protected by

the Clean Water Act. However, Mr. Wheeler and the Trump administration have proposed a rule that fails to provide the clear-cut certainty requested by my constituents. It would cancel protections for drinking water sources of tens of millions of people. It would also cancel protections for streams and wetlands that provide habitat for wildlife and protect communities from flooding.

Communities across the country, particularly low-income communities and communities of color, already struggle to access clean water. Mr. Wheeler's proposed rule will make it even harder for these communities. Mr. Wheeler's water rule puts the profits of corporate polluters before our health and clean water for our families.

Alan, from Wheeling, IL, wrote to me and said:

This is insanity. There is nothing more important than protecting the sources of water that many people in this country drink from.

No source of drinking water should be open for pollution or destruction, but that is exactly what this proposal does by stripping protections from critical streams and wetlands across the country.

Senator Duckworth, please do anything that is possible to protect our environment and industries that depend upon clean water.

Alan, thank you for writing to me. I agree with you. This rule makes no scientific, legal, public health, or fiscal sense.

Another constituent, Dave from Rockford, shared with me similar concerns. He wrote:

Clean water is not a political issue. Protecting our watersheds and ensuring that clean, fresh water is available for fish, farms and communities is not an option—it's a responsibility.

I cannot think of a more enjoyable satisfaction [than] just standing in a clean river, seeing all the life teaming in it, and knowing that our hard work is paying off.

Dave is right. Streams and wetlands work as natural filters and sponges, keeping our drinking water supplies safe, while reducing the impact of floods.

Like our water, I am concerned by this administration's attacks on clean air. One group that comes to mind that has been fighting for our clean air is Mom's Clean Air Task Force. They are a group of moms who know how painful it is when their child can't play outside because they have asthma or there is smog outside. They are fighting for cleaner air and stronger kids.

They list ten reasons they oppose Mr. Wheeler, and among those reasons are his attacks on rules to control mercury pollution, to make our cars more fuel efficient, and to reduce smog.

Mr. Wheeler's attacks on these priorities hits close to home for me. Currently, the rate of asthma in Illinois is 13 percent higher than the national average. The Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America ranks Chicago in the top 10 percent of the most challenging places to live with asthma. Asthma is hitting the frontline neighborhoods in Chicago harder than in many other

places in the Nation, with asthma rates in some neighborhoods soaring as high as 33 percent. As the climate gets hotter, air pollution, allergies, and temperatures will trigger more asthma attacks in children.

I want to end on a high note. I commend Mr. Wheeler for following through on his promise to make himself accessible and to conduct proactive outreach. Compared to Mr. Pruitt, he is an upgrade in terms of professionalism, but that is an incredibly low bar.

At the end of the day, my constituents are depending on me to protect them from pollution, even if it upsets some in industry. I believe we need an Administrator who is ready to fight for our kids, to fight for the Great Lakes, to fight for the civil servants that work at EPA, and to fight for every American's right to clean air, clean water, and a healthy environment. I believe EPA will achieve its mission when it requires rigorous enforcement when human health is at stake.

Mr. Wheeler believes that public health must be balanced against the health of corporations and industry interests who always want less rules, less oversight, and certainly less enforcement. That is why I must vote no.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this week the Senate is debating the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to serve as Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

I am going to make this short because this is bad news for anybody who wants the Environmental Protection Agency to live up to its fundamental mission; that is, to protect the public health so our citizens, from sea to shining sea, can breathe clean air and drink clean water.

In my view, Andrew Wheeler is Scott Pruitt without an appetite for luxury travel on the taxpayers' dime—yet another Trump appointee doing the bidding of the dirtiest, most powerful industry in America, no matter what physical harm it might do to the people of our country.

To me, the fundamental obligation of an EPA Administrator should be to make sure we don't compromise our health and the environment. Regrettably, Mr. Wheeler has spent his career doing essentially the opposite.

Given what he has done during his time as acting head of the Agency, he has already proven what sort of backward-thinking Administrator he will be. In fact, I think it would be fair to

say Andrew Wheeler is sure to be "Administrator Rollback."

During his time as Acting Administrator, he's rolled back fuel economy standards that reduce pollution and help drivers save money at the pump. Not even the car companies support him on that. He is rolling back the rules designed to stop dirty powerplants from belching toxic gases into the air. He is rolling back rules designed to protect workers from exposure on the job to dangerous chemicals that can cause heart attacks, for example. He is rolling back EPA enforcement—basic enforcement—of a host of safeguards that are already on the books.

Civil penalties against polluters are now at their lowest since 1994. Inspections of potentially toxic industrial sites amount to half of what they were just in 2010. Civil fines have plummeted on his watch. Judicial enforcement cases that have begun and are concluded have been cut in half. The Wheeler EPA is already letting environmental criminals off the hook. It is my view that these criminals are not creating victimless crimes—what they are doing is poisoning our communities, our workplaces, our air, and our water.

Perhaps what is most alarming about his appointment is that he essentially waves a hand of dismissal to the existential threat of climate change.

I have a lot of open-to-everybody townhall meetings in my State. We have now had more than 920. Just last week, I held five in different parts of our State. In counties where Donald Trump won and in counties where Hillary Clinton won, the issue of climate change comes up everywhere.

At the root of the questions I get in communities that span the philosophical spectrum is that people are terrified—terrified—of what climate change is going to bring. They see the news coming out of Washington. They see that the Trump administration isn't just waving the white flag of surrender on climate change. In effect, it almost feels as if the Trump people want to bring on those climate changes even faster. Anybody who is walking around in our communities and sees temperature shifts of more than 30 or 40 degrees on a dime is completely aware of what I am talking about, even if the Trump administration is not.

In my home State, when you talk about climate change, the first thing Oregonians think about are wildfires. These fires are not your grandfather's fires. They are bigger. They are hotter. They are more powerful.

Not too long ago, we actually had a fire leap the Columbia River—our magnificent Columbia River. This is noteworthy for a variety of reasons but especially because our rivers historically have acted as fire bricks. Now we have these bigger and more powerful fires almost all year round, not just a few months in the summer, the way it used to be. These new megafires are extraordinary.

It is almost as if we are trying to get acclimated to the idea of clean air refugees—people who live near areas where fires break out, with ash built up on their cars like snow in the winter-time.

California has seen its own huge infernos causing horrible fatalities in the last few years. Nevada has seen it, Colorado and Washington as well. People are literally homeless, out and about in their communities, trying to just find a safe place for shelter.

Climate change is also not just about fires. Across the West, there is the threat of crippling drought. The hurricanes that battered the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico are intensifying and drowning our cities with rain. It seems like every day there is another report about how sea levels are rising faster than previously estimated.

Climate change is affecting wildlife in catastrophic ways. Entire ecosystems could be lost. This week, there were reports that an ice sheet larger than the island of Manhattan broke off from Antarctica. So the effects of climate change aren't some threat way off in the future. It is already a massive problem today. Americans feel it, and they see it in their communities again and again.

My wife and I are older parents. We have 11-year-old twins and a 6-year-old daughter. I—and I am sure there are plenty of other Senators—think about what their generation is going to be dealing with down the road. This is why there is so much grassroots energy out there about the Green New Deal, which I am proud to cosponsor.

I can tell you from the conversations I had in Oregon, people know what a grave threat climate change poses. They want action. My hope is that there are a variety of ways, like we saw with the original New Deal, in which we can find some common ground.

I am the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, which writes the tax laws. We have more than 40 separate tax breaks for energy that are on the books today, and most of them are dirty energy tax relics of yesteryear.

What I have proposed is that we basically throw those 40 energy tax breaks—relics of dirty energy—in the trash can and substitute three; one for clean energy, one for clean transportation fuel, and one for energy efficiency.

The Presiding Officer is new here. She is getting out and talking to Senators about a variety of issues. I can tell her that what I will be saying to colleagues on the other side of the aisle is something like, my idea responds to what Republicans have been talking about, the need for fewer subsidies. We ought to have fewer subsidies for energy.

Why don't we try to work together, find common ground, and do it particularly on an issue that helps us to promote clean energy at a time of dramatic climate change?

That is why I believe Andrew Wheeler is the wrong person to lead the EPA. Just when we need Democrats and Republicans to come together to find fresh ideas to combat climate change, he basically says that it really isn't a threat at all.

It really isn't a threat to Mr. Wheeler, and he is making the climate change challenge worse by basically suppressing the authority and the ability of the Agency to take this existential challenge head-on.

The mission of the EPA is all about protecting human health, fighting for clean air, fighting for clean water, and fighting on behalf of Americans from sea to shining sea.

Andrew Wheeler fights for those who endanger our health and pollute our air and water. This isn't a tough call. I am a no on a nomination that represents danger and going backward. I urge my colleagues to stay with me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today because in 1869, 150 years ago, the Nebraska Legislature unanimously passed and our Governor signed legislation that established the University of Nebraska.

The Morrill-Land Grant Colleges Act, signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln in 1862, provided Nebraska with land to establish colleges focused on agriculture and the mechanic arts. The university opened its doors in our State capital, Lincoln, where we honor President Lincoln's namesake.

Since then, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln has grown to an enrollment of over 25,000 students, providing over 5,000 new graduates to the workforce each year and over \$2 billion in annual economic impact for Nebraska across our 93 counties.

The university holds a special place in my heart. I am a graduate of the university. Staying true to its roots, UNL remains a national leader in water, agriculture, and rural development research, helping to transform our State, which was once called the Great American Desert, into one of the greatest agricultural exporting regions in the world.

On top of equipping Nebraskans with the skills to feed the world, the university has emerged as a leading institution for early childhood education and national security and defense research.

The university's sports teams unite our Nebraska communities, and they fuel our pride in our great State. Whether it is to cheer on our five-time national championship winning football team at Memorial Stadium or at the Devaney Center to support one of our State's treasures, the five-time national champion women's volleyball team, Lincoln is filled with a sea of Husker red on game days.

What is more, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln leads the Nation with 333 Academic All-Americans across our Cornhusker sports teams.

The university is also important to the culture of our State, showcasing some of the best of the good life—attractions such as the State Museum, which is the largest natural history museum in Nebraska or the Larsen Tractor Test and Power Museum or the East Campus Dairy Store known across our State for its wonderful cheese and, of course, ice cream.

The university, like our State, has grown and accomplished much over the last century and a half, and that is why my colleague from Nebraska and I have introduced a Senate resolution recognizing UNL's 150th anniversary on February 15 of 2019.

This is a formal way for this body to extend our congratulations to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln on this special milestone in its history. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of the resolution because, as my colleague and I know so well, there is no place like Nebraska.

Here is to the next 150 years and beyond for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Madam President, I yield some time to my colleague from Nebraska so that he may make remarks on this resolution as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I thank my senior Senator, DEB FISCHER, for her leadership and drawing attention to the 150th anniversary of the University of Nebraska. Senator FISCHER is a tireless champion of our State and of this special university, her alma mater.

I am sad to admit in public that I am not a graduate of the University of Nebraska, but I had lied about my age for many, many years to be able to vend and sell concessions at Huskers sporting events before I was old enough to do it so that I could be deeply affiliated with this institution, even though I didn't graduate from there.

I salute my senior Senator and her leadership in drawing attention to this. I want to tell stories about Coach Osborne, who was my boyhood hero, about crying as a 12-year-old after the January 2, 1984, national championship game in Miami, about Scott Frost and how he is going to soon lead us back to the promised land, but I have already been warned by the Presiding Officer that the Senate has some informal unwritten rules that actually prohibit football evangelism on the floor.

I will move along to celebrate, with my senior Senator, our volleyball national championships, our bowling national championships, and the fact that Nebraska is or was once known as the Great American Desert, and we are now the most trade-dependent, export-dependent State per capita in the Union precisely because we live on the

great Ogallala Aquifer, the most productive land anywhere on Earth and at any point in the history of the Earth.

We grow so much more food than we can ever conceivably consume that we feed the world from Nebraska, and a huge part of that is because of the ag extension programs of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. There are a lot of great Americans and great patriots who serve at the University of Nebraska on the faculty, in the administration, and donors and alumni and our current students, and the 150th anniversary is a great moment for our State. All 50 States have colleges and universities they are proud of, but there is no State that is more identified with its university than Nebraska. I would like to join my senior Senator and applaud her for her leadership in bringing this resolution today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Nebraska for his words and recognizing the importance of the University of Nebraska to our State as an economic engine of the State, as an institution that draws on the strengths of the State of Nebraska, and especially looking at Innovation Campus at the University in Lincoln, where there is a focus on water and on food. We are blessed in Nebraska with that water resource, and we do feed the world.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 82, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 82) recognizing the 150th anniversary of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 82) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the debate that we

are having with regard to the nomination or, I should say, confirmation of the EPA Administrator.

All of us in this Chamber and the other body, the U.S. House of Representatives—frankly, anyone in government—has an obligation to act in accordance with a goal of being good stewards of the Earth. Some might call it creation care—care of God's creation.

Unfortunately, the Environmental Protection Agency, under its current leadership, is, in my judgment, failing to meet that obligation. From day one, the administration has prioritized gutting environmental protections and rolling back policies that had us on a path toward a more sustainable future.

From attacking the Clean Power Plan to weakening methane protection standards, this administration has repeatedly prioritized the interests of polluters over the health and wellness of the American people.

Andrew Wheeler, the nominee, if he is confirmed to run the EPA or, I should say, the Environmental Protection Agency, which we call the EPA—this assault on clean air, clean water, and so many other protections will continue if he is, in fact, confirmed.

Some of the most troubling EPA actions have come while Mr. Wheeler has been running the EPA in an acting capacity.

In recent weeks, the EPA has decided to move forward with a rollback of the clean car standard and to gut the mercury and air toxics rule. These moves will harm public health and the health of our children, in particular.

The American Lung Association reports that 5 Pennsylvania counties, 5 of our 67 counties, which are home to approximately 4 million people, rank among the top 25 counties most polluted by particulate matter year round.

Rolling back the clean car standards and clean air standards will cause more exposure to harmful pollutants that lead to increased mortality, respiratory problems, emergency room visits, and work-loss days.

As we know, the transportation sector is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. We also know that the MATS rule, the so-called mercury and air toxics rule, is an environmental and public health success story.

Mercury pollution is particularly harmful for unborn children, who are much more sensitive to exposure and who may suffer neurological and developmental problems.

Powerplant mercury emissions have declined by 90 percent because of the MATS rule. This was achieved ahead of schedule and at one-third of the projected cost. Let me say that again. Powerplant mercury emissions have declined by 90 percent because of the MATS rule. This was achieved ahead of schedule and at one-third of the scheduled cost.

Let me give testimony from two Pennsylvanians—partial testimonies,

though they are from longer letters that they wrote to us.

Mollie Michel of South Philadelphia wrote to me, and I am quoting her:

As parents, my husband and I spend a lot of time making sure our daughters are safe and healthy. We make sure they eat healthy foods, get enough sleep, do their homework, and treat each other and their peers with kindness and respect. But the one thing we cannot control is the air they breathe. For that, we rely upon our elected officials to enact the policies that protect the health and well-being of my children.

The only thing I would correct in Mollie's excerpt of her letter is that it is the obligation not just of elected officials but of appointed officials, as well—those confirmed by the U.S. Senate, in this case, the Administrator of the EPA. Of course, it is our duty, as elected officials, to make sure that we confirm people who will meet the legitimate expectations of a mom like Mollie.

Patrice from Gibsonia, PA, wrote to me to say:

As a mom of two boys, I am deeply concerned by the track record of Acting Administrator Wheeler. He has spent his time at EPA proposing and implementing dangerous rollbacks to and attacks on pollution protections. He is putting our children's health and future at risk.

So said Patrice of Gibsonia.

While we are on the subject of major threats to the environment, major threats to our communities, to our children, and to our families, we cannot forget about climate change itself. Climate change is a threat to the health and well-being of our children and future generations. We must take action to address the global climate crisis with a sense of urgency and determination. The effects of climate change are real and have become worse, and unless we take action, we are going to be in a position where it will be impossible to take any action if we do it too late.

We can address the challenge of climate change and continue to protect jobs. We can and we must do both. One is not exclusive of the other. We have already demonstrated that we can make advancements in clean energy and that it can happen quickly while also benefiting the economy and creating jobs.

According to the Business Council for Sustainable Energy and Bloomberg New Energy Finance, renewables—renewable sources of energy—now account for 18 percent of power generation in the United States, up from just 9 percent in 2008.

According to the 2018 U.S. Energy Employment Report, the wind and solar industries support three times as many jobs as oil and gas—three times as many jobs as oil and gas. According to S&P Global, battery storage cost for a 20-megawatt facility declined by 40 percent in 2018. So I think it is entirely possible, and the data proves it, to deal with this crisis, to meet our obligations, to continue to create and grow jobs, and also to make sure that our economy grows as well.

I live in a State where more than a generation ago we passed a State Constitution provision. Article I, section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution says in pertinent part that people have a right to clean air, pure water, and to the preservation of the natural scenic, historic, and aesthetic values of the environment. That constitutional provision goes on to say that we are trustees. We, the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are the trustees of our natural resources, and they specifically talk about future generations.

That is my obligation, not only as a citizen of the Commonwealth and not only as an elected official but, I believe, as an American as well.

To confront these crises—whether it is attacks on clean power standards, clean air and clean water standards or whether it is the challenge of climate change itself—we need an EPA and an EPA Administrator who is totally committed to that same spirit that is set forth in that State constitutional provision that the people have a right to clean air and clean water, and, I would argue in a larger sense, the right to the kind of creation here that is connected directly to the question of climate change.

We are talking about God's creation and preserving His creation. If we are trying to preserve God's creation, we better make sure we nominate and confirm people committed to preserving creation itself. We are but stewards of that creation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING COLONEL JOE JACKSON AND
LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHARLES KETTLES

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate two Medal of Honor recipients who passed away last month. Every Medal of Honor recipient has served his country with extraordinary valor and with little or no regard for his own life and safety.

Air Force Col. Joe Jackson and Army LTC Charles Kettles were no exceptions. They were both pilots and both served honorably in the Vietnam war. Both were responsible for extraordinary rescue missions of American soldiers trapped deep behind enemy lines against incredible odds. These two men were patriots who by chance, skill, and strength of character became true American heroes. They are gone now, but their legacies and examples will always live on. It is up to us to learn from them.

Col. Joe Jackson passed away on January 12 at the age of 95.

Jackson enlisted in the Army Air Corps in 1941, serving as a gunnery instructor for the duration of World War

II. But he may never have been a pilot—may never have been a hero—if not for a chance event in that war.

One of his friends, a flight engineer, fell ill right before a B-25 bomber flight. Jackson agreed to take his place. During the flight, one of the engines caught fire. The pilot didn't know what to do, but Jackson did. His timely instructions helped extinguish the fire, possibly saving the aircraft. Emboldened by this incident, Jackson decided to become a pilot—and he did, flying 107 missions as an F-84 Thunderjet pilot during the Korean war and becoming one of the very first pilots of the U-2 spy plane.

That in itself would be a pretty distinguished career of honorable service, but Joe Jackson returned for more, decades later. At the age of 45 he answered the call of service once again, volunteering with the Air Force's 311th Air Commando Squadron to fly cargo planes in Vietnam. It is not often a cargo pilot gets a chance to distinguish himself in combat, but it was in that very role that Joe Jackson earned the Nation's highest honor.

May 12, 1968, was supposed to be a routine cargo mission for Joe Jackson and the crew of his C-123. That all changed when the American special forces camp at Kham Duc was attacked by the North Vietnamese. As the Viet Cong overran the camp and established firing positions just off the landing strip, an emergency evacuation began of the much smaller American contingent.

The evacuation quickly turned into a turkey shoot. Eight aircraft and helicopters were shot down or destroyed on the runway during the desperate evacuation of Kham Duc. In a horrible tragedy, one cargo plane was shot down by North Vietnamese forces shortly after takeoff. All aboard the aircraft perished—the American air crew, plus some 150 South Vietnamese civilians. Eventually, the airlift succeeded in evacuating nearly all of the camp's survivors. But as the last scheduled plane left the runway and the order was given to bomb the remainder of the camp, a horrible discovery was made: Three American soldiers had accidentally been left on the ground. Joe Jackson's plane was the closest to the area, so he made a split-second decision. "We're going in," he said.

The C-123 cargo plane was not known for its agility, but Joe Jackson tested its limits as an aircraft. He banked the plane into a breathtaking turn and descent, dropping 9,000 feet to the runway in a matter of seconds. The plane instantly drew fire from the enemy, including an anti-armor rocket that crashed just shy of the aircraft but, providentially, did not detonate. The three beleaguered soldiers boarded Joe Jackson's aircraft, and he gunned it, lifting them to safety.

That terrible assault on Kham Duc exacted a high toll in American lives. But thanks to Joe Jackson's quick wits and skillful flying, that toll was much lower.

Joe Jackson remained in the Air Force until 1974, when he retired as a full colonel. He taught at the Air Force Air War College so that future pilots could learn from his example. Then he worked for Boeing, helping that great company build airplanes for use in peacetime, not just wartime. He ultimately settled in Kent, WA, with Rosamund, his wife, to whom he was married for 74 years and with whom he had two children.

Joe Jackson was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Lyndon Johnson in January of 1969. He later described the heavy burden that recipients of that honor must shoulder. He said:

I have to represent the thousands of Americans who have served the country. You have to make them proud of what you have done and what they have done.

As a former soldier and as an American, let me state that there can be no finer representative of courage under fire than Joe Jackson. May he rest in peace.

LTC Charles Kettles passed away on January 21 at the age of 89.

Kettles was a helicopter pilot with the Army's 176th Assault Helicopter Company, 14th Combat Aviation Battalion, Task Force Oregon.

Flying was in Kettles' blood. He was born in Ypsilanti, MI, to a father who had flown for the Canadian Royal Air Force in World War I and later for the U.S. Army Air Corps in World War II.

Kettles was drafted in 1951, which began a whirlwind of Active Duty tours in Korea, Japan, and Thailand. He returned to the armed services in 1963, volunteering as a pilot. That is one thing to note about Charles Kettles. He was always willing to volunteer for dangerous assignments. Vietnam would give him many opportunities to volunteer.

On May 15, 1967, then-Major Kettles volunteered to lead a flight of six Hueys to reinforce the brigade of the 101st Airborne Division that had been ambushed by a battalion of North Vietnamese.

The situation was pretty hairy. It pitted Americans against hundreds of the VC, and the Americans were taking heavy fire. Worse still, they were trapped in little cover in what was called "Chump Valley," so nicknamed because only a chump would go there.

Major Kettles and his team landed under heavy fire from the enemy. One of the aviators later recalled that the tracers were "like rain . . . coming straight out of the wood line." So intense was the enemy fire that several Americans were killed as they approached the evacuation zone. Nevertheless, Major Kettles stayed until reinforcements were offloaded and wounded soldiers were brought on board.

After that insertion, Major Kettles returned to the battlefield a second time when his helicopter was raked front to back by machine-gun fire. Mechanics later counted 40 holes in his Huey. Major Kettles' gunner was seri-

ously wounded in this trip, but Kettles piloted his aircraft, limping back to base streaming fuel.

Those two flights would be a full day's work and then some for any aviator, but Major Kettles wasn't done yet.

Later that day, with the situation in the valley growing yet more desperate, Kettles volunteered for a third time to evacuate the remaining 44 soldiers. So dangerous was the situation that Kettles was ordered to stand down. However, he disobeyed that order.

Kettles led six helicopters on a third landing as fiercely contested by the enemy as the previous two. Soon the last helicopter reported all personnel were evacuated off the ground, and the helicopters evacuated the area. The all clear had been given too soon; a small group of American soldiers who were bravely fighting a rearguard action had been left behind.

One of those soldiers later recalled the feeling when he saw the helicopters disappear over the jungle canopy: "If it's possible for your heart to fall into your boots, that's what mine did."

There were now eight Americans stranded in Chump Valley against hundreds of Viet Cong. Those are long odds even for the Screaming Eagles of the 101st.

So for the fourth time that day—the fourth time—in a split-second decision, Kettles turned around his aircraft to land in a hot LZ. This time he returned alone with no gunship support.

When he landed, a mortar exploded near the front of his aircraft, blowing out his Huey's chin bubble, windshields, tail boom, and rotor. His helicopter returned with 40 holes and was 600 pounds overweight because all eight American soldiers were onboard. They all attribute their survival to his brave actions.

Kettles was later awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for his extraordinary courage and self-sacrifice, but he wasn't immediately awarded the Medal of Honor. There is one thing Charles Kettles wouldn't volunteer for—the spotlight. He accepted the Distinguished Service Cross and moved on with his life, retiring from the military in 1978 after another tour in Vietnam.

Kettles moved back to Michigan, where he taught aviation management at Eastern Michigan University and worked for Chrysler Pentastar Aviation. He married twice and had nine children, who survive him, along with his wife Ann.

That is how the Kettles' story may have ended if not for a local historian who persuaded Congress and the Army to reopen the file. When they did, it became apparent to all that he deserved the Nation's highest honor. Charles Kettles was awarded the Medal of Honor in 2016 at the young age of 86. Kettles did what he could to downplay his role in saving his comrades in arms. According to him, "The bottom line of the whole thing is simply that those 44 [soldiers] did get out of there and are

not a statistic on that wall in DC. The rest of it is rather immaterial, frankly."

Pardon me here if I disagree for once with Lieutenant Colonel Kettles. It was due to his bravery that those 44 soldiers returned alive and back to their families. On the battlefield, valor is hardly immaterial; it is essential. Charles Kettles proved that on his four volunteer rescue flights that fateful day.

May he rest in peace. May both of these great warriors rest in peace.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

TRIBUTE TO MAURA KEEFE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I come to the floor this afternoon with mixed emotions—mixed emotions because I feel a tremendous sense of gratitude but also sadness because at the end of this month, tomorrow, after more than a decade of working together, my chief of staff, Maura Keefe, will leave to start a new adventure.

Maura is here on the floor today with my new chief of staff, Chad Kreikemeier, and most of our staff here in DC are in the Gallery watching. Everyone is here because we think so much of Maura, and we are so sad that she is leaving but wish her Godspeed in everything she does. She has been an incredible asset as we worked together to improve the lives of Granite Staters.

I must thank her for her service and share some of the memories from the past 10 years. In New Hampshire, where we are the home of the first primary State, public service and political engagement are part of our culture. It is a culture that is epitomized by Maura and her family.

Maura helped me get elected in 2008. Actually, she helped me before that—in 2002, when I didn't win the election. Despite our loss, she came back and she worked with me in 2008, and then when we won, she set up the office. She had already accumulated several careers by that time in political campaigns and nonprofits and in the private sector. At each and every step along the way, Maura made new friendships, and she blazed a trail of accomplishments. Her time with us has certainly been no different.

I remember right after that election, she and a small group of people were working to set up the office. She showed me the files of people who were interested in working on the staff. I was down here for orientation, and she and the woman who would become the deputy chief of staff spent the whole weekend—while I was running around doing fun things, they were working into the night to go through those résumés to hire the best possible people to open the office.

Maura's father, who served as chief of staff to New Hampshire Senator Tom McIntyre, whose seat I now hold, would be very proud of everything she has done and all of her accomplishments.

I will never be able to thank her enough for building our wonderful

team, for hiring a staff of dedicated public servants who work hard for the people of New Hampshire.

Those of us who have had the pleasure to work with Maura know her sense of humor. She does great birthday cards that are very funny. Every month when we do birthdays in the office, she does farewell cards that are sort of testimonials but more roasts—or equally roast and testimonial. Her sense of humanity is also what makes her special. I have certainly benefited from both of these over the last 10 years.

Maura is going to be missed, not just in our offices here in Washington and in New Hampshire but throughout the Senate because for the last several years, she has played an important leadership role among the Democratic chiefs of staff and among the women chiefs of staff. She has made a positive difference for all of our offices, and she has made important and constructive inroads with Senate leadership on both sides of the aisle. Her presence will be missed by so many people in this institution.

Of course she is going to be missed for forging important consensus on the golf course as well. Our office does a golf outing every summer, and Maura is always the one who comes out on top in those golf outings. She has two holes in one, and she displays the plaques for those holes in one on the wall that is between our two offices. They are a reminder that from the Capitol to the tee box and everywhere in between, Maura is a fierce competitor.

Over the last 10 years, there have been real historic moments. I hope those moments will be the cornerstone of Maura's memories from the Senate—the passage of healthcare reform that was decades in the making, ushering in the first bipartisan energy efficiency legislation in a generation, working to put a woman on the twenty-dollar bill, increasing funding and resources to combat the opioid crisis, expanding critical investments for the Office on Violence Against Women, and so many other critical infrastructure projects, changes in New Hampshire that have meant jobs and that have improved the lives of so many of our citizens.

Perhaps the most succinct description of Maura can be credited to Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, for whom Maura worked as chief of staff in the 1990s. Congresswoman DELAURO once told a reporter aptly that Maura is "someone who doesn't mince words." I can attest to that. When I do things that she thinks are not quite what I ought to be doing, she doesn't mince words; she lets me have it.

I am going to greatly miss her daily doses of wisdom and wit. Her supporting counsel has always been invaluable to me. I can't thank her enough for her dedicated service.

Thank you, Maura. We are all going to miss you but me, most of all.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as we are considering the leadership of the Environmental Protection Agency, I think we should pause a moment to recognize this administration's record on the environment—or should I say the missed opportunities—and what this administration has done in moving America in the wrong direction on environmental protection. This administration's record in dealing with the greatest challenge we have—global climate change—is deplorable.

I had the opportunity to lead a delegation of 10 Members of the Senate to the Paris climate talks in which U.S. leadership demonstrated our ability to get universal consensus that climate change is real, is happening, that it is primarily caused by the activities we do here on Earth, and that we can make a difference in the trajectory of climate change and the impact it will have on our lives. If we follow what science tells us, we can change the course for the better for future generations.

I saw in Paris the importance of U.S. leadership. We had been trying for a long time to get a global agreement to deal with this challenge. It wasn't until America's leadership in Paris that we were able to get a global consensus. In fact, every country in the world signed on to the Paris Agreement and recognized that every nation has the responsibility to respond because what happens in the environment knows no state boundaries—we are all in this together.

Then there was the election of Donald Trump as President of the United States. One of his first actions was to withdraw America from the Paris climate agreement. America became the only Nation in the world not to be part of the global effort to deal with climate change.

Our leadership was now going to be lost, but the Trump administration didn't stop there. They have withdrawn the powerplant rules even though it was in 2007 that the Supreme Court, in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, determined that carbon dioxide is a dangerous air pollutant and is required to be regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency under the clean air rules. Yet the administration is moving in the other direction as it relates to clean air.

They did the same thing with water. The Supreme Court issued certain decisions in regard to regulated waters. It required Congress to act. Congress didn't act. The administration under President Obama issued regulations that were similar to what we had before the Supreme Court decision, and now the Trump administration has withdrawn those regulations as they relate to clean water.

The list goes on. The Trump administration is now backing down on CAFE standards. That is energy efficiencies

in our automobiles. Maryland is one of 12 States under section 177 that follow California's tougher standards. That is now being jeopardized by the Trump administration.

As we are considering the leadership of the Environmental Protection Agency, we have to recognize that the Trump administration has moved us in the wrong direction. We take pride that with every administration, Congress adds to the protections we have for clean air and clean water and dealing with our environment. Yet we find with this President, the opposite is true. That puts special responsibility on us in Congress. We have to fill that vacuum. Yet the Republican leadership in Congress has made no effort to bring forward legislation to deal with climate change. They have not acknowledged that climate change is real. They have not acknowledged that our activities here are the primary cause of climate change. They have not acknowledged that science tells us that if we do the right thing, we can affect for the better the impact of climate change in our communities. All that has been denied by this administration.

What we should do is bring forward comprehensive legislation to reduce greenhouse gases. We should put a true cost on carbon. Let the market forces help solve the problems we have here. We should provide for the continued efficiency of the transportation sector. We should restore America's leadership. That is what this Congress should be considering. Yet under Republican leadership, we have had no opportunity to consider comprehensive legislation in this area.

If we acted, it would be good for our environment. There is no question about that. Why should we all be concerned about that? Let me give some examples from my State of Maryland. Over the last 50 years, Maryland has experienced a 70-percent increase in rainfall. Tell the people of Ellicott City, who have experienced two 1,000-year floods in the last 20-month period. These are floods that they have never seen before in their lifetime. A large amount of rain that fell in a very short period of time caused tremendous damage to the people of Ellicott City. Tell the 13 million people who are in danger of being displaced by the end of this century because of rising sea levels. Tell the people in the Western United States whose homes were taken by wildfires. We need to act. It would be good for our environment.

I am proud to be one of the Senators who represent the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. There are 18 million people who live in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. We see a rise in the sea level. This is a vulnerable body of water.

The warming of the Chesapeake Bay is causing the loss of seagrasses that are important for the aquatic life. The salinity of the bay is being diminished because of more freshwater, and that is affecting the ecology of the bay. Algae growths are greater and longer because

of the warm waters. All of that affects the Chesapeake Bay. If we respond to climate change, we have a much better chance of improving the quality of the Chesapeake Bay, which is critically important for the way of life for the people who live in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

It is also, by the way, an important economic issue. If we do what is right and respond to climate change, we will also be helping our economy. The Chesapeake Bay alone adds \$1 trillion to our economy. A clean bay helps our economy. Green energy creates jobs—many more jobs than do traditional fossil fuels.

It also is good for our national security. If we use more of the renewables and fewer fossil, we as a nation will be stronger from the point of view of not being dependent on other countries that don't agree with our way of life for supplying energy needs not only to us but to our allies around the world—to the democratic countries around the world. It makes sense.

As we are considering the future leadership of the Environmental Protection Agency, let us recommit ourselves to recognizing that we have responsibilities to advance these environmental issues and implore upon the Republican leadership to bring forward comprehensive legislation that, in fact, will make a significant difference on the trajectory of climate change here in the United States and will restore America's global leadership on this critically important issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I start by associating myself with the remarks of my friend, the senior Senator from the State of Maryland, Mr. CARDIN, both with respect to the vital importance of moving forward on climate change legislation here in the Senate and with respect to my opposition to the nomination of Mr. Wheeler. I think we need somebody at the head of the EPA who is going to make the issue of climate change and other vital environmental issues a priority.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. President, I come to the floor with respect to another critical issue facing this Senate right now. I would just start by noting the fact that earlier this week, in this very Chamber, the senior Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. DEB FISCHER, gave the annual reading of George Washington's Farewell Address, reminding all of us of the advice that our first President gave our country upon his resignation. He encouraged us to review the words of his farewell address frequently as the "disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel." Those were the words of George Washington in his farewell address as he gave us all some warnings and admonitions.

Maryland is particularly proud of the fact that President Washington re-

signed his military commission in Annapolis, in our Old Senate Chamber. Every year, in the Maryland Senate, where I once served, we honor President Washington for Presidents Day. One year, I had the honor of giving the commemorative address on that occasion, and I appreciate the fact that the U.S. Senate recognizes the extraordinary farewell address delivered by our first President. His words of warning have been prescient throughout history, from his caution against internal divisions, including geographic divisions between the North and the South, to the necessity of avoiding foreign entanglements that would imperil our own unity.

At this particular moment in time, as we reflect on President Washington's Farewell Address, we have to do it in the context of the current President's extraordinary, unnecessary, and, I believe, totally unlawful declaration of emergency powers for the sole purpose of diverting taxpayer money, which has been previously appropriated by this Congress, to a different purpose, especially to build a wall along our southern border. In that context, we really need to reflect on the words of our first President and remember that our Constitution entrusts us, through article I, as a coequal branch of government, to do our duty under the Constitution.

We know the history. We know that after winning our independence from England, President Washington, along with many of our other Founders, was concerned with the possibility of authoritarianism and of the critical need to build checks and balances into our political system. Here is the key warning in the farewell address on this score: "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."

President Washington argued that this encroachment of one branch of government on the constitutional powers of another is a natural impulse and one that we must guard against as a self-governing people because of the "love of power and proneness to abuse it," and that is why checks and balances are necessary to prevent it.

He went on to write:

The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositaries 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.

Now let's review what just happened here in our political system in the last couple of weeks. Just a few weeks ago, President Trump, after failing to achieve his desired outcome through the legislative process, through congressional action, decided that he would bypass the Congress by declaring

a national emergency in order to redirect funding to build the wall. This is a textbook example of the kind of power grab by an executive branch that George Washington warned us about in his farewell address.

President Trump is claiming he has this authority pursuant to the National Emergencies Act of 1976, but a review of the legislative history of the National Emergencies Act demonstrates that it was passed not to expand Presidential power but to curb it. Three years earlier, Congress's Special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency was created to end outdated emergency declarations and, according to the committee's report at the time, "recommend ways in which the United States can meet future emergency situations with speed and effectiveness but without relinquishment of congressional oversight and control." That was what the special committee's report concluded, and that formed the basis of the legislation that followed.

The National Emergencies Act gives the President very, very narrow and conditioned-based authority to declare an emergency and specify the steps necessary to confront it, and it gives Congress the authority, as we saw in the House just yesterday, to pass legislation to disapprove of and to terminate the emergency. Of course, it will also be subject to court review. I would suggest that it is not our job to pass laws which we know to be unconstitutional and simply leave it to the courts to reach the obvious conclusions. We have a responsibility here in this Chamber, not only under the Constitution but under the very statute the President proposes to use now for his declaration, to apply our authority and responsibility as a coequal branch of government.

Now let's review the context of this decision. The President's interest in spending billions of dollars of taxpayer money for a wall along the southern border was not a secret to Congress. Of course, during the campaign—as a matter of his campaign pledges and as he continues to insist—he did say that at the end of the day, Mexico will pay for it. Yet, for the purposes of today, that is not the main point. The point is that the President had told this Congress that it was his intention to try to spend billions of dollars to build a wall.

His original budget request to the Congress for the fiscal year that we are in was \$1.6 billion. That was the budget request we got from the Senate Appropriations Committee. Then, last fall and last winter, in December, the President began demanding much higher amounts for the wall he wants to build. In fact, in his meeting with then-Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI and Democratic Leader SCHUMER on December 11, here is what the President said: If we don't get what we want, one way or the other, through you or the military or anybody else, yes, I will shut down the government.

That was in December. What the President was saying was that if he doesn't get his appropriations—the budget request—through the Congress, he was going to shut down the government. He did, and he did that for 35 days. That was his constitutional prerogative not to sign a bill. It, obviously, caused great harm and dislocation around the country. It caused a lot of economic pain and a lot of personal financial pain to millions of Americans, but the President clearly had the authority to do that.

As the Congress, we were aware of the President's position. He made it very clear. Then, after the government shutdown was over, of course, we passed that short-term piece of legislation to keep the government open for 3 weeks as we worked on a longer term budget plan.

Around February 14 of this year, we passed a compromise budget bill—a compromise appropriations bill. That bill provided \$1.375 billion for 55 miles of pedestrian and levee fencing along the U.S. border with Mexico. That bill passed the U.S. Senate by a vote of 83 to 16, and it passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 300 to 128. As with most bills that pass the Congress with those kinds of bipartisan majorities that are compromises, it didn't have everything everyone wanted. It had some things in it that one side or the other may not have wanted, but it was a compromise, and it was made necessary to pass a bill to keep the government open. It was to make sure our constituents received the services of their government and to make sure that we met the needs of the country.

On the very morning that we considered that bill here in the Senate Chamber, President Trump was considering his next steps. In fact, Majority Leader MCCONNELL announced on the floor here that President Trump had told him that he was going to sign the bill but that he was also going to sign an emergency declaration to override the appropriations in the bill and divert those moneys to some other purpose that Congress had not authorized. In fact, while Senator MCCONNELL was making that statement at the time we were considering and voting on the bill, it was not a surprise that the President had been considering it. He had been talking for weeks and threatening the Congress that if he didn't get the appropriations levels he wanted for the wall—if he didn't get the budget allocation he wanted—he was just going to declare a national emergency and do it himself. That was his threat.

Clearly, he hoped that threat would force Congress to provide the extra moneys the President requested for the wall, but the Congress didn't do the President's bidding. We passed that compromise bill by those large bipartisan majorities. So what did the President do? Of course, he declared this emergency.

I should note that even as he announced his emergency declaration in

the Rose Garden, the President said: "I could do the wall over a longer period of time. I didn't need to do this . . . but I'd rather do it much faster." That is what the President said at the time. He said he didn't need to do this, not in that way, but he wanted to do this quickly.

Here is the thing. He didn't need to do it. He made it very clear that he decided to do it simply because he didn't get what he wanted from the U.S. Congress; that because we didn't do what the President—what the Executive asked, heck, he was going to declare some emergency to divert money from areas the Congress had approved on a bipartisan basis to some other area the President wanted to spend money on, in this case the wall.

Now, look, the Constitution is pretty clear. The President had the power to veto that bill. He, of course, had refused to go along with an earlier proposal, and that led to a 3-week government shutdown. The President could have done that again. That would have been in his power to do it, and of course the choice for the Congress at that point would have been whether to override the President's veto.

If you look at the size of the votes that appropriations bill passed by—83 to 16 in the U.S. Senate and 300 to 128 in the House—he could have overridden the veto. That would have been the constitutional way for the President of the United States to try to get his way, but that is not what he did. He decided to do something different, declare an emergency in an unconstitutional way.

The question we have to ask ourselves—and I am talking Republicans and Democrats, and I am talking about the Senate as an institution, the House of Representatives as an institution—is should this President or any other President—or any other President—be able to override an appropriations law to the tune of billions of dollars right after Congress has already expressed its position in a bill that we passed by overwhelming majorities or by any majority, a bill that passed.

In declaring this alleged emergency, the President has announced his intention to divert \$2.6 billion from the Department of Defense counterdrug activities. This is an ironic diversion, considering the President's stated concern, which I share, about drug trafficking.

The Defense Department has indicated that those moneys the President is proposing to take from drug trafficking are being spent for that purpose and that only about \$85 million remains in that account. So that means they are going to have to take other moneys from other Defense Department priorities, and the President has indicated they want to take \$3.6 billion from military construction accounts—moneys that this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has already appropriated for those military construction projects.

Article I is crystal clear. Article I of the Constitution vests this Congress—

this Senate and the House of Representatives—with the power of the purse.

I have my handy, small Constitution right here, and I would just again like to remind our colleagues that it says: “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law, and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.”

So article I of the Constitution is very clear. It is the U.S. Congress that has the power of the purse and has the authority to direct taxpayer moneys to the priorities that we decide.

I ask my colleagues whether they are prepared to relinquish that authority. In fact, I would make the point it is really not ours to relinquish because the Constitution is quite clear on this point.

We all know that yesterday the House of Representatives took a vote to say the President is not able to use the particular law he used the other day to declare an emergency. This Senate is going to be voting on that soon, and we have to ask ourselves as Senators what kind of precedent we want to set.

Do we want to adhere to our duties under the Constitution? Should any President be able to say, “Oh, my goodness. I don’t like what the Congress just did. I don’t like the fact that the Congress, through their duly elected Representatives and duly elected Senators, didn’t give me all the money I wanted for the wall, and so I am going to throw the Constitution out, and I am going to take money that the Congress proposed for one purpose, and I am just going to move it somewhere else?”

I want my colleagues to think really carefully about the precedent we would be establishing if we allow that action to go unchecked.

We were just having a conversation here on the floor, my colleague from the State of Maryland and others, about the dangers and risks of climate change. That is a real crisis. I believe we should be investing a lot more funds in building out our clean energy infrastructure.

We may well have a future President, maybe sooner rather than later, who wants to do that. I just ask my colleagues whether they think that President should be able to declare a national emergency and spend money for that purpose even if this Congress has not appropriated the moneys for that purpose.

The idea that the President of the United States—any President of the United States—is going to declare an emergency simply because he or she did not get the appropriations request they asked for is unprecedented. We have looked. There have been times when people have declared emergencies, but we were not able to find any time where we have a situation like this, where a President, who tried

to get a certain appropriation for a certain purpose out of Congress, didn’t get it and immediately turned around and asked for a national emergency to do what the Congress had just denied them the authority to do.

Just this morning President Trump’s adviser, Kellyanne Conway, was on “FOX & Friends” and said the President had to act because Congress didn’t. In other words, the President had to act because Congress, on a bipartisan basis, through its duly elected representatives, did not give the President of the United States, the Executive, what the Executive asked for. That is why the President gets to declare an emergency.

That would create a lawless situation and a gross violation of our Constitution.

She went on to say: “It’s failed to do its job since he has been President on securing the border, and it has failed to do its job for decades, and so he waited for them.” In other words, because the President is dissatisfied with what the Congress did, he gets to tear up the Constitution and go his own way.

Back in 1983, when President Reagan was frustrated with the Congress and its control of the budget, he received a letter urging him to declare a state of emergency over our Nation’s finances. In response, President Reagan acknowledged his frustration but wrote: “I don’t believe the President has the power to declare an emergency short of war.”

I urge my colleagues—I urge my colleagues—to be cautious in allowing any President to use or claim an emergency in order to undercut the clear division of power set forth in the Constitution between the legislative and the executive branch.

Yesterday Leader MCCONNELL was asked about the legality of President Trump’s move, and the majority leader acknowledged he “hadn’t reached a total conclusion” on whether President Trump is acting legally.

Think about that. You have the majority leader acknowledging that the President may be acting unlawfully. I think it is pretty clear on its face for those who closely examine the Constitution and the power of the purse.

I think we are all called upon not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans and as Senators in this Chamber to do our job and reject what is clearly an unconstitutional power grab. We should not passively submit to these actions. We should think about what we are going to do in light of the precedent that is being set here, and I hope we will do our jobs.

I will just close with another statement from President Washington’s Farewell Address where he cautioned against allowing any one branch of government to claim excessive power, even with the best of motivations. “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.”

In my view, the President’s actions are not for the good, but I know many of my Republican colleagues would agree with the ends the President seeks with respect to using more moneys to build a wall. I understand that is the position of our Republican colleagues, but what George Washington warned us about was—whether we like what the President is doing or don’t like what the President is doing—if the President is diverting money away from the purposes this Senate and the House of Representatives directed to some other purpose this President or any other President may want that we have not authorized, that is a gross usurpation of power, and we should not allow it to happen.

So I ask my colleagues, let’s join together to do the business of the Senate, protect the Constitution, and do our jobs.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

MR. UDALL. Mr. President, I would associate myself with the comments of Senator VAN HOLLEN, who I think hit the nail on the head when it comes to this overreach by the President.

I rise in support of the growing calls for action on climate change that are echoing in every corner of this Nation.

The science is overwhelming, the evidence is clear, and unless we take immediate action, we will lose our planet as we know it. There is nowhere that has more at stake than my home State of New Mexico and the Southwest, which are in the bullseye of global warming. Unless we act against greenhouse gas pollution, rising temperatures, drought, wildfires, deforestation, we will permanently harm our communities.

Because I believe in climate science and because I believe we desperately need to act, I must strongly oppose the confirmation of Andrew Wheeler to lead our Nation’s Environmental Protection Agency. Mr. Wheeler has consistently advocated for measures that would damage the environment, hurt public health, and do long-term injury to the economy, and his record on climate change and the record of his administration are simply disqualifying.

Mr. Wheeler’s nomination is among the worst in a long line of backward nominations by this President. For someone who wants to lead the EPA—the key word being “protection”—Mr. Wheeler’s priorities are upside down.

Let’s be blunt with the American people. Mr. Wheeler was not nominated to protect the environment and human health. He was nominated to unravel and undo the environmental protections that are now in place. He was nominated to stop any new environmental and public health protections from being initiated. He was nominated to go easy on those who violate existing environmental laws. He was nominated to stand in the way of climate science and climate action.

So far, by these measures, he has been a great success for a President who mocks climate science and who denies that this existential threat even exists, but there is no success for the American people. Mr. Wheeler's nomination puts the American public at great risk, and we should firmly oppose making his appointment permanent.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wheeler's upside-down priorities don't end at climate change. In addition to actively resisting climate action, Mr. Wheeler is not looking out for the health and well-being of my constituents or protecting my State's most precious resource, our water. There, like in so many other parts of the country, fire foam used by the Air Force has contaminated groundwater with toxic chemicals known as PFAS. These chemicals are linked to various cancers, heart disease, and other ailments. Groundwater in and around Cannon Air Force Base, near Clovis, NM, is contaminated with PFAS.

This is dairy country. One dairy is actually being put out of business because the PFAS is in groundwater and it has contaminated this farmer's water wells. The family that owns the dairy and its hard-working employees have drank water from these wells for years.

Will a Wheeler EPA put us in this situation? Will they help us out of it? During his confirmation hearings, he refused to commit to setting a drinking water standard. Then, later, we find out that he had already decided not to set standards for these toxic chemicals in December of last year. Under bipartisan pressure, he has since backed down and says EPA will set a standard—someday. I wouldn't hold my breath. In the meantime, millions of Americans and the dairies in eastern New Mexico are being hurt.

Furthermore, Mr. Wheeler is a committed soldier in the long-running assault on science that President Trump has championed. One of my constituents, Celerah Hewes, wrote this week asking me to vote against this nomination. She writes:

I grew up in Corrales, surrounded by farmland and fresh air. I remember when the Rio Grande was full of water and the ditches in the bosque flowed freely.

Climate change and drought have forever changed the land I call home and my daughter will not remember a time without severe fire danger and ozone pollution.

Celerah wants me to vote no because Mr. Wheeler "is putting our children's health and future at risk."

According to the 2018 "Fourth National Climate Assessment," we have 12 years to turn this around for Celerah, her daughter, and the world. Soon, the impacts will become irreversible.

The previous EPA set rules to reduce carbon pollution from powerplants by 32 percent by 2030. Mr. Wheeler's new plan will allow increased emissions from fossil fuel plants instead.

He is no better when it comes to even modest standards for methane waste

from oil and gas operations. Methane is an extremely potent greenhouse gas, 84 times more potent than carbon dioxide over the initial 20-year period. EPA's prior methane rules would have cut back methane pollution in a cost-effective way. Those regulations are out the window under Mr. Wheeler and replaced with loose rules, adding hundreds of thousands of tons of methane, volatile organic compounds, and toxins into the air.

Climate change is the most significant threat facing our planet. The EPA is the Agency that should be leading the charge on tackling this threat, but Mr. Wheeler is a former lobbyist for the coal industry. Like so many other nominations, the President has again put the fox in charge of the henhouse. This time, the consequences could be disastrous and irreversible for our country and our planet. If we vote to confirm him, there will be little, if any, hope for climate action for the next 2 years.

Mr. Wheeler leaves no doubt whose side he is on. His record shows that, under his watch, big polluters will get off scot-free.

Companies that pollute often try to reduce their cost of business and increase their profits by dumping that pollution and its costs on society as a whole. When environmental officials fail to enforce the rules against polluters, bad actors get an unfair advantage. Lax environmental enforcement is bad for American businesses that do the right thing and bad for taxpayers, who get stuck with the cleanup bills.

Sadly, Mr. Wheeler's EPA is the poster child for lax enforcement. In 2018, EPA collected the smallest amount of civil penalties against polluters since 1994. Inspections are half of what they were in 2010. EPA charged the fewest criminal defendants since 1991. It saw a steep drop in civil judicial enforcement cases as well. The bad news goes on and on.

So the best that can be said of Mr. Wheeler's record is that he is not Scott Pruitt. As far as we know, he has not abused taxpayer funds or staff for a variety of luxurious perks or rented his house from a lobbyist. But the bar is so low that it is in the Capitol basement.

Indeed, I believe that the EPA under this President has reached an all-time low. There is hardly even any pretense that their goal is to safeguard the environment and public health. They are actively damaging our environment and actively resisting action on climate change at a time when young people and so many others across New Mexico and this country are crying out for action. We simply must do better.

So I will vote no, and I will urge my colleagues to consider the consequences of this nomination for their children, grandchildren, and beyond, and to vote no as well.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on the Wheeler nomination be considered expired at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 28, with the time between 12 and 12:30 equally divided in the usual form; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. I further ask that the cloture motion on Executive Calendar No. 12 be withdrawn and that following disposition of the Wheeler nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Ryder nomination, with the time until 1:45 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that PN389, the nomination of Ian Paul Steff to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, sent to the Senate by the President, be referred jointly to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote 29, the confirmation of Eric D. Miller to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted yes on rollcall vote 30, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Michael J. Desmond to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury.●

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for February 2019. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, BBA18. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

This is my second scorekeeping report this year. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 10, 2019. The information included in this report is current through February 25, 2019.

Since my last filing, two bills with significant budgetary effects cleared Congress, the Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019, P.L. 116-3, and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019, P.L. 116-6.

Budget Committee Republican staff prepared Tables 1-3.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution and the fiscal year 2019 enforceable levels filing. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. Over the current 10-year enforceable window, authorizing committees have increased outlays by a combined \$3.4 billion. For this reporting period, as in my last report, 8 of the 16 authorizing committees are not in compliance with their allocations. Two of these committees, Finance and Judiciary, further exacerbated their violations during this work period with the passage of Medicaid Extenders and the authorizing division, Division H, of the final 2019 appropriations bill, respectively. For the Finance Committee, P.L. 116-3 was estimated to increase budget authority over each enforceable period for its allocation, with the largest violation, \$120 million, occurring in 2019. For the Judiciary Committee, Division H of P.L. 116-6, which included various immigration extenders, was estimated to increase budget authority and outlays by \$30 million over the next 10 years.

Table 2 provides the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order re-

lated to the spending caps found in sections 312 and 314 of the CBA. Appropriations for fiscal year 2019, displayed in this table, show that the Appropriations Committee is compliant with spending limits for fiscal year 2019. Those limits for regular discretionary spending are \$647 billion for accounts in the defense category and \$597 billion for accounts in the nondefense category of spending.

The fiscal year 2018 budget resolution contained points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPs. Table 3, which tracks the CHIMP limit of \$15 billion for fiscal year 2019, shows the Appropriations Committee has enacted \$15 billion worth of full-year CHIMPs for fiscal year 2019. The fiscal year 2019 CHIMPs were contained in the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies division of P.L. 115-245 and the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies division of P.L. 116-6. This information is used for determining the point of order under section 4102, overall limit, of H. Con. Res. 71, 115th Congress.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by Congress.

For fiscal year 2019, CBO estimates that current-law levels are \$2.8 billion above and \$3.3 billion below enforceable levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively. Revenues are \$426 million below the level assumed in the budget resolution. Further, Social Security revenues are at the levels assumed for fiscal year 2019, while Social Security outlays are \$4 million above assumed levels for the budget year.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. The PAYGO scorecard shows deficit increases in fiscal year 2019 of \$1,930 million—\$427 million revenue loss, \$1,503 million outlay increase—over the fiscal year 2018-2023 period of \$3,337 million—\$894 million revenue loss, \$2,443 million outlay increase—and over the fiscal year 2018-2028 period of \$425 million—\$634 million revenue loss, \$209 million outlay decrease. During this work period, one bill, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019, included a statutory exemption for the budgetary effects of its Division H from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71, 115th Congress.

This submission also includes a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the enforcement filing on May 7, 2018. Since my last report, no new budgetary points of order were raised.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

	2019	2019–2023	2019–2028
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry			
Budget Authority	2,414	4,249	3,123
Outlays	1,406	1,820	70
Armed Services			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs			
Budget Authority	21	285	382
Outlays	20	285	382
Commerce, Science, and Transportation			
Budget Authority	41	77	91
Outlays	11	74	90
Energy and Natural Resources			
Budget Authority	0	0	–14
Outlays	0	0	–14
Environment and Public Works			
Budget Authority	2	4	–333
Outlays	2	4	–333
Finance			
Budget Authority	326	1,058	–917
Outlays	127	1,051	–919
Foreign Relations			
Budget Authority	0	–5	–20
Outlays	0	–5	–20
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	2	4
Outlays	43	48	49
Judiciary			
Budget Authority	13	209	497
Outlays	13	205	492
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions			
Budget Authority	0	–36	–84
Outlays	0	–36	–84
Rules and Administration			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs			
Budget Authority	4	3	–729
Outlays	4,402	4,400	3,668
Indian Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total			
Budget Authority	2,821	5,846	2,000
Outlays	6,024	7,846	3,381

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	647,000	597,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	23,042
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,499	58,619
Defense	606,340	129
Energy and Water Development	22,440	22,200
Financial Services and General Government	31	23,392
Homeland Security	2,058	47,353
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	35,552
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	178,076
Legislative Branch	0	4,836
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	10,332	86,804
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	46,218
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	70,779
Current Level Total	647,000	597,000
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	0	0

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]	
	2019
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2019	15,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	7,285
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	7,715
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	15,000
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	0

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2019.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through February 25, 2019. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018, pursuant to section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123).

Since our last letter dated January 10, 2019, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority, outlays, and revenues in fiscal year 2019:

• Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-3); and

• Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6).

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF FEBRUARY 25, 2019

[In billions of dollars]			
	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,639.3	3,642.1	2.8
Outlays	3,550.0	3,546.7	–3.3
Revenues	2,590.5	2,590.1	–0.4
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^a	908.8	908.8	0.0
Social Security Revenues	899.2	899.2	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF FEBRUARY 25, 2019

[in millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^{a,b}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,271,360	2,169,258	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	573,950	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–890,012	–890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,381,348	1,853,193	2,590,496
Enacted Legislation			
Authorizing Legislation			
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (P.L. 115–174) ^c	18	17	–5
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–182)	0	4,400	0
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (P.L. 115–197)	3	3	0
Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–239)	0	0	–304
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–251)	4	2	0
FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–254) ^d	1	44	0
America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–270)	2	2	0
SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (P.L. 115–271) ^b	206	119	0
Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–282)	40	10	0
Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–334)	2,414	1,406	7
First Step Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–391)	11	11	0
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–3)	120	8	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–6, Division H) ^e	2	2	1
Subtotal, Authorizing Legislation	2,821	6,024	–301
Appropriation Legislation ^a			
Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 115–244)	191,127	145,276	0
Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 115–245) ^{a,b}	1,691,001	1,223,855	0
Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief, 2018 (P.L. 115–254, Division I) ^d	1,680	25	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Divisions A–G, P.L. 116–6) ^{a,b}	480,297	311,586	–125
Subtotal, Appropriation Legislation	2,364,105	1,680,742	–125
Total, Enacted Legislation	2,366,926	1,686,766	–426
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Total Current Level ^b	–106,128	6,756	0
Total Senate Resolution ^f	3,642,146	3,546,715	2,590,070
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	2,822	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	3,294	426
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2019–2028			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	33,272,518
Senate Resolution ^f	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,213
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	695

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

a. Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) or the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include \$771 million in budget authority, and \$767 million in estimated outlays.

b. For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include those items.

c. Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.

d. Division I of P.L. 115–254 provided \$1.68 billion in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and designated those amounts as being for emergency requirements pursuant to section 251 of the Deficit Control Act. In general, the budgetary effects of authorizing legislation are recorded as direct spending or revenue. However, consistent with the language in Division I, and at the direction of the Senate Committee on the Budget, those budgetary effects are classified as discretionary spending.

e. The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–5), as amended, extended several immigration programs through February 15, 2019, that would otherwise have expired at the end of fiscal year 2018. The estimated budgetary effects of those previously enacted extensions are charged to the Committee on Appropriations, and are included in the budgetary effects of P.L. 116–6 shown in the “Appropriation Legislation” portion of this report. In addition, division H of P.L. 116–6 further extended those same programs through the end of fiscal year 2019. Consistent with the language in title III of division H of P.L. 116–6, and at the direction of the Senate Committee on the Budget, the budgetary effects of extending those immigration programs for the remainder of the fiscal year are charged to the relevant authorizing committees, and are shown in the “Authorizing Legislation” portion of this report.

f. Section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 required—in the absence of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2019—that the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2019; those aggregate levels were first published in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 also allows the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget to revise the budgetary aggregates:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on May 7, 2018:	3,547,094	3,508,052	2,590,496
Revisions:			
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	921	0	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	69,464	38,556	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	0	–214	0

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	1,680	25	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	20,165	3,590	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496

TABLE 3—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF FEBRUARY 25, 2019
[in millions of dollars]

	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation ^{b,c}				
A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Incident Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act” (S.J. Res. 57, P.L. 115–172)	*	*	*	*
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (S. 2155, P.L. 115–174) ^d	*	22	329	490
Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right To Try Act of 2017 (S. 204, P.L. 115–176)	*	*	*	*
An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes (H.R. 3562, P.L. 115–177)	*	*	*	*
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (S. 2372, P.L. 115–182) ^e	*	*	*	*
Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act (S. 1869, P.L. 115–192)	*	*	*	*
All Circuit Review Act (H.R. 2229, P.L. 115–195)	*	*	*	*
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770, P.L. 115–197)	0	3	3	0
Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018 (H.R. 4743, P.L. 115–189)	*	*	*	*
Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018 (H.R. 5956, P.L. 115–218)	0	0	0	–3
KIWI Act (S. 2245, P.L. 115–226)	*	*	*	*
To make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes (H.R. 4528, P.L. 115–228)	*	*	*	*
John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (H.R. 5515, P.L. 115–232)	0	304	690	–118
Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Act of 2018 (H.R. 4318, P.L. 115–239)	0	*	–1	–3
Tribal Social Security Fairness Act of 2018 (H.R. 6124, P.L. 115–243)	0	0	18	18
Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.R. 6157, Division B, P.L. 115–245, Division B)	*	2	*	–3
Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017 (S. 97, P.L. 115–248)	*	*	*	*
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2018 (S. 3479, P.L. 115–251)	*	2	*	–3
Elkhorn Ranch and White River National Forest Conveyance Act of 2017 (H.R. 698, P.L. 115–252)	*	44	42	26 ^f
FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (H.R. 302, P.L. 115–254) ^g	*	*	–11	–52
Patent Right To Know Drug Act of 2018 (S. 2554, P.L. 115–263)	0	0	13	–24
Orrin G. Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act (H.R. 1551, P.L. 115–264)	0	0	2	4
Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 3509, P.L. 115–268)	0	2	16	–230
America’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (S. 3021, P.L. 115–270)	0	*	*	*
SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (H.R. 6, P.L. 115–271) ^h	0	*	*	*
Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017 (S. 1595, P.L. 115–272)	0	*	*	*
To authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes (H.R. 1037, P.L. 115–275)	0	*	*	*
Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act (H.R. 2615, P.L. 115–279)	0	10	34	0
Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (S. 140, P.L. 115–282)	0	*	*	*
Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes (H.J. Res. 143, P.L. 115–298)	0	0	0	–4
Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018 (S. 2152, P.L. 115–299)	0	0	0	–7
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota (S. 440, P.L. 115–306)	0	*	*	*
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes (S. 2074, P.L. 115–308)	0	11	120	317
Anwar Sadat Centennial Celebration Act (H.R. 754, P.L. 115–310)	0	*	*	*
Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act (H.R. 1861, P.L. 115–322)	0	0	5	5
Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018 (H.R. 1872, P.L. 115–330)	0	*	*	*
Protecting Access to the Courts for Taxpayers Act (H.R. 3996, P.L. 115–332)	0	*	*	*
Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (H.R. 2, P.L. 115–334)	0	1,399	1,785	0
Nicaragua Human Rights and Anticorruption Act of 2018 (H.R. 1918, P.L. 115–335)	0	*	*	*
21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act (H.R. 5759, P.L. 115–336)	0	*	*	*
Chinese-American World War II Veteran Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 1050, P.L. 115–337)	0	*	*	*
USS Indianapolis Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2101, P.L. 115–338)	0	0	0	0
Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act (H.R. 1235, P.L. 115–343)	0	*	*	*
Sanctioning the Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act (H.R. 3342, P.L. 115–348)	0	*	*	*
Correcting Miscalculations in Veterans’ Pensions Act (H.R. 4431, P.L. 115–352)	0	*	*	*
Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (H.R. 5787, P.L. 115–358)	0	*	*	*
Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act (H.R. 5923, P.L. 115–361)	0	*	*	*
To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend through 2023 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission (H.R. 7120, P.L. 115–386)	0	8	63	*
First Step Act of 2018 (S. 756, P.L. 115–391)	0	125	229	9
Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (S. 1311, P.L. 115–392)	0	1,930	3,337	425
CENOTE Act of 2018 (S. 2511, P.L. 115–394)	0	1,503	2,443	–209
NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act of 2018 (S. 7, P.L. 115–403)	0	–427	–894	–634
Veterans Benefits and Transition Act of 2018 (S. 2248, P.L. 115–407)	0	*	*	*
Stephen Michael Gleason Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2652, P.L. 115–415)	0	*	*	*
Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act of 2018 (S. 2679, P.L. 115–416)	0	*	*	*
Forever GI Bill Housing Payment Fulfillment Act of 2018 (S. 3777, P.L. 115–422)	0	*	*	*
National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 2200, P.L. 115–423)	0	*	*	*
To authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (H.R. 4689, P.L. 115–429)	0	*	*	*
75th Anniversary of World War II Commemoration Act (S. 3661, P.L. 115–433)	0	*	*	*
Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act (H.R. 251, P.L. 116–2)	0	*	*	*
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (H.R. 259, P.L. 116–3)	0	8	63	*
Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 28, P.L. 116–5)	0	*	*	*
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 31, P.L. 116–6) ^h	0	125	229	9
Impact on Deficit	*	1,930	3,337	425
Total Change in Outlays	*	1,503	2,443	–209
Total Change in Revenues	*	–427	–894	–634

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: P.L. = Public Law. * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.
^a On May 7, 2018, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate’s Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.
^b The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
^c Excludes off-budget amounts.
^d Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve’s surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.
^e The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 512 of the Act.
^f Division 1 of P.L. 115–254 contains the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2018, which provided \$1.680 billion in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251 of the Deficit Control Act. At the direction of the Committees on the Budget, and consistent with the language in section 1701, those amounts are shown as discretionary spending.
^g The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 8231 of the Act.
^h The budgetary effects of title I of division H are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to title III of division H of the Act.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF POINTS OF ORDER RAISED SINCE THE FY 2019 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive	Result
127	June 18, 2018	H.R. 5515—John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.	4106(a)-Senate-Pay-As-You-Go Violation ¹	Sen. McConnell (R-KY) ²	81–14, waived
192	August 23, 2018	S. Amdt. #3695 to H.R. 6157, the Defense, Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Act ³ .	314(a) CHIMP with Net-Costs	Sen Leahy (D-VT)	68–24, waived

¹ Senator Sanders raised a section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress) point of order against the bill because the bill would increase the on-budget deficit.
² By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to a roll call vote to waive the point of order.
³ This surgical point of order would have struck lines 7–8 of page 270 in Division B (Title III) of the substitute amendment, which was related to the Pell Grant program. This provision was a Change in Mandatory Program (CHIMP) estimated to increase spending by \$390 million over 10 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING PARKER GREENE

• Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a great loss suffered in my home State of Georgia and more specifically in the city of Valdosta. For more than 40 years, Parker Greene spent every day of his life thinking about how he could make a difference in his community by supporting the various missions at Moody Air Force Base, which is located just on the outskirts of Valdosta in South Georgia. Parker passed away on December 18, 2018, at the age of 86. He leaves behind a lasting legacy that will be remembered throughout my home State for decades to come.

Parker moved to Valdosta in 1970 and immediately became involved with the Valdosta-Lowndes County Chamber of Commerce. He was named to the military affairs committee and quickly developed a fondness for the airmen stationed at Moody, as well as the multiple missions housed at the base. Through the years, his level of advocacy for Moody continued to increase. The local community recognized this and created the Moody Support Committee and named Parker as its chairman. As chairman, Parker took countless trips every year to Washington, DC, to impress upon congressional and Department of Defense leaders the importance of maintaining a robust Air Force presence at Moody due to its strategic location in the southeastern U.S. and unmatched community support.

In the 1990s, when the Base Realignment and Closure Commission recommended closing Moody and moving its missions to other bases, Parker and the Moody Support Committee tirelessly walked the halls of Congress and the Pentagon to advocate for the removal of Moody from the BRAC list and to increase its mission presence. Parker's efforts proved successful. His determination allowed Moody to continue its mission, while sparing the Valdosta community from certain economic loss due to the closure of the base.

Following his successful efforts in the 1990s, Parker continued his work on Moody's behalf to relocate new missions to the base in order to diversify Moody's mission presence and further prove its strategic importance. In fact, in 2007, the newly constructed consolidated base support center at Moody was named after Parker because of his efforts on behalf of the base and its airmen. Former Air Force Chief of Staff Michael Moseley was at the renaming and presented Parker with the first-ever Chief of Staff Exceptional Service Award.

Several years later, Parker was awarded the highest honor the Air Force can bestow on a civilian: the Air Force Distinguished Public Service Award. The award stated that Parker "distinguished himself by service as an

Air Force advocate, with both an intimate knowledge of Air Force operations and a deep grasp of social and economic issues vital to Moody Air Force Base. He has expertly advised the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff, and senior Air Force leaders on these matters while serving as an Air Force civic leader to the community surrounding the installation."

Of course, Parker could not have accomplished his many feats without the loyal and steadfast support from his lovely wife Dr. Lucy Greene. Together, they made an unstoppable duo, and Lucy proved to be as tireless an advocate for Moody as Parker. I know I speak for the entire State when I offer my heartfelt condolences to Lucy and their two children, Buck and Sharon.

While we mourn Parker and the loss to Moody AFB and south Georgia, I know that everyone can look at Parker's record of achievement and see an unparalleled legacy of selflessness, kindness, and service to others. I have no doubt that Moody will continue to be a leading example of Air Force excellence because of Parker's impact on the base and his advocacy for the region in Atlanta and Washington.●

REMEMBERING NORMAN W. DESCHAMPE

• Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge the contributions and legacy of Norman W. Deschampe, the longtime chairman of the Grand Portage Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa, who recently passed away on February 9, 2019.

Norman Deschampe was born on February 26, 1953, and lived with a commitment to improving the lives of the people of the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa. For more than 40 years, Norman Deschampe served the people of the Grand Portage Band, first as a Tribal council member and later as secretary-treasurer and, for 27 years, as chairman. He also served for 6 years as vice president and 22 years as president of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

Norman Deschampe's legacy includes a longstanding commitment to supporting the health, education, and economic development of the Grand Portage Band. He promoted environmental stewardship and fostered relationships with local, State, and Federal governments to encourage conservation on the reservation and beyond. Norman Deschampe encouraged the appreciation and preservation of the traditions and customs of the Grand Portage Band and is remembered by many for his kindness and generosity.

Norman Deschampe made a lasting contribution to the Grand Portage Band and the State of Minnesota, and I am proud to recognize his legacy as Minnesota celebrated Norman Deschampe Day on Tuesday, February 26, 2019.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:01 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 47. An act to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 47.

At 11:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, 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 Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, Chair.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), 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 Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following joint resolution was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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-395. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Abamectin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9987-32-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-396. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Waxes and Waxy Substances, Rice Bran, Oxidized; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9987-83-

OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-397. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Subpart Nomenclature Change" (Docket No. APHIS-2018-0070) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-398. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exceptional Family Member Program (EFMP)" (RIN0790-AK38) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-399. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-400. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-401. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Updates to Personnel References" ((RIN1901-AB49)(10 CFR Part 903)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-402. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Approval of Revised Statutes; Error Correction" (FRL No. 9989-09-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-403. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology" (FRL No. 9989-61-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-404. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9989-99-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-405. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Georgia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9989-93-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-406. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibiting Persons with Certain Criminal Convictions from Serving as Representative Payees" (RIN0960-AH78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-407. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-408. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-409. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalties - 2019 Adjustment" (Docket No. EP 716) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-410. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Containment Installation, South of New Orleans, LA, Gulf of Mexico" ((RIN1625-AA00)(Docket No. USCG-2019-0030)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-411. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation" (RIN0605-AA50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 19, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*William I. Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024.

*William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.

*Mary Anne Carter, of Tennessee, to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts for a term of four years.

*Janet Dhillon, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2022.

*John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

*Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024.

*Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

*Arthur R. Traynor III, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring August 30, 2022.

*Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 573. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study of 10b5-1 trading plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of amounts related to employment discrimination and harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 575. A bill to deter, prevent, reduce, and respond to harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KING, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 576. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of herbicide exposure for certain veterans who served in Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 577. A bill to require the establishment of a process for excluding articles imported from the People's Republic of China from certain duties imposed under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BENNET, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. JONES, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 578. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 579. A bill to provide grants to eligible local educational agencies to help public schools reduce class size in the early elementary grades, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. ENZI, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 580. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 581. A bill to provide regulatory relief to alternative fuel producers and consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 582. A bill to ensure that the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network works with Tribal law enforcement agencies, protects against all forms of terrorism, and focuses on virtual currencies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 583. A bill to provide for digital accountability and transparency; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 584. A bill to extend the commitment of the United States to the International Space Station, to develop advanced space suits, and to enable human space settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 585. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the same level of Federal matching assistance for every State that chooses to expand Medicaid coverage to newly eligible individuals, regardless of when such expansion takes place; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 586. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 587. A bill to promote economic partnership and cooperation between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 588. A bill to require State agencies to use Federal tax return information to verify income eligibility for Medicaid, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 589. A bill to provide for a period of continuing appropriations in the event of a lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, and establish procedures and consequences in the event of a failure to complete regular appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. ERNST, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BURR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JONES, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 590. A bill to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 591. A bill to assist States in improving guardianship oversight and data collection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. Res. 80. A resolution establishing the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. Res. 81. A resolution calling for accountability and justice for the assassination of Boris Nemtsov; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. SASSE):

S. Res. 82. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mrs. HARRIS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 83. A resolution designating February 2019 as "American Heart Month" and February 1, 2019, as "National Wear Red Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 84. A resolution celebrating Black History Month; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 25

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 25, a bill to reserve any amounts forfeited to the United States Government as a result of the criminal prosecution of Joaquin Archivaldo Guzman Loera (commonly known as "El Chapo"), or of other felony convictions involving the transportation of controlled substances into the United States, for security measures along the Southern border, including the completion of a border wall.

S. 94

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 94, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Michigan

(Mr. PETERS) 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. 169

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons.

S. 172

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) 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. 178

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor 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. 266

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) 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. 267

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to provide for a general capital increase for the North American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

S. 326

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 326, a bill to prohibit the use of amounts appropriated for military construction or the Army Corps of Engineers for the construction of barriers, land acquisition, or any other associated activities on the southern border without specific statutory authorization from Congress.

S. 383

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) 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. 403

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to encourage the research and use of innovative materials and associated techniques in the construction and preservation of the domestic transportation and water infrastructure system, and for other purposes.

S. 409

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal in commemoration of Aretha Franklin.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) 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. 503

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the opportunity for responsible health savings to all American families.

S. 505

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 518

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

SINEMA) 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. 546

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill clarifying that it is United States policy to recognize Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 572

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 572, a bill to provide for additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 14, a resolution affirming that the Government of Cuba's foreign medical missions constitute human trafficking.

S. RES. 74

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor 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 Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 591. A bill to assist States in improving guardianship oversight and data collection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, I rise today to introduce, with the Committee's Ranking Member, Senator BOB CASEY, the "Guardianship Accountability Act of 2019," a bill that would assist States in improving guardianship oversight and data collection.

Protecting older Americans from financial fraud and exploitation has long been one of my top priorities as Chairman of the Aging Committee. According to the National Center for State

Courts, an estimated 1.3 million adults are under the care of guardians—family members or professionals—who control approximately \$50 billion of their assets. Guardianship is a legal relationship created by a court that is designed to protect those with diminished or lost capacity. We found, however, that in some cases, the system lacks basic protections against inappropriate use of guardianship and abuse by those in power, leaving the most vulnerable Americans at risk of exploitation.

In November 2018, the Aging Committee released a bipartisan report following a year-long investigation into State guardianship programs. Titled, “Ensuring Trust: Strengthening State Efforts to Overhaul the Guardianship Process and Protect Older Americans,” the report included a number of recommendations intended to help stem the wave of guardianship abuse, encourage reforms to State systems and restore trust in guardianship arrangements.

Throughout the course of our investigation, we heard harrowing tales from families around the Nation who have struggled with abusive guardians, unscrupulous individuals exploiting vulnerable Americans for their personal profit. Yet we also spoke with families who had heartening stories to share—of dedicated and faithful guardians stepping up to protect the assets of seniors with dementia and other conditions affecting their capacity. A good guardian can provide years of support for a protected individual, ensuring a full life directed, wherever possible, by the person's own choices and preferences. Once a guardianship is imposed, however, the individual's rights are removed, and oversight to protect the individual from abuse, neglect and exploitation becomes critical.

Our Committee gathered information, analysis and recommendations from States, courts, and organizations representing older Americans and those with disabilities around the country. We found signs of progress in a number of jurisdictions. For example, in 2017, Maine was the first state to enact the Uniform Law Commission's Uniform Guardianship, Conservatorship, and Other Protective Arrangements Act. Among the reforms made to Maine's guardianship system, this legislation highlighted the importance of exploring all options to limit or preclude the need for guardianship when appropriate, including the use of supported decision making. Maine's law also mandates the regular review of reports filed by guardians to determine, among other things, whether the guardianship should continue and whether the guardian has complied with his or her duties.

Yet stories in the news continue to call our attention to this important issue. Appalling stories, such as that of a guardian from Nevada who allegedly used the guardianship process to financially exploit more than 150 individuals, and that of another guardian

from North Carolina who, along with an attorney, an advocate, and a professor, took advantage of two men under guardianship and allegedly stole hundreds of thousands of dollars, remind us of the vulnerabilities created by these relationships and the need for diligent oversight.

In the course of the Committee's investigation, we received more than 100 comments identifying gaps in the system and, most important, offering solutions. The Committee found a pattern of barriers to proper oversight and a need for greater use of alternatives to guardianship. We found persistent and widespread challenges that require a nationwide focus in order to ensure the guardianship system works on behalf of the individuals it is intended to protect. The Committee's report outlines policy recommendations at local, state and federal levels that would improve outcomes for Americans subject to guardianship.

The Guardianship Accountability Act, which we are introducing today, addresses many of the report's recommendations. The bill would direct the Elder Justice Coordinating Council to establish a National Online Resource Center on Guardianship to collect and publish information relevant to guardianship for use by guardians, individuals subject to guardianship, as well as courts, states, local governments, and community organizations. The resource center would also publish model legislation and best practices developed pursuant to the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act, compile and publish training materials for guardians, share research related to guardianship, and maintain a database on state laws regarding guardianship and the use of less restrictive alternatives. In addition, our legislation would also expand the availability of federal demonstration grants established by the Elder Justice Act, so funds can be used for developing state guardianship databases, for training for court visitors, and for sharing information on guardian background checks.

Combating financial abuse and exploitation of seniors requires law enforcement and social service agencies at all levels of government to work together, and the bipartisan Guardianship Accountability Act promotes this kind of collaboration. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 80—ESTABLISHING THE JOHN S. MCCAIN III HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. SINEMA) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 80

Resolved,

SECTION 1. JOHN S. MCCAIN III HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION.

(a) COMMISSION ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Senate the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission (in this section referred to as the “Commission”).

(2) DUTIES.—The Commission shall—

(A) serve as a forum for bipartisan discussion of international human rights issues and promotion of internationally recognized human rights as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(B) raise awareness of international human rights violations through regular briefings and hearings; and

(C) collaborate with the executive branch, human rights entities, and nongovernmental organizations to promote human rights initiatives within the Senate.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—Any Senator may become a member of the Commission by submitting a written statement to that effect to the Commission.

(4) CO-CHAIRPERSONS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Two members of the Commission shall be appointed to serve as co-chairpersons of the Commission, as follows:

(i) One co-chairperson shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the majority leader of the Senate.

(ii) One co-chairperson shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the minority leader of the Senate.

(B) TERM.—The term of a member as a co-chairperson of the Commission shall end on the last day of the Congress during which the member is appointed as a co-chairperson, unless the member ceases being a member of the Senate, leaves the Commission, resigns from the position of co-chairperson, or is removed.

(C) PUBLICATION.—Appointments under this paragraph shall be printed in the Congressional Record.

(D) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the position of co-chairperson of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) COMMISSION STAFF.—

(1) COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission is authorized, from funds made available under subsection (c), to—

(i) employ such staff in the manner and at a rate not to exceed that allowed for employees of a committee of the Senate under section 105(e)(3) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968 (2 U.S.C. 4575(e)(3)); and

(ii) incur such expenses as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out its duties and functions.

(B) EXPENSES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Payments made under this subsection for receptions, meals, and food-related expenses shall be authorized only for actual expenses incurred by the Commission in the course of conducting its official duties and functions.

(ii) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Amounts received as reimbursement for expenses described in clause (i) shall not be reported as income, and the expenses so reimbursed shall not be allowed as a deduction under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) DESIGNATION OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each co-chairperson of the Commission may designate 1 professional staff member.

(B) COMPENSATION OF SENATE EMPLOYEES.—In the case of the compensation of any professional staff member designated under subparagraph (A) who is an employee of a Member of the Senate or of a committee of the

Senate and who has been designated to perform services for the Commission, the professional staff member shall continue to be paid by the Member or committee, as the case may be, but the account from which the professional staff member is paid shall be reimbursed for the services of the professional staff member (including agency contributions when appropriate) out of funds made available under subsection (c).

(C) DUTIES.—Each professional staff member designated under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) serve all members of the Commission; and

(ii) carry out such other functions as the co-chairperson designating the professional staff member may specify.

(C) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The expenses of the Commission shall be paid from the Contingent Fund of the Senate, out of the account of Miscellaneous Items, upon vouchers approved jointly by the co-chairpersons (except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees who are paid at an annual rate of pay).

(2) AMOUNTS AVAILABLE.—For any fiscal year, not more than \$200,000 shall be expended for employees and expenses.

SENATE RESOLUTION 81—CALLING FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AND JUSTICE FOR THE ASSASSINATION OF BORIS NEMTSOV

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. GARDNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 81

Whereas Boris Nemtsov was a Russian statesman, who over twenty-five years of public service served as Member of Parliament, Governor of the Nizhny Novgorod Region, and First Deputy Prime Minister of Russia;

Whereas Boris Nemtsov throughout his life showed an unwavering commitment to the ideals of democracy, freedom, and the rule of law, and to upholding the rights and dignity of Russian citizens;

Whereas Boris Nemtsov was a powerful voice in opposition to the authoritarianism and corruption of Vladimir Putin's government, publicizing its abuses, leading street protests against election fraud and the war on Ukraine, and successfully advocating for international sanctions on human rights violators;

Whereas Boris Nemtsov was co-chairman of a leading opposition party, won election to the Yaroslavl Regional Duma in 2013, and was planning to run for the Russian Parliament in 2016 and challenge Vladimir Putin for the presidency in 2018;

Whereas, on the evening of February 27, 2015, Boris Nemtsov was shot in the back and killed as he walked across Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge near the Kremlin in Moscow;

Whereas, on March 7 and 8, 2015, Russian authorities arrested five individuals, all of them natives of the Chechen Republic, on suspicion of carrying out the assassination, while a sixth suspect allegedly blew himself up during the attempted arrest;

Whereas the defendants were tried at the Moscow District Military Court, which on June 29, 2017, found them guilty of carrying out the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, and on July 13, 2017, sentenced them to different prison terms;

Whereas, at the time of the assassination, the now-convicted gunman, Zaur Dadayev, was serving as a Lieutenant in the Internal Troops of the Interior Ministry of the Russian Federation and as Deputy Battalion Commander in the “Sever” (“North”) Regiment stationed in the Chechen Republic, under the command of the Internal Troops Commander, General Viktor Zolotov, and the Kremlin-backed head of the Chechen Republic, Ramzan Kadyrov;

Whereas Ramzan Kadyrov has called Lieutenant Zaur Dadayev a “true patriot” and has publicly referred to Boris Nemtsov as an “enemy of Russia”;

Whereas by Decree No. 115 issued on March 8, 2015, President Vladimir Putin awarded Ramzan Kadyrov the Order of Honor;

Whereas, according to reports published in RBC newspaper on January 20, 2016, General Alexander Bastrykin, chairman of the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation, has on two occasions prevented investigators from indicting Major Ruslan Geremeyev, Battalion Commander in the “Sever” (“North”) Regiment of the Internal Troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation stationed in the Chechen Republic and a close associate of Ramzan Kadyrov, as an organizer in the assassination;

Whereas, according to reports published in Novaya Gazeta newspaper on December 9, 2016, operatives of the Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation in the Chechen Republic have failed to serve Major Ruslan Geremeyev with a summons for questioning as a witness, reporting to their superiors that on the sole occasion they attempted to do so, “nobody opened the door”;

Whereas, despite requests from the legal team representing Boris Nemtsov's family, the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation and the Moscow District Military Court have refused to question high-ranking persons of interest, including Ramzan Kadyrov and General Viktor Zolotov;

Whereas the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation has, to this day, not issued any indictments against the organizers or masterminds of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, with the exception of Major Ruslan Geremeyev's driver, Ruslan Mukhudinov, who is named alongside “other unidentified persons”;

Whereas the Investigative Committee of the Russian Federation and the Moscow District Military Court have refused to classify the assassination of Boris Nemtsov under Article 277 of the Criminal Code as “encroachment on the life of a statesman or a public figure,” choosing instead Article 105 that deals with common domestic murders;

Whereas, throughout the proceedings at the Moscow District Military Court, the judge repeatedly disallowed questions relating to political motives behind the assassination;

Whereas the Federal Protective Service of the Russian Federation has refused to release video footage from the security cameras on Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge from the night of the assassination, claiming in a letter to State Duma Member Dmitry Gudkov on November 6, 2015, that the bridge next to the Kremlin is “not a protected object”;

Whereas, on May 18, 2017, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe appointed Lithuanian Member of Parliament Emanuelis Zingeris as its special rapporteur on the need to shed light on the background of the murder of Boris Nemtsov, with a mandate to review and report on the case and on the progress of the official Russian investigation;

Whereas, on May 24, 2018, the Russian Foreign Ministry informed Emanuelis Zingeris

that he is forbidden from entering the Russian Federation;

Whereas, at its twenty-seventh annual session held on July 7–11, 2018, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) adopted a resolution urging Russian authorities to “undertake a new, full and thorough investigation into the February 2015 assassination of Boris Nemtsov”;

Whereas, on July 8, 2018, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe held a public event to discuss the need for OSCE oversight of the official Russian investigation into the assassination of Boris Nemtsov;

Whereas the United States and the Russian Federation are full members of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe;

Whereas the OSCE Moscow Document has established that “issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law . . . are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned”;

Whereas, on February 27, 2018, Washington, D.C. designated the street in front of the Embassy of the Russian Federation as “Boris Nemtsov Plaza” to honor Mr. Nemtsov; and

Whereas, on February 22, 2019, the President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, George Tsereteli, appointed Swedish Member of Parliament and Vice President of the Assembly Margareta Cederfelt as the rapporteur on the investigation of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, with a mandate to review and report on the case and on the progress of the official Russian investigation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the life of Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov and his work to advance democracy and human rights in Russia;

(2) condemns Vladimir Putin and his regime for targeting political opponents and working to cover up the assassination of Boris Nemtsov;

(3) urges the United States Government, in all its interactions with the Government of the Russian Federation, to raise the case of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov and underscore the necessity of bringing the organizers and masterminds to justice;

(4) supports the efforts by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly to initiate oversight of the official Russian investigation into the assassination of Boris Nemtsov;

(5) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to allow an impartial international investigation of the assassination of Boris Nemtsov and to cooperate with the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in their ongoing inquiries over this case;

(6) calls on the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to use their authority under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act (title IV of Public Law 112-208) and the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328) to designate individuals whom they determine to have been involved in the assassination of Boris Nemtsov as perpetrators, organizers, or masterminds, on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury, freezing their assets and making them ineligible to receive United States visas; and

(7) calls on the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to prepare and submit to Congress a report detailing the circumstances of the February 27, 2015, assassination of Boris Nemtsov, including the list of individuals whom they determine to have been involved in the assassination as perpetrators, organizers, or masterminds, and identifying what measures, if any, have been taken by the Government of the Russian Federation to investigate this crime and bring its perpetrators, organizers, and masterminds to justice, and evaluating the effectiveness of such measures.

SENATE RESOLUTION 82—RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. SASSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 82

Whereas Congress passed the Act of July 2, 1862 (commonly known as the “First Morrill Act”) (12 Stat. 503, chapter 130; 7 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), which was signed by President Abraham Lincoln, to allow for the establishment of land-grant colleges offering programs teaching agriculture and the mechanic arts;

Whereas, on February 15, 1869, the Nebraska Legislature unanimously passed, and Nebraska Governor David Butler signed, legislation enabling the founding of the University of Nebraska;

Whereas the charter for the University of Nebraska established the University of Nebraska as a university “to afford to the inhabitants of this State, the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of literature, science and the arts”;

Whereas, in 1871, the University of Nebraska opened its doors to men and women across the State of Nebraska, with an inaugural class of 130 students;

Whereas the University of Nebraska, now known as the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, has grown to an enrollment of 25,820 students;

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln is a national leader in academic excellence, research, and service;

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln has a \$2,000,000,000 annual economic impact on the State of Nebraska, including more than \$300,000,000 in research expenditures each year;

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln provides more than 5,000 new graduates to the workforce each year;

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln serves the needs of students, families, and communities across the State of Nebraska through activities in all 93 counties of the State;

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln is a leader in research in areas such as—

- (1) water and agriculture;
- (2) national security and defense;
- (3) early childhood education; and
- (4) rural development;

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln is instrumental in celebrating the culture of the State of Nebraska and the region in which the State is located through—

- (1) the University of Nebraska State Museum;
- (2) the Center for Great Plains Studies;
- (3) the International Quilt Study Center and Museum; and
- (4) the Larsen Tractor Test and Power Museum;

Whereas the Husker athletic programs at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln create

pride and joy on the fields of play and in the hearts of alumni and fans;

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln has 333 Academic All-Americans, more than any other institution of higher education in the United States;

Whereas more than 200,000 alumni residing in all 50 States, and in countries around the world, are proud to call the University of Nebraska-Lincoln their alma mater; and

Whereas “There Is No Place Like Nebraska”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 150th anniversary of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln;

(2) commends the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for its status as a leading public university that excels in academics, athletics, and quality of life for students; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Chancellor of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln; and

(B) the President of the University of Nebraska system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 2019 AS “AMERICAN HEART MONTH” AND FEBRUARY 1, 2019, AS “NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY”

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 83

Whereas cardiovascular disease affects men, women, and children of every age and race in the United States;

Whereas, between 2003 and 2013, the death rate from cardiovascular disease fell nearly 30 percent, but cardiovascular disease continues to be the leading cause of death in the United States, taking the lives of approximately 800,000 individuals in the United States each year and accounting for 1 in 3 deaths across the United States;

Whereas congenital heart defects are—

- (1) the most common birth defect in the United States; and
- (2) the leading killer of infants with birth defects;

Whereas, each year, an estimated 790,000 individuals in the United States have a heart attack, of whom an estimated 115,000 die;

Whereas, in 2015, cardiovascular disease accounted for \$555,000,000,000 in health care expenditures and lost productivity;

Whereas, by 2035, cardiovascular disease will account for \$1,093,900,000,000 in health care expenditures and lost productivity annually;

Whereas individuals in the United States have made great progress in reducing the death rate for cardiovascular disease, but this progress has been more modest with respect to the death rate for cardiovascular disease in women and minorities;

Whereas many people do not recognize that cardiovascular disease is the leading killer of women in the United States, taking the lives of over 400,000 women in 2016;

Whereas nearly ⅔ of women who unexpectedly die of cardiovascular disease have no previous symptoms of the disease;

Whereas over ⅓ of all African-American adults have some form of cardiovascular dis-

ease, including 57.1 percent of African-American women and 60.1 percent of African-American men;

Whereas more Alaska Natives and American Indians die from cardiovascular disease than individuals from other ethnic groups;

Whereas it is estimated that 36 percent of Alaska Natives and American Indians who die of cardiovascular disease die before reaching 65 years of age;

Whereas Native Hawaiians have higher mortality rates and die at a younger average age from cardiovascular disease than other ethnic groups in Hawaii;

Whereas many minority women, including African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and Native American women and women from indigenous populations, have a greater prevalence of risk factors or are at a higher risk of death from heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases, but are less likely to know of the risk;

Whereas, between 1965 and 2018, treatment of cardiovascular disease for women was largely based on medical research on men;

Whereas, due to the differences in cardiovascular disease between men and women, more research and data on the effects of cardiovascular disease treatments for women is vital;

Whereas extensive clinical and statistical studies have identified major and contributing factors that increase the risk of cardiovascular disease, including—

- (1) high blood pressure;
- (2) high blood cholesterol;
- (3) smoking tobacco products;
- (4) exposure to tobacco smoke;
- (5) physical inactivity;
- (6) obesity; and
- (7) diabetes mellitus;

Whereas an individual can greatly reduce the risk of cardiovascular disease through lifestyle modification coupled with medical treatment when necessary;

Whereas greater awareness and early detection of risk factors for cardiovascular disease can improve and save the lives of thousands of individuals in the United States each year;

Whereas, under section 101(1) of title 36, United States Code, the President is requested to issue an annual proclamation designating February as American Heart Month;

Whereas the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health, the American Heart Association, and many other organizations celebrate National Wear Red Day during February by “going red” to increase awareness about cardiovascular disease as the leading killer of women; and

Whereas, every year since 1964, the President has issued a proclamation designating the month of February as American Heart Month; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates—

(A) February 2019 as “American Heart Month”; and

(B) February 1, 2019, as “National Wear Red Day”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day;

(3) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to fighting cardiovascular disease—

(A) by promoting awareness about the causes, risks, and prevention of cardiovascular disease;

(B) by supporting research on cardiovascular disease; and

(C) by expanding access to medical treatment;

(4) commends the efforts of States, territories, and possessions of the United States,

localities, nonprofit organizations, businesses and other entities, and the people of the United States who support American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day; and

(5) encourages every individual in the United States to learn about his or her risk for cardiovascular disease.

SENATE RESOLUTION 84—CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. JONES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 84

Whereas, in 1776, people envisioned the United States as a new nation dedicated to the proposition stated in the Declaration of Independence that “all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness . . .”;

Whereas Africans were first brought involuntarily to the shores of the United States as early as the 17th century;

Whereas African Americans suffered enslavement and subsequently faced the injustices of lynch mobs, segregation, and denial of the basic and fundamental rights of citizenship;

Whereas, in 2019, the vestiges of those injustices and inequalities remain evident in the society of the United States;

Whereas, in the face of injustices, people of good will and of all races in the United States have distinguished themselves with a commitment to the noble ideals on which the United States was founded and have fought courageously for the rights and freedom of African Americans and others;

Whereas African Americans, such as Lieutenant Colonel Allen Allensworth, Maya Angelou, Louis Armstrong, Arthur Ashe, Jr., James Baldwin, James Beckwourth, Clara Brown, Blanche Bruce, Ralph Bunche, Shirley Chisholm, Holt Collier, Miles Davis, Larry Doby, Frederick Douglass, W. E. B. Du Bois, Ralph Ellison, Medgar Evers, Aretha Franklin, Alex Haley, Dorothy Height, Jon Hendricks, Olivia Hooker, Lena Horne, Charles Hamilton Houston, Mahalia Jackson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, B.B. King, Martin Luther King, Jr., Coretta Scott King, Thurgood Marshall, Constance Baker Motley, Rosa Parks, Walter Payton, Bill Pickett, Homer Plessy, Bass Reeves, Hiram Revels, Amelia Platts Boynton Robinson, Jackie Robinson, Aaron Shirley, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, Booker T. Washington, the Greensboro Four, the Tuskegee Airmen,

Prince Rogers Nelson, Recy Taylor, Fred Shuttlesworth, Duke Ellington, Langston Hughes, Muhammad Ali, Ella Fitzgerald, Mamie Till, and Edith Savage-Jennings, along with many others, worked against racism to achieve success and to make significant contributions to the economic, educational, political, artistic, athletic, literary, scientific, and technological advancement of the United States;

Whereas the contributions of African Americans from all walks of life throughout the history of the United States reflect the greatness of the United States;

Whereas many African Americans lived, toiled, and died in obscurity, never achieving the recognition those individuals deserved, and yet paved the way for future generations to succeed;

Whereas African Americans continue to serve the United States at the highest levels of business, government, and the military;

Whereas the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass inspired the creation of Negro History Week, the precursor to Black History Month;

Whereas Negro History Week represented the culmination of the efforts of Dr. Carter G. Woodson, the “Father of Black History”, to enhance knowledge of Black history through *The Journal of Negro History*, published by the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, which was founded by Dr. Carter G. Woodson and Jesse E. Moorland;

Whereas Black History Month, celebrated during the month of February, originated in 1926 when Dr. Carter G. Woodson set aside a special period in February to recognize the heritage and achievements of Black people in the United States;

Whereas Dr. Carter G. Woodson stated, “We have a wonderful history behind us . . . If you are unable to demonstrate to the world that you have this record, the world will say to you, ‘You are not worthy to enjoy the blessings of democracy or anything else.’”;

Whereas, since its founding, the United States has imperfectly progressed toward noble goals;

Whereas the history of the United States is the story of people regularly affirming high ideals, striving to reach those ideals but often failing, and then struggling to come to terms with the disappointment of that failure, before committing to try again;

Whereas, on November 4, 2008, the people of the United States elected Barack Obama, an African-American man, as President of the United States; and

Whereas, on February 22, 2012, people across the United States celebrated the groundbreaking of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, which opened to the public on September 24, 2016, on the National Mall in Washington, District of Columbia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that all people of the United States are the recipients of the wealth of history provided by Black culture;

(2) recognizes the importance of Black History Month as an opportunity to reflect on the complex history of the United States, while remaining hopeful and confident about the path ahead;

(3) acknowledges the significance of Black History Month as an important opportunity to commemorate the tremendous contributions of African Americans to the history of the United States;

(4) encourages the celebration of Black History Month to provide a continuing opportunity for all people in the United States to learn from the past and understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(5) agrees that, while the United States began as a divided country, the United States must—

(A) honor the contribution of all pioneers in the United States who have helped to ensure the legacy of the great United States; and

(B) move forward with purpose, united tirelessly as a nation “indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during its session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Policy principles for a Federal data privacy framework in the United States.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 12:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, and John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, both to be an Assistant Secretary, Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary for Veterans’ Employment and Training, all of the Department of Labor, Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, Janet Dhillon, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mary Anne Carter, of Tennessee, to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, William I. Althen, of Virginia, and Arthur R. Traynor III, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety

and Health Review Commission, and other pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Perspective on protecting the electric grid from an electromagnetic pulse or geomagnetic disturbance."

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The 45th anniversary of the Native American Programs Act and the establishment of the Administration for Native Americans."

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Made in China 2025 and the Future of America Industry."

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Cyrus Johnson, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

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

AMERICAN HEART MONTH AND
NATIONAL WEAR RED DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 83, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 83) designating February 2019 as "American Heart Month" and February 1, 2019, as "National Wear Red Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 83) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY
MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 84, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 84) celebrating Black History Month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 28, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, February 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Wheeler nomination under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the

previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about climate change and about our climate crisis.

Climate change is an existential threat to our country and the planet. We know this because the world's leading scientists—the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—just made that very warning last year. The U.N. report told us that we have very limited time until we are past the point of no return and the most catastrophic impacts of climate change are irreversible. Our own Federal scientists across 13 Agencies also just warned in the "National Climate Assessment" that the impacts of climate change are not in the future but are happening in our communities right now. Here is what all 13 Federal Agencies said: "Our efforts do not yet approach the scale necessary to avoid substantial damages to the economy, environment, and human health."

These are Earth-shattering reports about the state of our Earth. These are the doomsday reports about what will happen if we do not take bold action.

The consequences of climate change will be dire: a tenfold increase in ice-free summers in the Arctic, a 99-percent loss of coral reefs, and a doubling of species lost around the world. In worst-case scenarios in the Northeast, by the end of the century, both the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Logan Airport will be underwater. Climate emissions are not slowing down. In 2018, greenhouse gas emissions in the United States increased by 2.8 percent. We have a denier-in-chief in the White House.

This week, Republicans in the Senate are poised to confirm a coal lobbyist to be the head of the Environmental Protection Agency. It is unbelievable that we will confirm a coal lobbyist to be the head of our environment in our country. Andrew Wheeler's denial of the climate crisis should in and of itself be disqualifying. His record as a coal lobbyist should be disqualifying.

We should come together and reject Andrew Wheeler as the next head of the Environmental Protection Agency. The impact of climate change on ordinary families, on their health, on our Nation, on our security, and on our future is too urgent.

The United Nations tells us that climate change is an existential threat to the planet. It is the national security, health, economic, and moral issue of our time—of all time. We have a responsibility to act. We must be bold. We must be ambitious. That is why I have introduced the Green New Deal resolution, because it lays out a serious, bold, and aspirational set of goals

that meet the scale of the threat. It is a set of principles and not prescriptions. It challenges this country to find solutions to this problem.

The Green New Deal is a climate plan about net-zero emissions. The Republican climate plan is in zero existence. They don't have a climate plan. Republicans don't like the Green New Deal because they don't like a functional government. Republicans don't like the Green New Deal because they don't like climate science. Republicans don't like the Green New Deal because their allies—the oil companies, the coal companies, and the corporate polluters—don't like wind power or solar power or all-electric vehicles or the millions of blue-collar jobs they can create. We can save all of creation by engaging in massive blue-collar job creation in this country. Republicans don't like the Green New Deal because clean energy is a direct threat to the interests and the bottom line of Big Oil and King Coal.

The Green New Deal isn't just a socialist manifesto. It isn't pie in the sky. It isn't a takeover. It isn't any of the misinformation and distortions that Republicans and their fossil fuel allies have called it. The Green New Deal isn't, as the Republican leader called it this morning, "the far left's Santa Claus wish list dressed up to look like serious policy." If it were, then Republicans in this Chamber wouldn't care enough about it to spend their entire morning remarks on it, and the majority leader wouldn't be threatening to bring it to the floor without any hearings, without any expert testimony, without any amendments, and without any science.

Let's have the debate. Let's have the hearings. Let's bring in all the experts. Let's let the U.N. testify. Let's let our own scientists and every one of the Federal Agencies in America testify. Let's bring in all of the corporate executives right now on wind, solar, all-electric vehicles, and storage batteries in our society. Bring them in. Let's hear the stories. Instead, what we have is just an attempt to short-circuit the debate.

They may not believe climate change is an existential threat to human kind, but they are smart enough to know that the bold goals of the Green New Deal are an existential threat to the Koch brothers and all of their other corporate polluter and fossil fuel allies.

Let me just read some of what is in the Green New Deal that Republicans are opposed to: securing for all people of the United States for generations to come clean air and water, climate and community resiliency, healthy food, access to nature, and a sustainable environment.

Are Republicans opposed to access to nature? That is in the resolution. Are Republicans opposed to clean air and water? That is in the resolution too. Do you know what is not in the resolution? Ending airline travel. Do you know what is not in the resolution? No more cows.

Do you know what is not in the resolution? A prohibition on nuclear energy or carbon capture and sequestration. The Green New Deal resolution is bold, and it is aspirational in its principles, but it is not prescriptive in its policies.

Let's look at some of what is actually in this resolution: to create millions of good, high-wage jobs—I guess Republicans don't believe in that; to invest in the infrastructure and industry of the United States to sustainably meet the challenge of the 21st century—I guess Republicans don't believe in that; guaranteeing universal access to clean water, supporting family farming, cleaning up existing hazardous waste and abandoned sites, ensuring economic development and sustainability on those sites—I guess Republicans don't believe in those either. Those are all part of the Green New Deal and climate solutions.

We already know that Big Oil and King Coal and other fossil fuel companies don't want to compete with clean energy because that is a direct threat to their business plan.

Clean energy makes the air we breathe cleaner, it saves consumers money, it makes us safer, and it creates jobs.

In his remarks, the Republican leader called the Green New Deal "foolish and dangerous." With all due respect to the leader and my Republican colleagues, the only foolish and dangerous thing about the Green New Deal is to ignore the \$400 billion in damage to our country over the last 2 years from supercharged storms and wildfires all over California and all over the West.

To ignore the tens of trillions of dollars in damages we will see from climate change in the United States by 2100 is something that ultimately, from my perspective, is foolish and dangerous. An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure. Ignoring what is happening, ignoring the warnings from all of the top scientists in the world and in the United States and continuing on the same pathway—that is foolish, that is dangerous, and that is going to cost us tens of trillions of dollars in damages that would have been otherwise avoided if we unleashed a technology revolution in our country that would create millions of new jobs.

It is also dangerous to send our men and women in the military overseas to protect tankers of oil coming from the Middle East to the United States. We are still bringing in oil from Saudi Arabia. We are still bringing in oil from other countries in the Middle East. What if we could dramatically increase the fuel economy in the vehicles we drive? What if we could accelerate the pace to use all-electric vehicles? Wouldn't it be great if we could say that the day arrived when we never have to see another tanker of oil from the Middle East coming into our country? Would that not make us safer? Would that not give us better control of our own foreign policy and where we

send young men and women in uniform? I think it would.

I think it would be foolish and dangerous not to take that pathway. The superstorms, the wildfires, the rising seas, and the other extreme weather events—the impacts of climate change if we do not act boldly to stop it—that isn't just dangerous; that is an existential threat. That is what the world's scientists have called it.

The Green New Deal is dangerous for the status quo of doing nothing on climate change. It is dangerous for the Koch brothers and those who are used to killing off every climate debate before it gets a chance to start. It is dangerous for those who want us to limp into a frightening future with no plan and no protections in place. It is dangerous for those who benefit from the continued devaluation of our workers, the historic oppression of vulnerable communities, and from the continued destruction of the environment. Those are the ones who would think the Green New Deal is dangerous.

We want to support working families and support a safe climate future where all communities are protected. We welcome a debate on proposals for how to get there, but the science is clear as to where we need to end up.

The Republicans may think that the Green New Deal is just a resolution, but it is a revolution. It is a revolution. Young people want a green energy revolution in our country. They know we can do this. They know that all of these new technologies can be invented; all of these new technologies can be deployed.

It is not just a resolution; it is a revolution. All across this country, when the Republicans have refused to bring their climate plan out there because theirs is a party of science denial—the President is the "Denier in Chief" on climate science—then we are going to allow this problem to worsen and worsen and worsen.

Do you know who should know best? Donald Trump, because within 30 years, according to the science, Mar-a-Lago is going to become Mar-a-Lagoon. It is right on the coast. It has already begun to happen. It is just going to continue.

The President might be able to protect his property, but we are going to lose tens of trillions of dollars for the properties of other Americans because he decided that he was going to deny the warning that the scientists have presented to us.

When I was a boy, lying on the rug, looking at President Kennedy on the television, he challenged our country to send a mission to the Moon and to return that mission safely to the United States within 10 years.

When he gave that speech at Rice University, he made very clear in the speech that we would have to invent new metal alloys that did not exist. We would have to invent new transmission systems that did not exist, that we would have to return that mission safely from the Moon through heat half the

intensity of the Sun. We would have to complete it within 10 years, and we would have to do it not because it was easy but because it was hard. We had to be bold.

Because the challenge from the Soviet Union was so great, the United States did not have an option. Failure was not an option, and we completed that mission.

Well, the same thing is true here for a Green New Deal. Failure is not an option. The consequences will be catastrophic for our planet and for the United States of America, and the solution is to unleash this green energy job-creation engine. We now have 350,000 solar and wind workers in the United States. It is up from almost nothing in 2008. It has already happened over 10 years.

We had only 1,000 megawatts of solar in our country in 2008. We now have 62,000 megawatts of solar.

We had only 25,000 megawatts of wind. We now have 98,000 megawatts of wind.

We had only 2,000 all-electric vehicles in our country in 2008. We now have a million, and between Tesla and all of the other companies, they are going to sell 500,000 just this year in our country. They have invented new metals. They have invented new battery systems. They have invented new propulsion systems in order to solve those problems, but we still have a long way to go.

It is imperative that we put the tax breaks for wind and solar, for all electric vehicles, for batteries on the books and make them permanent because this problem is going to be solved only if we can convince the smartest young people in our country that all of the incentives, all of the policies are there and that their country has their back and wants them to solve the problem in the same way that our whole country had the back of NASA in the 1960s. If we do that, we will be successful. There is no question about it in my mind.

I am a technological optimist, and I hate the pessimism of the other side. I hate this “can’t do” mentality that they have, especially given what has happened in the last 10 years in electric vehicles and wind, solar, and storage technology breakthroughs. It is just really sad to hear this.

I think, ultimately, something is rising up across this country. Young people, especially, know it is time for the revolution. They know it is time to close the door on this era where all we do is indiscriminately use the atmosphere as a sewer for all of this carbon and all of these greenhouse gases.

I am very confident that one way or another this body will start to act or it is going to become one of the top two or three election issues in 2020 because this generation knows that the planet is running a fever. There are no emergency rooms on planets, and it is going to take action in this body in order to put the policies in place, in order to preserve this planet and hand it on better than we found it.

The challenge is great. The Green New Deal sets the framework for laying out how serious the problem is and how bold the action has to be to deal with that serious problem for our planet.

If we do it right, I think future generations will look back on ours in the same way we now look back on President Kennedy and that generation, and they will know that they discharged their historic responsibility to our country and to the planet.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

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

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, in many ways, Andrew Wheeler is a perfect example of a Cabinet appointment in the Trump era—conflicted, unethical, and hostile to the mission of the Agency he was nominated to lead.

He shouldn’t have been confirmed to this position as Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, and he certainly shouldn’t be confirmed to lead the Agency on a permanent basis.

Prior to his service at EPA, Mr. Wheeler spent 8 years lobbying for many of the special interests that he is targeted or charged with regulating. For example, in his work for Murray Energy, whose president, Robert Murray, was among the largest donors to Donald Trump’s 2016 campaign, Mr. Wheeler worked to kill a rule that would have prevented coal companies from dumping mining waste into American streams and waterways.

As a lobbyist for Murray Energy, Mr. Wheeler also fought tooth and nail against President Obama’s Clean Power Plan, a forward-looking initiative that would have substantially reduced carbon emissions from power generation.

Mr. Wheeler’s client, Robert Murray, was present front and center as former EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt signed an Executive order to begin the process of dismantling the Clean Power Plan. I don’t think that was a coincidence.

After Mr. Wheeler’s confirmation as the EPA’s Deputy Administrator, he assured Bloomberg News in June 2018: “If I lobbied on something, I don’t think it’s appropriate for me to participate [in policymaking].”

Of course, he was lobbying on a lot of things for years. In fact, Mr. Wheeler participated in meetings with three former clients with interests before the EPA. Holding these meetings with former clients is a clear conflict of interest and ethical lapse. Andrew Wheeler fits right in with Donald Trump’s version of “draining the swamp,”

which is more like “come on in, the water’s fine.”

We have already had one EPA Administrator, Scott Pruitt, resign in disgrace over ethical lapses and potentially illegal behavior in office. We don’t need another.

Mr. Wheeler’s work at the EPA is also consistent with the hostility of Trump Cabinet officials to the core mission of the Department or the Agency that they are appointed to lead.

The EPA is the primary Agency charged with safeguarding the environment and protecting public health from dangerous and toxic chemicals. At its core, the EPA is tasked with making sure we have safe air to breathe and clean water to drink.

Yet, during his time as Deputy Administrator, Mr. Wheeler has championed a deregulatory agenda that fundamentally undermines the EPA’s core mission. Under Mr. Wheeler’s leadership, the EPA has proposed undermining the legal authority of the mercury and air toxics standard to reduce emissions of mercury and other toxic air emissions from coal and oil burning powerplants.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, mercury exposure can damage the nervous, digestive, and immune systems and is a serious threat to child development. The EPA’s current efforts to reverse these emission standards, in place since 2012, come after utilities across the country had already invested resources in reducing mercury emissions by 90 percent.

Under Mr. Wheeler’s leadership, the Trump administration has also proposed a dramatic weakening of fuel economy and greenhouse gas emissions standards for cars. Their proposed rule would increase air pollution from vehicles and would result in Hawaii families ending up paying thousands more dollars for gasoline to fill less efficient cars. Through his opposition to the Clean Power Plan and his efforts to repeal it at the EPA, Mr. Wheeler serves as a primary architect of the Trump administration’s assault on climate science and their refusal to act decisively against climate change. This assault can also be seen in a new proposed rule from the EPA that would exclude rigorous, peer-reviewed scientific studies under the guise of promoting scientific transparency.

At first glance, the rule sounds like something everyone should support, but like so many initiatives proposed by this administration, the rule’s true intent is much more sinister.

Insisting that policymaking rely only on studies that make all of their data public would exclude studies that rely on confidential medical information that by law cannot be made public. Limiting the factual basis on which the EPA can make decisions in this manner would have a catastrophic impact on public health.

If this rule had been in effect in 1993, the “Six Cities” study by the Harvard

School of Public Health would never have transformed the way we regulate air pollution in this country. The study showed that Americans living in cities with more air pollution have shorter lifespans than Americans living in cities with less air pollution.

Using confidential medical information, the study conclusively demonstrated that fine particulate matter that is smaller than 2.5 microns is exceptionally deadly to human beings. These findings, which have been backed up in subsequent studies, provide the basis for cost-benefit analyses done by EPA for future rules regulating air pollution. Undermining this kind of evidence-based policymaking would give industry the green light to pollute with fewer consequences.

This proposed rule is consistent with an administration-wide effort to promote ignorance in the face of the real threat climate change poses to national security, public health, and public safety.

Climate change is an issue where ignorance is not bliss. Ignorance is dangerous. The President's own top security officials agree. Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, for example, issued a new worldwide threat that concluded that "climate hazards" like extreme weather, wildfires, droughts, and acidifying oceans are, "threatening infrastructure, health and water and food security."

In 2017, then-Secretary of Defense James Mattis told the Senate Armed Services Committee that "climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating." He went on to say that "climate change is a challenge that requires a broader whole-of-government government response."

Instead of accepting the conclusions of his top national security officials, Donald Trump is following the recommendation of William Happer, a notorious climate denier and now a Senior Director on the NSC, to establish a new Presidential Committee on Climate Security.

Dr. Happer is particularly notorious for his assertion that "the demonization of carbon dioxide is just like the demonization of the poor Jews under Hitler. Carbon dioxide is actually a benefit to the world, and so are the Jews."

Anyone who makes this kind of outrageous analogy should not be entrusted to lead anything on climate security, in my view.

No one should doubt that the President and Dr. Happer have a preordained outcome in mind. They want to legitimize ignorance and denial of climate change and abandon tens of millions of Americans to the disastrous impacts of climate change in the coming decades.

I repeat, with climate change, ignorance is not bliss. It is dangerous. It is dangerous for a State like Hawaii that would be the hardest hit by the impact of climate change. With extreme weather, ocean acidification, coral

bleaching, and rising seas, climate change poses an existential threat to our State. It is one of the reasons Hawaii has implemented some of the most ambitious and aggressive policies to combat climate change in the country.

Hawaii was the first State to separately ratify the Paris climate agreement and has set an ambitious goal of becoming carbon neutral and generating 100 percent of our power from renewable sources by 2045. Hawaii's ambitious effort to confront climate change and the success we have already seen in moving toward our goals demonstrate that we can embrace similarly ambitious policies at the national level.

It is one of the reasons I have signed on as a cosponsor of the Green New Deal—an aspirational effort to transform our economy to combat climate change.

In the weeks since the plan was introduced, we have endured all kinds of mocking outrage from people who would rather stick their heads in the sand as science and fact deniers. They paint the Green New Deal as something scary and dangerous for the country. What is really scary and dangerous are people like them who deny that climate change is real and refuse to do anything about it in their steadfast support and alliance with the fossil fuel industry. History will not be kind to them.

Rejecting the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to serve as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, we can take one step forward in the fight against dangerous ignorance.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Henry David Thoreau once said: "What use is a home if you don't have a tolerable planet to put it on?"

We might just expand that question to say what use is anything if we destroy our planet because it is the only one we have. There is no planet B, no rescuing by going to some horrific other planet nearby. We have the gem, we have the treasure, and we have the responsibility to make sure we don't destroy it.

Here we are. Within a single human lifetime, we have increased the percent of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere by a dramatic amount—about 30 percent in my lifetime and more if you are older—and that chemistry change is really unseen in geological history on this planet, such a rapid change with rapid, deep growth.

That is why we are coming to the floor to keep talking about this issue, reach across the aisle, reach across the country, and find partners to say this isn't a blue or red issue. This isn't a city or rural issue. It affects us all, and we need to all work together to respond. As we do so, we need America to lead the world in responding.

Senator CARPER's resolution says a couple simple things. It says we recognize that we have a very warming cli-

mate on Earth. It says we recognize that human activity burning fossil fuel has consequences, and it calls on us to act. There we are. It is time to confront this enormous threat to our beautiful blue-green home in the middle of the cosmos.

There are some who say: That is so scary, so intimidating, so threatening. I just can't open my eyes or ears to hear that information. I have to pretend it is not real.

We are here in the Senate. We are here where we don't have the privilege of covering our eyes, our ears, pretending it is not happening. We have the responsibility to face this when others shy away and act.

There are others who say: You know, we just can't be sure exactly what is happening so let's wait another 10 or 20 years because we can't measure it as precisely as we want. It is like saying: Oh, cancer is ravaging my body, but I am not going to take any medicine because I am not sure if it has affected 15 percent or 16 percent of my cells. Well, you know you have cancer, and you know you need to act.

So there we are. Let us not let our heads be buried in the tar sands. Climate chaos is real. It is ravaging our planet. It is because of human activity, and we do have the responsibility to respond.

The year 2018 was one of the four hottest years on record. Nine out of the ten of the hottest years on record occurred since the year 2000. If we are looking at this chart, we don't see the Earth becoming any cooler. We see the Earth becoming a lot warmer. Four of the hottest years on record, 2018, 2017, 2016, and 2015—that was the last 4 years having been the 4 hottest years on record. The odds of that happening by accident is essentially none.

We have some very serious scientific heft weighing in. In October, the United Nations climate panel said we must act dramatically within this next decade. A month later, on Black Friday, we had the release of the "Fourth National Climate Assessment"—the Trump administration's "Fourth National Climate Assessment"—and it concluded that "Earth's climate is now changing faster than at any point in the history of modern civilization, primarily as a result of human activities."

There was a report from the Global Carbon Project that which found that global carbon emissions are going up. They went up 0.7 percent in 2018, hitting a record breaking 37.1 metric tons around the world. That is human activity putting out carbon dioxide that acts as a blanket on the planet. This isn't some new thought.

We go back to 1959. We had an eminent scientist who became better known for his work in the nuclear world, but he was asked to address the 100th anniversary of the petroleum industry. At that speech in 1959, he said: The energy you have unleashed and harnessed can do dramatic things to

change the world, but you have a couple of challenges. One challenge is that there isn't an infinite amount of petroleum in the ground. Another challenge is it creates carbon dioxide. It doesn't look like a pollutant because you can't see it and you can't smell it, but in fact, it traps heat. I think he framed it more scientifically, that it traps infrared energy.

He said that is going to be a problem, and, of course, we are seeing that problem all the time now. You don't need these scientific reports out of a global panel or a fourth assessment from the administration to tell us what is going on because we see the facts on the ground.

In my home State of Oregon, you can't move around the State without seeing the impact. In Eastern Oregon, you have the warmer winter. It is not killing the pine beetles. So the pine beetles are killing the trees. More pine beetles and less trees is not a good thing.

If you are over on the coast, the oyster men will tell you they had a big crisis in 2008 and 2009 because all of the baby oysters were dying, not because of a bacteria but because the acidity in the Pacific Ocean has gone up. How is that related? Because carbon dioxide is absorbed by the ocean and becomes carbonic acid. We burn so much carbon dioxide that we changed the acidity of the ocean. Can you imagine that is possible? It seems impossible, but it speaks to how much carbon dioxide we released within a few decades of human civilization on this planet.

You can keep going on with this story around Oregon. Our kelp beds are disappearing. They provide protection for all kinds of fish species. The kelp are dying because the blue sea urchins are eating them. The blue sea urchins are expanding rapidly because the starfish are dying because the ocean got too warm for them. It is one story after another. There is less irrigation water, less snowpack, warmer streams, and harsher conditions for trout and salmon all within the State of Oregon, and there are similar stories throughout our Nation.

Perhaps the most destructive factor, though, has been the increased number of forest fires. There are bigger fires, hotter fires, and a longer fire season. They are not just ravaging our forests but producing smoke that has a huge impact on our towns. We take a lot of pride in our wine in Oregon, and a lot of our grapes had smoke taint and weren't usable this last year.

We have towns where furniture salesmen said they couldn't sell the furniture because it had the lingering smell of smoke.

It had an impact on the entertainment world. The Shakespeare Festival had to shut down and partially move inside to smaller venues, which is having a huge impact on their finances and a huge impact on the tourism attraction.

This stuff is real. It is why we should all be here, Democrats and Repub-

licans, talking about the challenge and saying: What higher calling is there in our life than to come together to discuss this honestly and to work together to find solutions?

This isn't something where we can just say that the next generation can deal with it because the effects are cumulative. They build up. They become worse. It is a lot worse now than it was 10 years ago, and 10 years from now, it will be more so.

There is no easy, fast way to strip the carbon dioxide back out of the air. We can work at it, but it is not easy. We can plant more trees, yes, but, meanwhile, those hotter fires are killing more trees. Those pine beetles are killing more trees. In other words, it is urgent. The time to act is now.

In 1988 George H. W. Bush ran for President as an environmentalist. He announced he was going to take on global warming. His opponent, the Democrat, ran on the coal industry. That is not the same partisan alliance as you might hear today. George H. W. Bush said: "Our land, water and soil support a remarkable range of human activities, but they can only take so much and we must remember to treat them not as a given but as a gift."

Those words should echo in this Chamber. We have other words in this Chamber that seem to not address all of the facts that are right in front of us. One individual said: "The satellite says it ain't happening." Well, one could probably pick out some one piece of data from one satellite somewhere and say it doesn't show the story, but you collect all the data together and it is happening.

Here is a chart of how the globe is warming over time. It shows the difference in average temperatures. Here we are with just one tiny cache where there is a significant drop in temperature. There is a little bit of white and light blue showing that it stayed about the same, and there is a whole lot of red saying things are getting a lot worse. That is the collected data. Maybe there is some satellite that took a picture of one little spot here, but to cherry-pick data like that is dishonest.

We can't afford to pretend that things are OK when we are facing such a dramatic challenge to our blue-green home in the universe. NOAA, or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, works at this, and they record all kinds of data from all around the world.

Here is another chart that shows the Earth's climate record. This one shows the zigs and zags over time. We are going back to 1880, but if we look from 1880 to 1980, we see a significant rise in the temperature of the planet. If we go from 1980 until now, it is this absolutely frightening horror show of increasing temperature. That is what is happening when we talk about snowpacks. We talk about glaciers, we talk about coral, we talk about pine beetles, and we talk about 100 of these things where there is that feedback.

All of those affect humans. Those aren't just some abstract things, like if a tree falls in the woods but nobody hears it, did it really happen? Did we really hear it? Does it matter? No.

These reverberate back on our quality of life in this planet, including security concerns. The civil war in Syria that produced millions of refugees trying to get to Europe started with an extended drought because of the stresses of a warming planet.

Our military weighs in and says that climate chaos accentuates all the security concerns we have. It creates instability around the world. If one doesn't want to listen to the scientists, how about if we listen to our own military?

That is what the discussion of Senator CARPER's resolution is all about. That is what the Green New Deal is all about. The Green New Deal says a few simple things. It says we have a big problem. Check. Yes, we do. It says we need to take it on boldly and aggressively. Check. Yes, we do. It says when we take it on boldly, we can create millions of jobs, and that will be a good thing for our economy. Check. Yes, it is.

Creating those jobs is good. It says when we do that, we shouldn't leave our frontline communities behind. We should make sure those communities—rural communities and inner-city communities that have been left behind previously in different economic expansions—can't be left behind now. Check. That is absolutely right.

Let's make this economic surge benefit everyone in every community, with special attention to communities that have been struggling.

My colleague is here from Virginia. I am so glad he is. I am talking a lot about what is happening on the west coast of America. Perhaps he will fill us in a little bit on the perspective from the east coast. This is not one isolated spot on our planet. This is a concern to all of us. We need bipartisan work on this. Some suggest we put a fee on carbon. Let's have that conversation. Some suggest we provide more subsidies to renewable energy. Let's have that conversation. Some say we should do a green workforce—green corps training. Let's talk about that. Let's talk about every strategy we can bring to bear and come to a collective plan because there is no space in the urgency of this issue for us to retreat into blue and red corners. There is no time. It is unacceptable.

I feel it is such a privilege to come to this floor and be part of this conversation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do likewise. There are few issues that threaten us on this scale, but this one does. Let's work together to save our country and save our planet.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise and want to compliment my colleague from Oregon for putting on the table the

need for this body—the greatest deliberative body in the world—to deliberate upon a situation of grave importance to the world—the reality of climate change and what we as American leaders can do to tackle it. I will take the floor to talk about this in the coming days.

VENEZUELA

Mr. President, I actually rise now not on this topic, which affects Virginia significantly, especially sea level rise, but I want to talk a little about the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Venezuela. I do this on behalf of Venezuelans. I do this on behalf of Venezuelan-Americans, many of whom live in Virginia, but I also do it on behalf of democracies, because what is happening in Venezuela today demonstrates, really, in just one country, a global battle between democracies and authoritarian nations.

Authoritarian nations are supporting the regime of Maduro, and the democracies of the world are supporting the interim government of President Guaido.

If you want to know, circa 2019, in the battle being waged between authoritarians and democracies, Venezuela is a place where you can see it in one country. You see this global challenge between democracy and dictatorship.

The Maduro regime has been destroying Venezuela, which is home to the world's largest oil reserve, and it was once, in recent history, the richest country in all of Latin America. It is now in full-fledged economic and political collapse, with nearly 80 percent of the country's population living below the poverty line and more than half of the families unable to meet their basic food needs.

Right now, inflation in Venezuela is 2.7 million percent and will grow to 10 million percent this year, and most Venezuelans can't afford one meal a day. Medicines and other lifesaving commodities are too expensive for the average citizen to purchase, while Maduro and his colleagues and cronies syphon funds from state-owned enterprises into personal accounts and prohibit humanitarian assistance from entering the country.

Infants have starved to death because their families couldn't afford or access formula. Infectious diseases like malaria, measles, and diphtheria, which were previously eradicated in Venezuela, are emerging as public health system catastrophes.

Maduro is using the power of the state to subjugate and repress the Venezuelan people. His security forces use detention, torture, and lethal force against demonstrators and political opposition in what the United Nations and the Organization of American States called possible crimes against humanity.

It has provoked a massive refugee crisis. There are 3.4 million people and

counting who have made the difficult decision to leave their homeland because life has become untenable. Many have come to Virginia and to the United States as they have fled two countries throughout the region and created Latin America's worst refugee crisis, which is worsening by the day. Make no mistake—this is a manmade political crisis in a beautiful nation with beautiful people that would have ample resources if it were not so poorly governed.

In May 2018, Maduro declared victory for a second term in office in an election so flawed that the Organization of American States, the European Union, and the United States refused to recognize it as legitimate.

Following months of protests, on January 23, the National Assembly, which is Venezuela's only democratic body, determined that Maduro had usurped the Office of the President, and in accordance with the Venezuelan Constitution's provision for succession—and this is important—the President of the National Assembly, Juan Guaido, assumed the role of the Interim President of Venezuela. Again, that was done pursuant to Venezuelan constitutional law. The announcement, which I supported, was swiftly backed by the United States, by the Organization of American States, and by over 50 countries worldwide, including most of the democracies of the West. In contrast, which nations are supporting the Maduro regime? They are Russia, China, Iran, Syria, Turkey, Cuba, Nicaragua, Bolivia, and Belarus—authoritarian nations.

There is a clear international divide between democracies and authoritarians. We must defend our convictions and bolster the democracies of the world. It is about supporting the Venezuelan people, but it is also about sending an important message globally that the United States remains confident that democracy is the way for people to achieve their hopes and dreams, and when authoritarians try to crush the democratic desires of populations, the United States should be an ally.

The United States should never tell another nation who its leader should be. We have no business being in regime change. We support free and fair elections. We support constitutions. That is why I support the current interim Government of Venezuela, which has been designated pursuant to the Venezuelan Constitution.

I recently met with the Guaido interim government's representative to the United States. I was encouraged to hear that the National Assembly's goal was to move to a democratic system and replace the interim government with a national government that would follow free and transparent elections, which Maduro has blocked repeatedly. Support for this goal must continue to come from the international community, the Organization of American States, and other democracies.

A caution: As a missionary in Honduras in the 1970s, I lived in a military dictatorship, and I am keenly aware of the history and the legacy of U.S. intervention in the Americas. That is why I was very troubled and remain troubled by the Trump administration's threats of military intervention in Venezuela. That would be a massive mistake. The rhetoric is reckless and counterproductive. Our leaders should not be bombastic and enflame a delicate situation that could go in the direction of violence and civil unrest. In fact, the suggestion of U.S. military intervention actually strengthens the hand of the dictator because the Maduro dictatorship would like to blame Venezuela's economic challenges on Uncle Sam or the West rather than on its own mismanagement of the economy. The United States should not be making military threats against Venezuela.

There are many steps we can take, though, that would be appropriate. I support the increase in direct U.S. humanitarian aid for the Venezuelan people as the transition unfolds. It is unbelievable that for years, the government has refused to allow humanitarian aid to enter the country to help its own people. The scenes we have seen over the past weekend of roadblocks on highways entering Venezuela and the Venezuelan military fighting to stop humanitarian aid from reaching citizens epitomizes the Maduro regime's ongoing disregard for the plight of everyday people.

I support the long needed aid package that will help international organizations provide assistance inside Venezuela that interim President Guaido welcomes and that former President Maduro should welcome as well. That is why I joined Senator MENENDEZ in cosponsoring the Venezuela Humanitarian Relief Act and the Rule of Law Act, and I will support them in their reintroductions.

I support the United States in its playing a role in convincing other nations and the Organization of American States to also stand for the people of Venezuela. OAS's leadership is very strong, but in the OAS, every member country has one vote. Venezuela has used its petroleum reserves to convince a number of Caribbean nations to back the dictatorship. I think the United States could use very plain diplomacy with Caribbean nations to get them to support the democracy, the current interim government, and we could do that and attain some significant success.

We should amplify the pressure we have applied by recognizing the interim government and deploying humanitarian assistance to the border. South America is absorbing 3.4 million refugees from Venezuela. The Trump administration condemns the brutality of the Maduro Government, but we are reducing our support for refugees from Venezuela and elsewhere.

I think the crisis warrants the extension of temporary protected status to

the Venezuelans who are already in the United States. If the Trump administration is serious about helping Venezuela recover from a devastating crisis, it cannot require Venezuelans to return to a deteriorating security situation there.

It is not our place to dictate the negotiated terms of a resolution that will end this crisis. That is the role and the responsibility of the people of Venezuela and their representatives, but the United States and the international community should create the right environment for those negotiations to go forward, and they should provide the assistance to allow this transition to occur.

We don't want to see greater violence or greater civil war in Venezuela. Interim President Guaido's offer of amnesty to Maduro's military and political supporters who wish to end their support for autocratic rule is a good step, as is his explicit call for a transitional government and free and fair elections. His role should and must remain that of a steward until those elections take place pursuant to the Venezuelan Constitution.

There is an example in the region. The peace agreement in Colombia signaled the end of six decades of conflict. The hemisphere is on a trajectory toward peace with there being no ongoing hostilities in the more than 30 countries. It is critical that we keep it that way.

In conclusion, during my time in Honduras, I learned a very important prayer that we used to say at mealtime. It was this: (English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:) "Lord, give bread to those who hunger and hunger for justice to those who have bread."

I call on this body and our colleagues in the international community to support the people of Venezuela in their quest for both bread and justice.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before my colleague from Virginia leaves, I admire him so much. I just want to applaud him and applaud his early work as a missionary in Honduras.

During our past recess, Senator JEFF MERKLEY and I and four of our colleagues from the House were privileged to be a part of a 5-day congressional delegation to Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. We were there to find out how the Alliance for Prosperity was being implemented, of which the Senator has been very supportive, as have I, in order to focus on hope, economic opportunity, crime, violence, and corruption.

The Alliance for Prosperity is focused on all of those matters. The United States puts up some of the money to address them, but we expect the other countries, including Honduras, to put up even more. It is like being at Home Depot—you can do it, and we can help. For every \$1 in El Salvador, they put up \$7, and we leverage our money to get the support of foundations, NGOs, private companies, and others to do their share. It is like turning the course of an aircraft carrier, and it is starting to turn.

Probably late this week—maybe tomorrow—I suspect Senator MERKLEY and I will want to have a colloquy on the floor. It would be great if the Senator could join us because he has forgotten more about that part of the world than we will ever know.

Thank you.

I didn't come to the floor to focus on that, but I am glad I had the chance to since Senator KAINE was here.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mr. President, I rise this evening to continue to share with my colleagues the concerns I have about the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to be the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I want to talk for a couple of minutes about an issue that is important for all Americans, and that is reducing mercury and air toxic pollution that affect the health especially of our children.

As a number of our colleagues know, reducing mercury and air toxic pollution from our Nation's powerplants is something of a passion for me, and I know it is for some of my colleagues, too, Democrats and Republicans. In my home State of Delaware, for example, we have made great strides in cleaning up our own air pollution. Unfortunately, a number of the upwind States to the west of us have not made the same commitment.

When I was the Governor of Delaware, I used to say I could have literally shut down Delaware's economy—I could have taken cars, trucks, and vans off of highways and shut down every business—and we still would have been out of compliance for air quality because of the pollution from other States. That is because over 90 percent of Delaware's air pollution comes from our neighboring States—over 90 percent.

This air pollution is not only dangerous to our hearts, to our lungs, and to our brains, but it also costs a great deal in doctor and hospital bills and in our quality of life. It makes healthcare costs in Delaware more expensive than in other places where they get cheap electricity. We ended up having to clean up our emissions. We have more expensive electricity and higher healthcare bills. It is just not fair.

Delaware has depended on the EPA to ensure our neighbors do their fair share so that we can protect our citi-

zens in the First State. Just recently, Delaware petitioned the EPA under something called section 126 of the Clean Air Act, which requires upwind powerplants that are located in other States to turn on and fully operate their installed pollution technology. I will say that again—to use their installed pollution technology. They are not to turn it off but to leave it on.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wheeler ignored the health of Delawareans. The people of Maryland had the same concern, and the people of Connecticut had the same concern. He rejected all of our petitions. Talk about the Golden Rule. How is that consistent with the Golden Rule of treating other people the way you want to be treated? It flies in the face of it. We thought it was unforgivable.

Some of the air pollution that crosses our border is toxic. It is coming into our State as a silent killer. It wasn't too long ago that uncontrolled fossil fuel powerplants were the largest source of unregulated mercury and air toxics in the country—coal-fired powerplants.

For those who may not know, mercury and other toxics, such as lead, arsenic, benzene, and acid gases, that are emitted by uncontrolled coal-fired powerplants get into our airways, our waterways, and our seafood. As we breathe and ingest these air toxics, they build up in our bodies and cause cancer, respiratory illness, mental impairment, and even death.

Mercury pollution is especially dangerous for unborn children, who can suffer long-lasting neurological damage if they are exposed during their development at very early ages—even before they are born. The American Academy of Pediatrics has stated there is no safe level of mercury exposure for children—none.

Almost two decades ago, Senator ALEXANDER and I led legislation that required utilities to reduce mercury emissions by 90 percent. At the time, most utilities told us that it could not be done or that it would be too expensive to achieve.

In 2012, which was a few years later, the EPA implemented something called the mercury and air toxics standards—we call it MATS—which also required utilities to reduce their mercury emissions by 90 percent and other air toxic emissions by half.

Just as with the bill introduced by Senator ALEXANDER and me about a decade ago, many utilities claimed they could not meet those standards to reduce mercury and other air toxics. They predicted consumer rate spikes. They predicted mass powerplant closures. They predicted brownouts. They predicted blackouts. Luckily, those predictions were dead wrong. Under the 2012 MATS rule, the EPA determined it was appropriate and necessary to regulate air toxic plant emissions, like mercury, lead, arsenic, acid gases, and benzene, because of the health hazards of these pollutants. Today, believe it or

not, 7 years later, every utility is now in compliance with the mercury and air toxics rule—every one.

Powerplant mercury emissions are down by over 80 percent from just 7 years ago.

Compliance with MATS was done faster than predicted and for one-third the cost. Imagine that, faster than predicted, for one-third the cost, and we have gotten better results than we could hope for as well.

Let me go on. Consumer retail prices are lower today than they were before MATS was implemented. We are also seeing health benefits, as I said, occur faster than expected originally, and despite some of the original opposition, everyone now has embraced MATS. Isn't that amazing?

All these utilities and folks who opposed what Senator ALEXANDER and I were trying to do a decade ago, what the MATS rule that up to 12 years ago was trying to do—all the folks who were opposed to it then say: No, this is good. It didn't cost as much. We implemented it much faster than we had ever expected—better results than we had expected. So it is pretty amazing, a wonderful outcome—except over the December holiday break 2 months ago, for reasons unknown to me, Acting EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler signed a proposal to remove the legal underpinnings of the mercury and air toxics standards, remove the legal underpinnings of the MATS rule.

Mr. Wheeler says this action was not intended to get rid of the rule. He says it was necessary and that the proposal strikes a balance. Everyone—everyone—industry, environmental groups, health groups—knows that is just not so. It is just not so.

No court has ordered this action, no utilities are asking for this action, and this proposal is not intended to protect public health.

Here is what EPA has done. In the proposal, EPA mimics flawed arguments used in a recent Murray Energy lawsuit against the MATS rule.

Like the lawsuit, EPA uses outdated data and deems that some benefits—like reductions in cancer, reductions in birth defects, reduction in asthma attacks—are no longer important and shouldn't even be considered.

Think about that. Think about that. Based on this information, EPA determined it is no longer appropriate and necessary for the Agency to regulate powerplant air toxic emissions—no longer appropriate and necessary to regulate mercury, to regulate lead, arsenic, acid gases, benzene pollution from powerplants. Imagine that.

Yet the Agency also proposes to keep the MATS rule which regulates powerplant air toxic emissions in place, even though it is simultaneously saying that the rule is not appropriate and necessary. This confusing conclusion opens the door for future lawsuits to vacate the MATS rule entirely.

That is our concern—not just my concern but a broadly held concern. By undermining the legal foundation of MATS, this proposal unnecessarily puts the MATS rule in legal jeopardy, and despite Mr. Wheeler's claim that he doesn't plan to eliminate the standards themselves, EPA is still requesting public comment in the proposal on whether to do just that.

If EPA is successful and the MATS rule goes away, air pollution control technologies on coal plants across the country will be turned off, just like the coal plants listed in Delaware's 126 petitions and up in Pennsylvania and I think to our west in West VA.

On this issue, Mr. Wheeler seems to be all alone. Environmentalists, States, labor groups, coal-fired utilities, religious leaders, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce all agree that the life-saving protections to limit mercury pollution should stay in place. They all agree. There are not a whole lot of things they all agree on. They all agree on this.

The stakeholders listed on this chart right over here over my shoulder and many more urge this administration not to move forward with their pro-

posal—not to move forward. Mr. Wheeler has chosen to ignore the chorus of the stakeholders who all hoped he would chart a more responsible path.

In talking with my Republican friends, I know many of them can't make sense of the EPA's efforts to undermine the MATS rule. They are as confused as I am by why Mr. Wheeler would be taking a step that will hurt public health and, frankly, hurt the industries that are required to implement this technology and protect our health.

I had hoped we could try to help Mr. Wheeler course correct on this issue during the nomination process. That just doesn't seem to be happening. His lack of willingness to change course on the MATS rollbacks is very troubling to me and one of the reasons I cannot support his nomination to be EPA Administrator at this time.

I have fought for almost two decades in this body to protect our children from mercury and air toxic pollution from powerplants. I am not going to back down. I am not going to go away.

For my colleagues who are concerned about regulating mercury, I would ask that you join me in opposing Andrew Wheeler's nomination vote tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 27, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

MICHAEL J. DESMOND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND AN ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today in observance of Women's History Month and its 2019 theme—Visionary Women: Champions of Peace and Nonviolence. Each year, the National Women's History Project selects a unifying theme to recognize and promote Women's History Month. This year's theme features the stories of women from diverse backgrounds and fields who have advocated for peace and human rights throughout the world.

In the United States, women of every race, class, and ethnic background have played a critical role in advocating for unity and peace. For generations, women have contributed to resolving conflicts and have worked to promote nonviolence in the workplace, schools, homes, communities, and government. Women have insisted upon and continue to fight for respect, justice, and peace for all of humanity.

Strong pioneers such as Graciela Sanchez, Dr. E. Faye Williams, and Dorothy Cotton built their lives upon fighting for equal rights and eliminating racism and sexism. Leaders including Deborah Tucker advocated for improvements of laws and policies worldwide. Ms. Tucker helped write and pass the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. Sister Alice Zachmann was also a trailblazer who dedicated her life to ending war and violence, giving much of her time and efforts to organizations that supported the end of the Vietnam War. In 1982, Sister Zachmann founded the Guatemala Human Rights Commission USA and served as its director for twenty years. For their leadership and outstanding dedication to women's rights, unity, and peace, they are well deserving of our respect and admiration. I commend these fine women and the many others who have fought alongside them for securing rights for all women of every creed, class, and ethnic background. These fearless and strong women serve as remarkable role models who reflect the 2019 theme, Visionary Women: Champions of Peace and Nonviolence.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to join in celebrating Women's History Month and to recognize that after decades of dedication, perseverance, contributions, and advances, great American women from all cultures and classes are being celebrated. To illustrate the numerous brave women of our nation's history, we remember and recount the tales of our ancestors' talents, sacrifices, and commitments that serve as an inspiration to today's generation. I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in celebrating these brave women who have improved American society and whose stories are woven into the fabric of our nation.

AMBER HARRIS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Amber Harris for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Amber Harris is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Amber Harris is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Amber Harris for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF MR. JAMES AUSTIN JENKINS, JR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I pay tribute to a great man, outstanding public servant, and dear friend of longstanding, Mr. James Austin Jenkins, Jr. Mr. Jenkins passed away on Thursday, February 21, 2019. A funeral service will be held on Saturday, March 2, 2019, at 12:00 p.m. at Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church in Burksville, Alabama.

James Austin Jenkins, Jr. was born on December 28, 1937, to the late James Austin Jenkins, Sr. and Octavia McCray Jenkins. A product of the Lowndes County, Alabama Public School System, he graduated from Lowndes County Training School before attending Alabama State University, where he received his bachelor's degree in Political Science.

James built quite an impressive career as a public servant in our nation's federal government which was demonstrated through his dedicated services to the National Park Service, as a Ranger stationed in the Washington Monument and as a Horse Mounted Ranger at Prince William Forest Park in Virginia, as well as in Federal Government Law Enforcement, and finally as a National Zoological Park Police Officer with The Smithsonian Institution.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct

and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." We are all so blessed that Mr. James Austin Jenkins, Jr. passed this way during his life's journey. As a proud member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., his exuberant personality captured the attention of all those he encountered and made him the life of the party wherever he went. He will be remembered for his welcoming spirit and love for his fraternity, his friends, and above all else, his family. He leaves behind a great legacy in public service to and warm cherished memories in the lives of those who knew him.

While he was preceded in death by his parents and brothers, Aaron, Frederick, and Elliot; he is survived by his children, Karen, Earl, Bianca, Alicia, and Nathan; and a host of family and friends who will miss him dearly.

On a personal note, James and I both understood the importance of addressing the important issues facing our nation's Veterans and would discuss these issues at the Veterans Brain Trust during the Congressional Black Caucus' Annual Legislative Conference, which he attended regularly.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, along with my wife, Vivian; and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to Mr. James Austin Jenkins, Jr. for his service to our country. We extend our deepest condolences to his family and friends during this difficult time of bereavement and pray that they will be comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

GUN VIOLENCE

HON. ROBIN L. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today for Hadiya Pendleton and Blair Holt—because they can no longer rise. Their promising young lives were cut short by gun violence.

I rise for Xavier Joy, Julian Gonzalez and Delmonte Johnson and the thousands of Americans lost to gun violence over the years.

People are dying in our cities and our rural counties, in school classrooms and movie theatres.

In Waffle Houses, synagogues and on our streets. Nowhere is safe from gun violence and the American people are sick and tired of it.

That's why they sent a historic wave of gun sense candidates to Congress with a singular mission: do something and save lives.

Today, we will keep that promise. Today, we will vote on legislation to ensure a background check on every gun sale.

This week, we will also vote on legislation that would have prevented the Mother Emanuel tragedy.

Now, Madam Speaker, we know that no single bill can prevent all gun violence but each

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

of these bills will prevent some. It's time to act and start saving lives.

To my colleagues, you must do the right thing. You must vote "yes" on H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112, for the sake of our families and our nation.

History will remember this moment.

HANNAH HOFFMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Hannah Hoffman for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Hannah Hoffman is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Hannah Hoffman is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Hannah Hoffman for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF EUROPEAN UNION AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES DAVID O'SULLIVAN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished service of European Union Ambassador to the United States, David O'Sullivan, who will retire his post at the end of the month after nearly five years of tireless advocacy for transatlantic unity. It has been my privilege to work alongside Ambassador O'Sullivan as we strive to secure our mutual interests in national security, trade, and foreign affairs.

Ambassador O'Sullivan was appointed in November 2014, shortly after receiving the EU Transatlantic Business Award from the American Chamber of Commerce for his contributions to improving our economic ties with Europe. As Ambassador, he has devoted himself to strengthening the EU-U.S. trade relationship and worked to ensure that other large economic powers play by the rules. In 2018, he promoted a trilateral approach between the EU, the U.S., and Japan to tackle the issue of Chinese overcapacity in steel manufacturing.

In his four decades of public service for the European Union, Ambassador O'Sullivan has worked diligently for international cooperation. Prior to serving as Ambassador, he helped establish one of the world's largest diplomatic organizations, the European External Action

Service, and served as its Chief Operating Officer from 2011 to 2014. He held senior positions with the European Commission, including Head of Commission President Prodi's Cabinet from 1999 to 2000 and Secretary General of the European Commission from 2000 to 2005. In his capacity as Director General for Trade and Chief Negotiator for the Doha Development Round from 2005 to 2010, he secured numerous free trade agreements, including the conclusion of the EU's agreement with South Korea.

Born in Dublin, Ireland, the Ambassador's interest in global politics and international affairs was first inspired by his father, Lieutenant General Gerry O'Sullivan, who served as Chief of Staff of the Irish Defense Forces. While his father served as liaison to the United Nations in the Congo in 1961, David attended elementary school in my state of California and later worked two summers as a YMCA camp counselor in Chicago.

The bonds of friendship with our transatlantic allies are now more important than ever and must continue to be founded upon our shared values of democracy, respect for human dignity, and the rule of law. Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ambassador O'Sullivan's enduring contributions to transatlantic unity and EU-U.S. trade relations. I thank him for his service and wish him a happy retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HORSE TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ACT OF 2019

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Horse Transportation Safety Act, a bill I introduced earlier today along with Representatives PETER KING from New York, DINA TITUS from Nevada and BRIAN FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania, to ensure the humane and safe transportation of horses.

The Horse Transportation Safety Act seeks to end the exploitation of a regulatory loophole designed to ban the transport of horses in double-deck trailers. This loophole gives drivers an incentive to inhumanely transport horses to assembly points then reload them into single level trailers just outside their final destination.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, "Double-deck trailers do not provide adequate headroom for equines, with the possible exception of foals and yearlings. We do not believe that trailers that have two or more permanent levels that are not collapsible can be adequately altered to accommodate adult equines, especially tall equines."

This practice is not only dangerous and inhumane to the horses, but to the traveling public, as well. We have witnessed the dangerous nature of these double decker trailers in several horrific accidents. In October of 2007, fifteen horses died when a double deck trailer carrying 59 Belgian draft horses overturned on Route 41 in Illinois. Unfortunately, we know that accidents like this are not an uncommon occurrence.

The legislation is strongly supported by agricultural interests and animal protection groups

including the Humane Society of the United States, the Animal Welfare Institute, the National Black Farmers Association, and Return to Freedom Wild Horse Conservation.

Moreover, in 2010 the Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure unanimously adopted this bipartisan legislation.

This is common sense legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the swift passage of the Horse Transportation Safety Act. I also want to express my gratitude for the many years of hard work on this issue by our esteemed colleague, the late Representative Walter Jones from North Carolina.

ANTHONY JACOBER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anthony Jacober for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Anthony Jacober is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Anthony Jacober is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Anthony Jacober for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

CLARA LUPER

HON. KENDRA S. HORN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the visionary and unwavering leadership of Civil Rights icon and notable Oklahoman, Ms. Clara Luper. Six months ago, I got to witness history, as Oklahoma City commemorated the 60th anniversary of the sit-ins she organized. And even as a 5th generation Oklahoman, I realized how little I knew.

Clara Luper and her students sparked a movement: the sit-ins that led into our nation's civil rights movement. They deserve to be a household name.

Clara Luper made her mark in a time where people of color couldn't even walk into the front door of Oklahoma City businesses. They were relegated to hidden back doors. But she had a vision for equality, a heart for service, and a commitment to justice. She, in her words, "believed in a sun when it didn't shine, and the rain when it didn't fall." She knew that Oklahoma and this country could be a place where everyone is treated with respect, dignity, and humanity.

As a history teacher at Dunjee High School in Spencer Oklahoma, she instilled those principles into her students. Her steadfast commitment to ending racism and systemic discrimination inspired her to organize America's first sit in.

In August 1958, she and 14 of her NAACP walked up to a lunch counter they knew would refuse them, and they ordered a hamburger and a Coke. They were denied, but they did not waver. They knew what was on the line. In Ms. Luper's words, "within that hamburger was the whole essence of democracy."

At their own personal peril, they returned each day with more people until they broke the barrier. It was never easy. The protestors were verbally and physically assaulted. Ms. Luper received death threats.

Because of Ms. Luper and her students' fearlessness and determination, Katz Drug Stores integrated their lunch counters not just in Oklahoma City, but in Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa too. When the 1958 sit-in happened in Oklahoma City, a group of college students were inspired by what had taken place in Oklahoma City and took note. So in 1961 the students launched the Greensboro, N.C. sit-in at the Woolworth lunch counter—which fueled momentum within the civil rights movement.

It didn't end there. For years, Ms. Luper and others continued their fight. The sacrifices continued too. Authorities arrested Luper 26 times during her fight for freedom.

Clara Luper empowered young people to imagine a future brighter than their present and taught them how to make that future a reality. She changed lives and planted seeds of ethical leadership into those who were lucky to be mentored by her. Each of her former students talks about the pivotal role Ms. Luper played in instilling confidence, character, and dignity in them.

Generations reap the benefits of her sacrifice and the efforts to integrate not only businesses in Oklahoma City, but educational spaces. Ms. Luper integrated the History department at the University of Oklahoma, becoming the first Black graduate of that Master's program.

Her contributions are reflected across our state: in a namesake scholarship program at Oklahoma City University, a Corridor on the northeast side of Oklahoma City, a classroom at the University of Central Oklahoma, designating the Oklahoma City Public Schools District building as the Clara Luper Center, and naming the African American studies department at the University of Oklahoma after her.

As a lifelong Oklahoman, the representative of the fifth Congressional District, and as an American, I recognize how we are beneficiaries of Clara Luper's efforts to create a more just and equitable place to live. I cannot and will not take that history and her impact for granted.

Although we've come so far because of her sacrifices and the sacrifices of other heroes during the Civil Rights Era, there's still so much work left to do. Even with the numerous accolades given to her, the best way that we can honor Ms. Clara Luper is to uphold her legacy through a commitment to justice and equality in the policies that we propose. She knew that democracy isn't a spectator sport. It is our duty as a Congress and as Americans to make good on the constitutional promise of establishing justice and ensuring domestic tranquility. So we must continue to work for an

inclusive, equitable place for everyone to live and feel safe as well as build an economy where every American has the opportunity to thrive. I thank the sit-inners and I thank Clara Luper, for their resilience and giving us the torch to carry.

IN RECOGNITION OF EDWARD P. CHAPMAN

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the life of Edward P. Chapman, a decorated war veteran and Captain in the Springfield Police Department.

Mr. Chapman was born in Brattleboro, Vermont. In 1942 he enlisted in the United States Marines and served in the 5th Marine Division, 27th Marine Regiment. He defended our country during World War II and was honorably discharged in 1946 and awarded the Purple Heart following his service fighting in the Battle of Iwo Jima.

Upon returning home, Mr. Chapman joined the Springfield Police Department, where he served the people of Springfield for thirty years. He received his degree in criminal justice from Western New England College and later retired in the early 1980's as a Captain in the police department. After retiring, Mr. Chapman remained an active member of his community, attending mass at St. Patrick's Church in Springfield and belonging to American Legion Post No. 452, as well as fishing and golfing in his free time.

Surrounded by family, Mr. Chapman passed away on February 22, 2019, at the age of ninety-four. His dedication to serving both his country and his community will long be remembered by his growing family and all those who had the great privilege of knowing Mr. Chapman.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the life of Edward P. Chapman. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing his many years of dedication to his community.

KAYLEE MARONE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kaylee Marone for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kaylee Marone is a student at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kaylee Marone is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kaylee Marone for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I had to return to my district unexpectedly for a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: "nay" on Roll Call No. 90; "nay" on Roll Call No. 91; "nay" on Roll Call No. 92; "nay" on Roll Call No. 93; "nay" on Roll Call No. 94; and "yea" on Roll Call No. 95.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NON-DISCRIMINATION HOME RULE ACT OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Non-Discrimination Home Rule Act of 2019 to end the unique applicability of the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA) to the District of Columbia. My bill would protect the District's right to self-government, ensuring the District is treated the same as states, and defend LGBTQ and reproductive rights in D.C.

RFRA, which provides more protection for religious exercise than the First Amendment requires, applies to the federal government, the D.C. government and the territorial governments, but not to state governments. As RFRA does not apply to the states, under the principles of home rule, it should likewise not apply to the District.

While RFRA was designed to be a shield to protect religious freedom, it is being used, as evidenced by the Supreme Court's 2014 Hobby Lobby decision, as a sword to discriminate against the LGBTQ community and women. Members of Congress have used RFRA as a justification for trying—but failing—to overturn D.C. antidiscrimination laws. House Republicans have repeatedly tried since 2015 to nullify or block the District's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act (RHND), which prohibits employers from discriminating against employees and their families based on reproductive health decisions, claiming, in part, that it violates RFRA. However, it appears that no one has challenged RHND's legality under RFRA in court.

My bill ensures that District residents are treated the same as residents of the states under RFRA. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

KRYSTLE MCCOMB

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Krystle

McComb for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Krystle McComb is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Krystle McComb is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Krystle McComb for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

DENTAL AWARENESS MONTH

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Children's Dental Health Month. Each February, the American Dental Association unifies members of our healthcare community to recognize the importance of good oral health for our children and many others. As a former dentist, I know that quality dental care impacts your overall well-being. Proper Oral Health starts with the very first tooth as baby teeth are the building blocks to a healthy smile.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, almost 50 percent of children between the ages of 6 to 11 are affected by tooth decay. Tooth decay also happens to be the most common chronic disease in children. When a child suffers from dental pain, the impact is far reaching and can affect critical developmental stages including speaking, eating and learning.

Although tooth decay is widespread, it is preventable. It is important to brush your children's teeth twice a day with fluoride toothpaste. This year's slogan for National Children's Dental Health Month is "Brush and clean in between to build a healthy smile." If we as a society take these preventative measures to keep our children healthy, we can ultimately reduce healthcare costs and give our future generations the confidence they need in life. Please join me in raising awareness about the importance of oral health.

RECOGNIZING DALLAS GAY,
GAINESVILLE ROTARY CLUB'S
MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Dallas Gay, a fellow Northeast Georgian who was recently named Man of the Year by the Gainesville Rotary Club in recognition of his work to combat the opioid epidemic in Georgia.

Each year, thousands of Americans lose their lives to opioids. Mr. Gay understands the

severity of this issue better than most, as he lost his grandson to a drug overdose in 2012. This tragic loss inspired him to join the fight and ultimately save countless lives throughout the state of Georgia.

Mr. Gay has spearheaded several drug-related campaigns, some of which have led to new legislation. In May 2017, the Jeffrey Dallas Gay Jr. Act was signed into law, making naloxone—a life-saving antidote for drug overdoses—available over the counter. He also co-founded the "Think About It" campaign, which raised awareness of addiction to opioids and prescription drugs, and ultimately raised over \$400,000.

Mr. Gay was previously recognized by the Medical Association of Georgia and St. Jude's Children's Hospital for his work on the opioid epidemic.

In his Man of the Year acceptance speech, he encouraged others to continue to "be a soldier" in combating this crisis and to question and safeguard the drugs which are prescribed to them.

I thank Mr. Gay for his steadfast commitment to fighting this epidemic, and I look forward to witnessing his continued impact on countless lives across the state of Georgia.

EVA MORENO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Eva Moreno for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Eva Moreno is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Eva Moreno is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Eva Moreno for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN MEMORY OF LTC (RET.) JERRY
"JAY" WHITE II

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated husband, father, community servant, and soldier, LTC (Ret.) Jerry "Jay" White II. Sadly, LTC White passed away on September 20, 2018. A funeral service will be held on Wednesday, February 27, 2019, at Old Post Chapel at Fort Myer and will be followed by a burial via caisson at Arlington National Cemetery.

LTC White was born on September 23, 1966, to the union of U.S. Army Major General (Ret.) Jerry and Linda (Pickens) White in St. Mary's, West Virginia. As a member of a military family, LTC White attended several schools before graduating from Leilahua High School in Wahiawa, Hawaii, and going on to receive a bachelor's degree in Business from the University of Hawaii, where he also attended ROTC. He later continued his studies and earned a masters degree in International Affairs from The Georgia Institute of Technology.

It has been said that "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." LTC White paid his rent and he paid it well. His distinguished military career officially commenced when he entered the Army as a Second Lieutenant of Infantry after graduating from the University of Hawaii. Over the course of his career, LTC White distinguished himself as a great soldier. After graduating from the demanding Airborne, Ranger, and Air Assault Courses, he reported for duty at the legendary 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) in Fort Campbell, Kentucky. There he served in the 1/327 Infantry Battalion, the same unit where his father had served during the Vietnam War. He also excelled in leadership positions and was awarded the Bronze Star and Combat Infantryman's Badge for his service during the First Gulf War. His later assignments included duty at Fort Lewis, Washington; Paris, France, and Brussels, Belgium, where he trained as an Army European Foreign Area Officer; and Washington, D.C., where he served as a liaison officer for United States Southern Command and later as an advisor to the Washington, D.C. National Guard.

Even after honorably serving his country, he continued to give of himself in service to his community. As an avid Washington, D.C. sports fan, he enjoyed attending Redskins and Nationals games as well as working with youth by volunteering as the Braddock Road Youth Club softball commissioner and a team coach for many years.

LTC White achieved much in his life but none of it would have been possible without the love and support of his loving parents, Jerry and Linda; his wife Jennifer; his children, Juliana and Jameson; and a host of family and friends that will miss him deeply.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian; and the more than 730,000 constituents of the Second Congressional District in recognizing LTC (Ret.) Jerry "Jay" White II for his dedicated service to our country and his community and in extending our condolences to his family and friends. May they be consoled and comforted by their abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

HONORING THE PLATTSBURGH
NOON KIWANIS CLUB FOR THEIR
90 YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Plattsburgh Noon Kiwanis Club.

Kiwanis clubs and their members are dedicated to improving the lives of children all over the world. Their members engage in local, hands on volunteer activities to serve the needs of the children in their communities. These activities range from improving literacy and fighting hunger to fundraising for scholarships. The Plattsburgh chapter meets weekly to organize and volunteer at soup kitchens, holiday gift drives and fundraisers, and plays a vital role in improving the lives of children in the community.

On Thursday, April 11th, the Plattsburgh Noon Kiwanis Club will be celebrating 90 years of service. They have served generations of North Country children since their founding back in 1929. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to congratulate them on this milestone and thank them for their long tradition of service.

MELISSA OTAVA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Melissa Otava for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Melissa Otava is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Melissa Otava is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Melissa Otava for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

DO THE WRITE THING

HON. DONNA E. SHALALA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a poem written by Emma Tews, an eighth-grade student at Herbert A. Ammons Middle School in Miami-Dade County. Gun violence does not only impact those who have lost loved ones; children like Emma know that we are in the midst of a gun violence epidemic and they fear for their lives.

DO THE WRITE THING

(By Emma Tews)

Every day we wake up
To the news of something bad happening
School shootings, terrorist attacks, violence
We have gotten used to seeing it
It's not a surprise anymore
Every day we wake up
We see bad things happen around us
Pain that people experience

Hate that people give
We see it every day
Every day we wake up
It's just another day in the cycle
We see things that we are immune to
We are told to walk away
Or run
Every day we wake up
A part of our generation's youth is taken
away
Other people's pain turned into violence
There is so much hate in our world
Nobody realizes
Every day we should wake up
We shouldn't ignore it
We should seek a change
We shouldn't run
We should love

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENDRA S. HORN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my Congressional District on Monday, February 25, 2019 due to complications with my flight from Oklahoma City to Washington, D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted the following way on votes that day: "yea" on Roll Call No. 88 and "yea" on Roll Call No. 89.

OBITUARY OF MY FATHER WILLIAM QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to include in the RECORD the obituary of my father William Quigley, published in The Chicago Sun-Times on February 10, 2019.

WILLIAM QUIGLEY, ARMY VETERAN, FATHER OF CONGRESSMAN, DIES AT 92

Abandoned by his mother, the baby boy—he was about 2—ended up at an Indiana orphanage during the Great Depression.

His luck changed when a WWI veteran and his wife filled out the "boy or girl" portion of an adoption application with the words: "any child we can love."

That veteran, William Earl Quigley, made his adopted son his namesake and gave him whatever else he could working as a handyman and farmhand in a rural area outside Indianapolis.

The origin story stayed with him always—from when he served in the Army during the Korean War era as a newlywed to the time he retired with a pension from AT&T—and formed the bedrock motivation of his life: "You work hard to give your kids a better chance than you had."

On Saturday, after a long battle with Parkinson's disease, Mr. Quigley, 92, died knowing he did just that.

His daughter Chris is a retired school superintendent. His daughter Linda was a social worker. His son Dan, who passed away two years ago, owned a used-record store. And his son Mike is a U.S. congressman.

"He didn't like most politicians, so the irony that his son grew up to be one was not lost upon him," said Mike Quigley, who represents Illinois' 5th Congressional District.

Despite that fact, Mr. Quigley insisted on standing the entire time as his son was sworn in to the House of Representatives in 2009.

Mr. Quigley regularly wrote letters to politicians calling out "idiotcy and hypocrisy" and dinner conversation could easily be mistaken for political debate at the Quigley house.

Whatever adopted dog the family had at the time—there were many and they were all called "Missy" because it was easy to remember—was certainly well fed.

"He'd spoil those dogs rotten, and sing to them even, because they went through similar things as him. He knew what it was like to be an orphan," Mike Quigley said, recalling his dad's habit of mixing table scraps with gravy and offering it to the dogs.

Mr. Quigley had a unique appreciation for food surpluses.

"When you're hungry, you'll eat anything," he recalled his father saying. "We'd be like, 'Yeah, right!' And he'd never elaborate, he'd just say, 'Trust me.'"

Mr. Quigley, who went by Bill, was starting his second year at Purdue University when he was drafted into the Army during the Korean War. He married Joan Louise Deputy in the chapel of a military training facility in Georgia; the couple celebrated their 67th wedding anniversary last June.

Mr. Quigley spent his post-military career working for AT&T as a supervising engineer. A promotion brought him to the Chicago area in 1967. He settled in Carol Stream. Upon retirement, he moved to Ottawa, Illinois, where he volunteered at a homeless shelter and served on the Ottawa Planning Commission.

His hobbies included chess and reading. He also built radios, stereos—and his family's first color TV.

He was also fanatical about the Indianapolis 500; he sported his checkered socks and stopwatches to the race on as many as 60 occasions.

"To me he represented a more realistic aspect of the American Dream. He did it all to put a roof over our heads and food on the table," Mike Quigley said.

"He came from less than nothing and he raised four kids. My accomplishments are a shadow compared to what he was able to do," he said.

In addition to his wife and children, Quigley is also survived by six grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

CLAIRE PFAFF

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Claire Pfaff for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Claire Pfaff is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Claire Pfaff is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Claire Pfaff for winning the Arvada Wheat

Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHRISTIAN
KNOP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize Christian Knop.

A senior at Alexandria High School in Alexandria, Alabama, won his 235th consecutive wrestling match this month to win the 195-pound weight class in Class 1A–5A.

Christian is the first wrestler to go undefeated and win four straight championships in the history of the Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA).

Christian is ranked third in the nation for wrestling and has not lost a match since he was in the 8th grade. Knop plans to attend and wrestle at N.C. State.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Christian Knop on such an awesome achievement and wish him the best of luck in North Carolina.

CELEBRATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the 200th anniversary of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. It is an honor to recognize a court with such a rich and impactful history at the heart of the American judiciary system.

The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois traces its roots back to Illinois' establishment. Nathaniel Pope, serving as the Territory of Illinois' Secretary from inception in 1809, became its Delegate to Congress in 1816. There, he worked tirelessly on part of the territory's eventual admission to the Union as the state of Illinois in 1818. As such, it was only a natural progression for him to be nominated and confirmed as the first Judge of its new District, bringing with him strong anti-slavery views.

Eventually, the United States District Court for the District of Illinois was subdivided into the Northern and Southern District Courts in 1855. The Northern District led by its first judge, Judge Thomas Drummond, continued the tradition of protecting the rights of all people. One such example, was through the sentencing of the abolitionist John Hossack, who had violated the Fugitive Slave Act by abetting a runaway slave. Judge Drummond, conflicted between his duty to the rule of law and his abolitionist conscience, recognized Hossack was guilty of breaking the law, but chose to hand down a minimal sentence for the transaction.

Even as the Civil War raged on, Judge Drummond balanced his sense of duty and patriotism, actively supporting the Union and President Lincoln while still defending the Chicago Times' right to freedom of speech and criticism.

Today the court exists as the Northern District of Illinois and is led by Chief Judge Rubén Castillo. It has grown considerably during its 200 years and now contains 22 judicial posts, ensuring further public and juris prudential access to its resources and rulings. I am grateful to the District Court and its people, for laws are useless without justice.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois on the 200th anniversary of the courts establishment. Through its celebration, we pay tribute not only to our institutions and the rule of law, but to our long-standing history of justice.

ANALENA SHAW

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Analena Shaw for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Analena Shaw is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Analena Shaw is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Analena Shaw for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING MARFAN
AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Americans affected by Marfan syndrome and related connective tissue conditions to recognize February as Marfan Awareness Month.

Marfan syndrome is a rare genetic condition. About 1 in 5,000 Americans carries a mutation in gene called fibrillin which results in an overproduction of a protein called transforming growth factor beta or TGFβ. The increased TGFβ impacts connective tissue and since connective tissue is found throughout the body, Marfan syndrome features can manifest throughout the body. Patients often have disproportionately long limbs, a protruding or indented chest bone, 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 heart is weakened and prone to enlargement and rupture, which can be fatal. It is for this reason that increased awareness of Marfan syndrome can save lives.

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.

MACEDONIAN MINORITY IN
GREECE

HON. PAUL MITCHELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, as a co-chair of the Congressional Macedonian Caucus and representative of one of the largest populations of Macedonian-Americans in the country, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article from the BBC entitled "Greece's invisible minority—the Macedonian Slavs". I'm dedicated to maintaining and strengthening a positive and mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and Macedonia, and urge my colleagues to join me in building and enhancing the cultural, economic, strategic, and governmental ties between our two nations.

[From the BBC News Stories, Feb. 24, 2019]

"GREECE'S INVISIBLE MINORITY—THE
MACEDONIAN SLAVS"

By ratifying an agreement with the newly renamed Republic of North Macedonia, Greece has implicitly recognised the existence of a Macedonian language and ethnicity. And yet it has denied the existence of its own Macedonian minority for decades, says Maria Margaronis. Will something now change?

Mr. Fokas, 92, stands straight as a spear in his tan leather brogues and cream blazer, barely leaning on the ebony and ivory cane brought from Romania by his grandfather a century ago. His mind and his memory are as sharp as his outfit.

A retired lawyer, Mr. Fokas speaks impeccable formal Greek with a distinctive lilt: his mother tongue is Macedonian, a Slavic language related to Bulgarian and spoken in this part of the Balkans for centuries. At his son's modern house in a village in northern Greece, he takes me through the painful history of Greece's unrecognised Slavic-speaking minority.

Mr. Fokas takes care to emphasise from the start that he is both an ethnic Macedonian and a Greek patriot. He has good reason

to underline his loyalty: for almost a century, ethnic Macedonians in Greece have been objects of suspicion and, at times, persecution, even as their presence has been denied by almost everyone. Most are reluctant to speak to outsiders about their identity. To themselves and others, they're known simply as "locals" (dopyi), who speak a language called "local" (dopya). They are entirely absent from school history textbooks, have not featured in censuses since 1951 (when they were only patchily recorded, and referred to simply as "Slavic-speakers"), and are barely mentioned in public. Most Greeks don't even know that they exist.

That erasure was one reason for Greece's long-running dispute with the former Yugoslav republic now officially called the Republic of North Macedonia. The dispute was finally resolved last month by a vote in the Greek parliament ratifying (by a majority of just seven) an agreement made last June by the countries' two prime ministers. When the Greek Prime Minister, Alexis Tsipras, referred during the parliamentary debate to the existence of "Slavomacedonians" in Greece—at the time of World War Two—he was breaking a long-standing taboo.

The use of the name "Macedonia" by the neighbouring nation state implicitly acknowledges that Macedonians are a people in their own right, and opens the door to hard questions about the history of Greece's own Macedonian minority.

When Mr. Fokas was born, the northern Greek region of Macedonia had only recently been annexed by the Greek state. Until 1913 it was part of the Ottoman Empire, with Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia all wooing its Slavic-speaking inhabitants as a means to claiming the territory. It was partly in reaction to those competing forces that a distinctive Slav Macedonian identity emerged in the late 19th and early 20th Century. As Mr. Fokas's uncle used to say, the family was "neither Serb, nor Greek, nor Bulgarian, but Macedonian Orthodox".

In the end, the Slav Macedonians found themselves divided between those three new states. In Greece, some were expelled; those who remained were pushed to assimilate. All villages and towns with non-Greek names were given new ones, chosen by a committee of scholars in the late 1920s, though almost a century later some "locals" still use the old ones.

In 1936, when Mr. Fokas was nine years old, the Greek dictator Ioannis Metaxas (an admirer of Mussolini) banned the Macedonian language, and forced Macedonian-speakers to change their names to Greek ones. Mr. Fokas remembers policemen eavesdropping on mourners at funerals and listening at windows to catch anyone speaking or singing in the forbidden tongue. There were lawsuits, threats and beatings.

Women—who often spoke no Greek—would cover their mouths with their headscarves to muffle their speech, but Mr. Fokas's mother was arrested and fined 250 drachmas, a big sum back then.

"Slavic-speakers suffered a lot from the Greeks under Metaxas," he says. "Twenty people from this village, the heads of the big families, were exiled to the island of Chios. My father-in-law was one of them." They were tortured by being forced to drink castor oil, a powerful laxative.

When Germany, Italy and Bulgaria invaded Greece in 1941, some Slavic-speakers welcomed the Bulgarians as potential liberators from Metaxas's repressive regime. But many soon joined the resistance, led by the Communist Party (which at that time supported the Macedonian minority) and continued fighting with the Communists in the civil war that followed the Axis occupation. (Bulgaria annexed the eastern part of Greek Mac-

edonia from 1941 to 1944, committing many atrocities; many Greeks wrongly attribute these to Macedonians, whom they identify as Bulgarians.)

When the Communists were finally defeated, severe reprisals followed for anyone associated with the resistance or the left.

"Macedonians paid more than anyone for the civil war," Mr. Fokas says. "Eight people were court-martialled and executed from this village, eight from the next village, 23 from the one opposite. They killed a grandfather and his grandson, just 18 years old."

Mr. Fokas was a student in Thessaloniki then—but he too was arrested and spent three years on the prison island of Makronisos, not because of anything he'd done but because his mother had helped her brother-in-law escape through the skylight of a cafe where he was being held.

Most of the prisoners on Makronisos were Greek leftists, and were pressed to sign declarations of repentance for their alleged Communist past. Those who refused were made to crawl under barbed wire, or beaten with thick bamboo canes. "Terrible things were done," Mr. Fokas says. "But we mustn't talk about them. It's an insult to Greek civilisation. It harms Greece's good name."

Tens of thousands of fighters with the Democratic Army, about half of them Slavic-speakers, went into exile in Eastern bloc countries during and after the civil war. About 20,000 children were taken across the border by the Communists, whether for their protection or as reserve troops for a future counter-attack.

Many Slavic-speaking civilians also went north for safety. Entire villages were left empty, like the old settlement of Krystallopigi (Smrdes in Macedonian) near the Albanian border, where only the imposing church of St. George stands witness to a population that once numbered more than 1,500 souls.

In 1982, more than 30 years after the conflict's end, Greece's socialist government issued a decree allowing civil war refugees to return—but only those who were "of Greek ethnicity". Ethnic Macedonians from Greece remained shut out of their country, their villages and their land; families separated by the war were never reunited.

Mr. Fokas's father-in-law and brother-in-law both died in Skopje. But, he points out, that decree tacitly recognised that there were ethnic Macedonians in Greece, even though the state never officially recognised their existence: "Those war refugees left children, grandchildren, fathers, mothers behind. What were they, if not Macedonians?"

It's impossible accurately to calculate the number of Slavic-speakers or descendants of ethnic Macedonians in Greece. Historian Leonidas Embricos estimates that more than 100,000 still live in the Greek region of Macedonia, though only 10,000 to 20,000 would identify openly as members of a minority—and many others are proud Greek nationalists.

The Macedonian language hasn't officially been banned in Greece for decades, but the fear still lingers. A middle-aged man I met in a village near the reed beds of Lake Prespa, where the agreement between Greece and the North Macedonian republic was first signed last June, explained that this fear is passed down through the generations. "My parents didn't speak the language at home in case I picked it up and spoke it in public. To protect me. We don't even remember why we're afraid any more," he said. Slowly the language is dying. Years of repression pushed it indoors; assimilation is finishing the job.

And yet speaking or singing in Macedonian can still be cause for harassment. Mr. Fokas's son is a musician; he plays the haunting

Macedonian flute for us as his own small son looks on. He and a group of friends used to host an international music festival in the village square, with bands from as far away as Brazil, Mexico and Russia.

"After those bands had played we'd have a party and play Macedonian songs," he says. "None of them were nationalist or separatist songs—we would never allow that. But in 2008, just as we were expecting the foreign musicians to arrive, the local authority suddenly banned us from holding the festival in the square, even though other people—the very ones who wanted us banned—still hold their own events there."

At the last minute, the festival was moved to a field outside the village, among the reeds and marshes, without proper facilities—which, Mr. Fokas's son points out, only made Greece look bad.

"And do you know why the songs are banned in the square but not the fields outside?" his father adds. "Because around the square there are cafes, and local people could sit there and watch and listen secretly. But outside the village they were afraid to join in—they would have drawn attention to themselves by doing that."

The ratification of Greece's agreement with the Republic of North Macedonia—and its implicit recognition of a Macedonian language and ethnicity—is a major political breakthrough which should help to alleviate such fears. But the process has also sparked new waves of anger and anxiety, with large, sometimes violent protests opposing the agreement, supported by parts of the Orthodox church.

An election is due before the end of the year. Greece's right-wing opposition has been quick to capitalise on nationalist sentiments, accusing the Syriza government of treason and betrayal. For Greece's Slavic-speakers, who have long sought nothing more than the right to cultural expression, the time to emerge from the shadows may not quite yet have arrived.

Mr. Fokas has been referred to by his first name to protect his identity.

ISAAC HINOJOS VENEGAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Isaac Hinojos Venegas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Isaac Hinojos Venegas is a student at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Isaac Hinojos Venegas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Isaac Hinojos Venegas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COREY ADAMS SEARCHLIGHT ACT

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, this week, I introduced the Corey Adams Searchlight Act and I rise to urge my colleagues to support this legislation which would establish a national Green Alert system at the Department of Justice to provide assistance and support to regional, state, and local officials as they work to help locate missing veterans.

This legislation is a practical step toward bringing missing veterans home safely.

This issue was brought to my attention by my constituent Corey Adams. When Corey went missing, his family knew that something was wrong—Corey left his eyeglasses, phone, money, and medications at his parent's home, where he was last seen. Despite his family filing a missing person report within hours of his disappearance, it took eight days before the police determined he met the critical missing persons' criteria. On April 7, 18 days after his initial disappearance, Corey Adams' body was recovered from a pond in a local park just one mile from his mother's home.

After this tragedy, my state of Wisconsin became the first state to create a green alert system modeled after the "Amber" alert system which has proven effective at galvanizing public attention around abducted children. And the system has already been used to help locate missing veterans. Delaware quickly followed and more and more states may follow yet.

I would like to thank the bipartisan cosponsors that have joined in this effort so far, Representative FILEMON VELA, RAÚL GRIJALVA, DEREK KILMER, FREDERICA S. WILSON, HANK JOHNSON, JOHN R. MOOLENAAR, DONALD M. PAYNE, JR., DAN KILDEE, MARK POCAN, RON KIND, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, STEVE COHEN, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and DEBBIE DINGELL. The bill has also garnered the endorsement of Rolling Thunder National, Inc.

Madam Speaker, members of the military do not leave their fallen behind in battle and we should not do so when they come home. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation and to work with me to see that it is enacted in the 116th Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, on Monday, February 25, 2019 and Tuesday, February 26, 2019, I was unable to be present for recorded votes due to a doctor's appointment. Had I been present for these votes, I would have voted: "yes" on roll call vote No. 88 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 539); "yes" on roll call vote No. 89 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 276); "yes" on roll call vote No. 90 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 145); "yes" on roll call vote No. 91 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 145); "yes" on

roll call vote No. 92 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 144); and "yes" on roll call vote No. 93 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 144).

CONGRATULATING THE BLAIR OAKS FOR WINNING THE 2018 MISSOURI CLASS 2 STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Blair Oaks Falcons Football team for winning the 2018 Missouri Class 2 State Football Championship.

With a perfect record of 15–0, the Blair Oaks Falcons Football team and coaching staff should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

Please join me in congratulating the coaching staff: Ted Lepage, assistant coaches: Kevin Alewine, Lerone Biggs, John Butler, Mike Cook, Josh Linnenbrink, Mason Swisher, Andrew Terpstra, manager: Ben Stockman, and the players Kamron Morriss, Jayden Purdy, Nolan Hair, Gavin Wekenborg, Seth DeWesplore, Cade Stockman, Zach Herigon, Cobi Marble, Carson Prenger, Sam Luebbering, Jake Closser, Ian Nolph, Braydan Pritchett, Riley Lentz, Cadon Garber, Levi Haney, Josh Bischoff, Hayden Ellis, Adam Hughes, Zach Goeller, Trinity Scott, Griffin Herst, Kyler Griep, Adam Jurgensmeyer, Collin Brannum, Jordan Keesler, Nico Canale, Conner Wilson, Nolan Atnip, John Benward, Zack Wilbers, Carson Bax, Cale Wilson, Caleb Buechter, James Thomson, Austin Lange, Corban Bonnett, Shane Gillmore, Andrew Luebbering, Rylee Niekamp, Benner Thomas, Ayden Chouinard, Isaiah Prenger, Grant Laune, and Marcus Edler on their dedication to the game and focus throughout the season.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Blair Oaks Falcons Football team for a job well done.

FEBRUARY IS NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH MONTH

HON. ROBIN L. KELLY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, February is National Children's Dental Health month—an opportunity that brings together thousands of dedicated professionals, healthcare providers, and educators to promote the benefits of good oral health to children, their caregivers, teachers and many others.

Each year, millions of Americans suffer from untreated dental disease. Tooth decay remains the most common, chronic childhood disease. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, about 20 percent of children ages 5 to 11 suffer from tooth decay, despite the fact that it is a completely prevent-

able disease. Children from low-income families are twice as likely to have cavities compared to children from higher-income households.

Give Kids A Smile (GKAS), sponsored by the Foundation of the American Dental Association, is an annual centerpiece during National Children's Dental Health Month. Give Kids A Smile Day is one of the most important events for children and dentists in this country. Thousands of dentists and volunteers give their time to provide free oral health education, screenings, and treatment to underserved children. Since 2003, more than 5.5 million children have been cared for by more than half a million volunteers. Programs like this will continue throughout the year.

I'm happy to have led the passage of legislation that supports programs such as Give Kids A Smile and other initiatives aimed at providing greater access to care. The Action for Dental Health Act supports a nationwide, community-based movement focused on delivering care now to people suffering from dental disease, strengthening and growing the public and private safety net to provide more care to more Americans, and expanding dental health education and disease prevention within underserved communities.

Ensuring that children and adults receive accessible, quality oral health care should remain a priority for all of us. Thank you for supporting dentistry and the oral health of our nation's most vulnerable population.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HONORABLE PAUL K. LEARY

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the life of the Honorable Paul K. Leary, who led a life committed to justice as well as improving the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Born in Boston in 1939, Judge Leary spent his entire life in Massachusetts. After graduating from Suffolk Law School, Judge Leary worked in the Boston Municipal Court system. He then moved on to become First Assistant District Attorney for the Suffolk County District Attorney's office. Judge Leary ended his career as First Justice of the Boston Municipal court, where he started his career at the age of sixteen.

Alongside his jobs in the Suffolk County District Attorney's office and the Boston municipal court, Judge Leary taught at Suffolk University Law School and lectured at New England School of Law. He served for a period as the President of the National Board of Trial Advocacy and was awarded their Lifetime Achievement Award in July of last year.

Judge Leary was a dedicated family man and a staple in his community. He coached his son's youth hockey team in Milton all the way to the state championship in 1980. Judge Leary spent his summers in Pocasset, where he could be found with family and friends, playing golf or racquetball, or having dinner at one of his favorite local restaurants.

Judge Leary has led a life dedicated to justice and upholding the laws of Massachusetts.

He not only held positions in the judicial system for most of his life, Judge Leary utilized his expertise to educate the next generation of lawyers.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the life of the Honorable Paul K. Leary. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing his commitment to justice and the people of Massachusetts.

HONORING VICTIMS OF SUMGAIT POGROM

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 31st anniversary of the pogrom against the Armenian residents of the town of Sumgait, Azerbaijan. On February 27, 1988, and for three days following, Azerbaijani mobs assaulted and killed Armenians. The violence left hundreds of Armenian civilians dead and injured, women and girls were raped, and some victims were burned alive. Thousands were forced to flee their homes, leaving behind their belongings.

The pogroms came as a direct result of years of vicious, racist anti-Armenian propaganda by Azerbaijani authorities, dehumanizing the Armenian residents of Azerbaijan and laying the groundwork for mass violence. Azerbaijani authorities made little effort to punish those responsible, instead attempting to cover up the atrocities in Sumgait to this day and denying the government role in instigating the killings. Indeed, even today, racist propaganda against Armenia and Armenians is prevalent in Azerbaijan.

The hateful and dangerous Azerbaijani attacks on Armenians is also seen in a horrific crime which occurred 15 years ago last week. At a NATO sponsored training in Budapest, an Azerbaijani Army officer named Ramil Safarov snuck into the room of an Armenian lieutenant, Gurgen Margaryan, and hacked him to death with an axe as he slept.

For this brutal and despicable crime, Safarov was sentenced to life imprisonment in Hungary. Yet after a determined campaign by Azerbaijan's government, he was extradited to Baku in 2012 where he was greeted not as a criminal but as a hero, provided back pay, and promoted in rank. There is no more dramatic illustration of Azerbaijan's continued posture of hatred and aggression towards their Armenian neighbor than their celebration of a cold-blooded murderer.

The assault on ethnic Armenian civilians in Sumgait helped touch off what would become a direct conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan which took thousands of lives and displaced millions more. The anniversary of Sumgait is a reminder of the consequences when aggression and hatred grow unchecked.

Madam Speaker, in two months we will mark the 104th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, an event the Turkish government, Azerbaijan's closest ally, goes to great lengths to deny. We must not let such crimes against humanity go unrecognized, whether they occurred yesterday or 30 years ago or 100 years ago. Today, let us pause to remember the victims of the atrocities of the Sumgait pogroms. Madam Speaker, it is our moral obligation to

condemn crimes of hatred and to remember the victims, in hope that history will not be repeated.

RECOGNIZING NACDS RxIMPACT DAY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill that is coming up next week. This is a special day where we will have the chance to recognize the pharmacy industry's many contributions to the American healthcare system.

Organized by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores (NACDS), this event will take place on March 5-6, 2019. More than 400 individuals from all 50 states representing the pharmacy community—including practicing pharmacists, pharmacy school faculty and students, state pharmacy association representatives, and pharmacy company leaders—will be on Capitol Hill. They will visit every House and Senate office to share their views with us about the importance of supporting their access agenda—legislative priorities that will ensure that our constituents will continue to have access to more than 40,000 community and neighborhood pharmacies across the country and be better able to utilize pharmacists to improve healthcare quality while reducing the cost of care.

Local pharmacists are important community leaders, who are trusted by their patients to efficiently provide high quality, convenient healthcare services. And as demand for healthcare services continues to grow, pharmacists are stepping in to fill gaps in healthcare delivery by partnering with physicians, nurses, and other healthcare providers to address the unmet need. Moreover, pharmacists continually innovate to provide unique services that improve overall patient health and wellness.

Further, in many communities the local pharmacist is a patient's most direct healthcare access point. This is particularly true in rural areas. In fact, 91 percent of Americans live within five miles of a community pharmacy. These pharmacies bring value to their communities by providing care to those who need it most—older Americans and those who manage chronic conditions, particularly in rural and underserved areas. In addition, pharmacists frequently work with patients to navigate specific pharmacy benefits and the use of generic substitutions to identify strategies to save money. Pharmacists also ensure medications are administered appropriately, and offer other preventative services that help improve patients overall wellbeing and quality of life.

The pharmacy advocates attending NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill will be educating members on their access agenda. As we debate the future of healthcare, the pharmacy community wishes to work with us to help develop solutions that put pharmacy's value to work for patients and payers. Specifically, NACDS's advocates will be seeking our support for policies that will help address prescription drug affordability and transparency through much-needed reform to DIR fees, a

complicated fee structure imposed on pharmacies to participate in the Medicare Part D program. They will also highlight proposals designed to address the opioid epidemic.

I believe Congress should work with the 2019 NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill advocates to advance policies that support pharmacists in their effort to improve care, increase access, and lower costs.

RECOGNIZING DANNY RUSSELL

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Danny Russell, the morning show host on WMKR in Taylorville, Illinois, who is leaving the broadcasting industry after 40 years.

Local media is so important to our communities and Danny's service is a prime example of this.

Danny graduated from the radio-tv program at Lewis and Clark Community College in Godfrey and spent 17 years as the weekend weathercaster for WICS-TV Channel 20 in Springfield.

His career has included stints at several Springfield radio stations and in 2011, he joined the Miller Media Group to become the Morning Show host on WMKR Genuine Country 94.3.

Additionally, Danny has been the Miller Media Group production director, host of the Saturday Retro Request Show and the "Brown Bag Rewind" show. He has also broadcast live from countless events thru-out central Illinois over his nearly 8 years with Miller Media Group.

I congratulate Danny on 40 years of success in the broadcasting industry, and I wish him well on his next chapter.

SUPPORTING GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGISLATION

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act and H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act. Both pieces of legislation would close deadly loopholes in federal law to increase public safety. I am proud to co-lead these important initiatives to reduce gun violence.

H.R. 8, which would require background checks on all firearm purchases, is a common sense measure that will help keep our children and communities safe. This is particularly important with the rise of internet and gun show sales, where prohibited purchasers can easily skirt the law to obtain deadly firearms. This bill would also reduce firearms trafficking through secondary sales and enhance law enforcement's ability to trace firearms used in a crime.

Similarly, H.R. 1112 would increase public safety by giving background check operators sufficient time to complete background checks.

While roughly 90 percent of background checks on gun sales are completed immediately, a small amount requires additional time for operators to discern whether a purchaser is prohibited from buying a firearm. However, under current law, if a background check is not completed within three business days, the sale can proceed. This loophole allows thousands of prohibited purchasers each year—including the shooter in Charleston, South Carolina—from obtaining guns without the completion of a background check.

H.R. 1112 would keep everyday citizens safe by keeping firearms out of the hands of prohibited purchasers. It would also protect law enforcement by reducing the need for ATF agents to retrieve guns from individuals who shouldn't have been allowed to purchase them.

While there is no single measure that will completely eliminate gun violence, these bills take crucial steps towards reducing it. They also protect the rights of law abiding gun owners. I am proud to support these pieces of legislation and encourage my colleagues to do so.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, yesterday had I been present, I would have voted in strong support of S. 47, the Natural Resources Management Act. I was detained due to severe weather and cancelled flights in Oregon.

S. 47 is a compilation of approximately 100 public lands and natural resources bills. One of the main provisions would provide permanent authorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which I strongly support.

Also included in this essential legislation are three provisions that I authored to protect critical salmon and steelhead habitats in southwestern Oregon and designate more than 30,000 acres of public land as Wilderness.

H.R. 994, the Chetco River Protection Act, would prohibit new mining claims on various rivers and creeks in Southwestern Oregon. The waters protected by this legislation supply clean drinking water to thousands of residents of Southwest Oregon and Northwest California and are critical salmon habitat.

H.R. 999, the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Act, would permanently protect Devil's Staircase, a remote, unspoiled area in the Coast Range. The legislation would designate approximately 30,500 acres of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands as Wilderness. In addition, this legislation designates approximately 14.4 miles of the Wasson and Franklin Creeks, which support native Coho and Chinook salmon, trout, and steelhead runs, as Wild and Scenic Rivers.

H.R. 1056, the Frank and Jeanne Moore Wild Steelhead Special Management Area Designation Act, would designate almost 100,000 acres of public land in the Steamboat Creek Watershed in the Umpqua National Forest that is vitally important steelhead habitat. The legislation would honor Frank and Jeanne Moore's lifelong efforts to protect the North Umpqua River and its tributaries.

The lands protected in these bills are some of the most beautiful, pristine, and ecologically-diverse areas in Oregon. To leave these areas unprotected would be to subject them to pollution and mining, endanger drinking water for thousands of families, and devastate local recreation economies.

I am proud that Congress overwhelmingly passed this legislation and that President Trump is expected to sign this important legislation into law.

HONORING GRANT THOMPSON

HON. ANN KIRKPATRICK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Grant Thompson, a 14 year-old in my district who found a glitch in Apple's FaceTime software that allowed iPhones to be turned into spying devices. He is a Freshman at Catalina Foothills High School whose interest in technology put him in a position to discover this critical flaw.

The flaw Grant discovered allowed a user to be eavesdropped on before they actually accepted a call. Before his discovery, I'm sure millions of Americans used the app completely unaware of this very serious security and privacy violation. But Grant, his sister, and his mom took initiative to ensure this vulnerability was addressed, and for that, we should all be grateful.

Grant is a lot like other freshmen—he spends time on Instagram, he plays Fortnite, and obviously, he enjoys FaceTiming with his friends. He is a humble young man who told me that he and his sister Lauren simply stumbled across the flaw. His mother, Michele Thompson, supported her son and reached out to Apple so that the flaw could be fixed, which Apple promptly did. Michele is rightfully proud of her son, and I am too.

Grant's future is bright. I hear he dreams of one day being involved in a STEM-related industry, and I have no doubt that with hard work and his natural technology skills his dreams will one day become a reality.

I thank Grant, Lauren, and Michele for protecting the privacy of people around the world. I also want to thank Apple for listening to the Thompson family and for rewarding Grant's work with an investment in his future. Arizona's 2nd Congressional District is excited to watch Grant grow and thrive.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF BENJAMIN CAMACHO PALACIOS

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Command Sergeant Major Benjamin Camacho Palacios. Mr. Palacios was a Retired U.S. Army Command Sergeant Major and will be fondly remembered for his many outstanding contributions and accomplishments throughout his military and civilian career.

A dedicated public servant, Mr. Palacios became one of the most senior noncommis-

sioned officers serving with various commands both in the U.S. and overseas. Primarily serving in leadership positions within the Armor Career Management Field, he eventually assumed duty as the United States Army Forces Command Sergeant Major on July 27, 1998. He was the Army's senior ranking enlisted Soldier in Korea when he was honored with the South Korean Order of National Security Merit Gwanbok Medal. Command Sergeant Major Palacios was the first enlisted soldier to receive the medal since the end of the Korean War. He was also the only person who served over five terms on the Department of Veteran Affairs Congressional Committee Mandated Advisory Committee for Minority Veterans (ACMV).

On Guam and the Marianas, the personal accomplishments and success of native sons and daughters are celebrated and adopted as triumphs for everyone in the community. I am deeply saddened by the passing of Command Sergeant Major Palacios and I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life and legacy. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, loved ones, and friends. Command Sergeant Major Palacios will be deeply missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2019

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the bipartisan National Resources Management Act. Congress has not enacted a public lands package of this scale since 2009, and passage of this bill will mark a major milestone for the conservation and future of America's public lands. This bill will permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund, designate over 1 million acres of wilderness, and protect over 1 million acres of land from destructive practices.

I have supported the Land and Water Conservation Fund for many years and since its creation, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped preserve America's outdoors heritage by supporting anglers and outdoor recreation for families in every state. Wisconsin alone has received \$211 million in LWCF funding over the past five decades, helping to protect the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest, Ice Age National Scenic Trail, and North Country National Scenic Trail.

I am proud that the package includes the Migratory Birds of the Americas Conservation Act, which reauthorizes the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to help conserve migratory birds in rapid decline in Wisconsin and throughout the country. The Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act provides more than \$66 million in grants to support long term conservation, research, and habitat protection of migratory birds.

As the founder and co-chair of the National Parks Caucus and longtime member of the Congressional Wildlife Refuge Caucus and Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I am proud to support this legislation.

H.R. 4, THE VOTING RIGHTS
ADVANCEMENT ACT**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 4, The Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA). The VRAA restores the protections and enforcement of the Voting Rights Act (VRA) to its former strength after being gutted by the 2013 Shelby County v. Holder Supreme Court decision. The VRAA responds to the wave of voter suppression tactics enacted by states and localities since that decision, requiring states with a recent history of voter discrimination to seek federal preclearance for election changes.

Voting is the cornerstone of our democracy and the fundamental right upon which all our civil liberties rest. In the previous two elections, we have seen an unprecedented increase in the engagement of voter suppression tactics. Specifically, in my home state of Texas, there have been ongoing suppression efforts, such as including additional obstacles for voter registration, cutbacks on early voting, and stricter voter identification requirements.

The VRAA will counteract these unfair practices by requiring a nationwide, practice-based preclearance for “known discriminatory practices,” such as the creation of at-large districts, inadequate multilingual voting materials and cuts to polling places. The VRAA will also increase transparency by requiring reasonable public notice for voting changes. Finally, the bill will allow the Attorney General authority to request federal observers to be present anywhere in the country where a serious threat to voter access and fair elections exists.

The reality is that we continue to see a number of significant obstacles to the free and fair exercise of the right to vote. Congress must do everything in its power to ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to exercise their constitutional right to vote. I support this critical legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill as well.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I would have voted “yes” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 995, as amended, which was considered on Wednesday, February 13, 2019.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY LEE JONES

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man of faith, Henry Lee Jones. He was a husband, father, grandfather and entrepreneur from the Fourth Congressional

District of Wisconsin. Henry Lee Jones was born on July 19, 1943 in Aberdeen, Mississippi to the union of Elloyd and Rohdana Jones and passed away on February 18, 2019.

Mr. Jones moved to Milwaukee in his late teens and was employed by A. O. Smith as a welder for 12 years. In 1975, Henry and Bobbie's Bungalow was established on the corners of 14th Street and Keefe Avenue in Milwaukee. The restaurant featured specialties such as a variety of soul food, BBQ seafood and scrumptious desserts. The Bungalow's signature dessert is peach cobbler.

The Bungalow Restaurant provided catering services to many individuals in the community, as well as businesses and organizations. One of the most famous organizations he catered to was the Green Bay Packer franchise. In fact, as quoted in the Shepherd Express Newspaper, “The authenticity of Bungalow's Southern-styled menu heavy on pork, chicken, beef and fish has even captured the attention of the Green Bay Packers. Members of the Green & Gold have had Bungalow employees truck their soulful grub to Green Bay for many years now. Whether ordered from Lambeau Field or the Bungalow's cozy brick building, options abound. You'll find relatively rare dishes such as oxtails and smoked ham hocks in addition to more common fare like fried chicken, steak and catfish. And though the Bungalow staff takes pride in making healthy meat and sides, including yams, turnip greens and okra, one can still order “gravy, gravy and more gravy.” Even if you don't spot a Packer on a day you visit this establishment, you can still enjoy the many autographed photos on the walls.

As a successful entrepreneur, he was inspired to expand his business to other locations across the city of Milwaukee and Kenosha. He was never a complainer but rather a doer. Mr. Jones' children share his passion and continue to carry on his legacy and business.

He married Bobbie Jones on July 29, 1967 and their union was blessed with 5 sons: Henry, Jr., Milton, Rodney, Demetrius and Laval. Henry was preceded in death by his parents. He leaves many family and friends to cherish his memory including his wife Bobbie Jones and Children: Mitch Malone, Richard Jones, Henry Jones Jr., Milton Jones. Demetrius (Nichole) Jones and Laval Jones; Sisters: Dorothy (John) Williams, Delores Tools, Elloyd (Parline) Jones, Yvonne Jones; Grandchildren: Latoya (Emmanuel) Amoah, Deaquann Forrest, Vegas Jones, Naytasha Jones, Xavier Jones, Corey Malone, Britany Malone, Marcus Malone and Cortez Malone; 6 great grandchildren and a host of nieces, nephews and other relatives.

Henry had a significant impact on the community who not only enjoyed his cooking but his loving and joking spirit as well. He was a pillar of the community, the patriarch of his family. I have known Mr. Jones for over 30 years, well before I began my legislative career and he was my friend. He has made a positive impact on Milwaukee and it is truly an honor for me to pay homage to someone who has contributed so much to Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons I rise to pay tribute to a man whose legacy will continue to benefit the Fourth Congressional District.

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 Thursday, February 28, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States European Command and United States Transportation Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the electricity sector in a changing climate.

SD-366

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

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on United States European Command and United States Transportation Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SVC-217

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Joseph V. Cuffari, of Arizona, to be Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342

- Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition
Policy and Consumer Rights
To hold hearings to examine concentra-
tion and competition in the United
States economy. SD-226
- 3 p.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To receive a closed briefing on the status
of the North Korea denuclearization ef-
fort post-Hanoi. SVC-217
- MARCH 6
- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and
Governmental Affairs
To hold a hearing to examine rec-
ommendations to reduce risk of waste,
fraud, and mismanagement in Federal
programs. SD-342
- Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine the complex
web of prescription drug prices, focus-
ing on patients struggling with rising
costs. SD-138
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and
Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the state of
the American maritime industry. SH-216
- Committee on Environment and Public
Works
To hold hearings to examine the eco-
nomic benefits of highway infrastruc-
ture investment and accelerated
project delivery. SD-406
- Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nomina-
tions of John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to
be Ambassador to the Kingdom of
Saudi Arabia, and Matthew H. Tueller,
of Utah, to be Ambassador to the Re-
- public of Iraq, both of the Department
of State. SD-419
- Committee on the Judiciary
To hold an oversight hearing to examine
Customs and Border Protection's re-
sponse to the smuggling of persons at
the southern border. SD-226
- Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold a joint hearing with the House
Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ex-
amine the legislative presentation of
the Veterans of Foreign Wars. SD-G50
- 10:30 a.m.
Committee on Rules and Administration
To hold an oversight hearing to examine
the Library of Congress. SR-301
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
To hold hearings to examine the military
services' prevention of and response to
sexual assault. SR-222
- Committee on Small Business and Entre-
preneurship
To hold hearings to examine small busi-
ness and the American worker. SR-428A
- MARCH 7
- 9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the chain of
command's accountability to provide
safe military housing and other build-
ing infrastructure to servicemembers
and their families. SH-216
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investiga-
tions
To hold hearings to examine private sec-
tor data breaches. SD-106
- Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine the complex
web of prescription drug prices, focus-
ing on untangling the web and paths
forward. SD-138
- 2 p.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold a joint hearing with the House
Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ex-
amine the legislative presentation of
multiple veterans service organiza-
tions. SD-G50
- MARCH 12
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold a joint hearing with the House
Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ex-
amine the legislative presentation of
multiple veterans service organiza-
tions. SD-G50
- MARCH 13
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine
Indian programs on the Government
Accountability Office High Risk List. SD-628
- MARCH 14
- 10 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor,
Health and Human Services, and Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine the Ebola
outbreak in the Democratic Republic
of the Congo and other emerging
health threats. SD-124

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1497–S1553

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 573–591, and S. Res. 80–84. **Pages S1539–40**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing Expenditures by Committees of the Senate: Senate agreed to S. Res. 70, authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019, October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020, and October 1, 2020 through February 28, 2021.

Page S1519

Enrollment Correction: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 21, directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 47.

Page S1519

University of Nebraska-Lincoln 150th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 82, recognizing the 150th anniversary of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Page S1527

American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 83, designating February 2019 as “American Heart Month” and February 1, 2019, as “National Wear Red Day”.

Page S1546

Black History Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 84, celebrating Black History Month. **Page S1546**

Wheeler Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. **Pages S1509–34**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. EX. 32), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1510**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, all post-cloture time on the nomination of Andrew Wheeler be considered expired at 12:30 p.m., on Thursday, February 28, 2019; with the

time between 12 noon and 12:30 p.m., equally divided in the usual form; that the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, be withdrawn, and that following disposition of the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of John L. Ryder, with the time until 1:45 p.m., equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, and that at 1:45 p.m., Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of John L. Ryder, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S1534**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, February 28, 2019. **Page S1546**

Steff Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the nomination of Ian Paul Steff, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, be referred jointly to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation. **Page S1534**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 83 yeas to 15 nays (Vote No. EX. 31), Michael J. Desmond, of California, to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury.

Pages S1497–S1509, S1553

Messages from the House: **Page S1538**

Measures Referred: **Page S1538**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1538–39**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1539**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1540–41**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1541–45**

Additional Statements: **Page S1538**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S1545–46**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1546**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—32) **Pages S1509–10**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, February 28, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1546.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DOD CYBER OPERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity received a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations from B. Edwin Wilson, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Cyber Policy, Office of the Under Secretary for Policy, Rear Admiral William E. Chase, III, USN, Deputy Director, Command, Control, Communications, and Computers/Cyber, Joint Staff, J–6, and Captain Scott Asack, USN, Acting Deputy Director, Global Operations, Joint Staff, J–39, all of the Department of Defense.

MILITARY FAMILY READINESS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded an oversight hearing to examine military personnel policies and military family readiness, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Thomas C. Seamands, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–1, Vice Admiral Robert P. Burke, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, N–1, Lieutenant General Brian T. Kelly, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel and Services, Lieutenant General Michael A. Rocco, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Sergeant Major Daniel A. Dailey, USA, Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Officer Russell L. Smith, USN, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant Kaleth O. Wright, USAF, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, and Sergeant Major Ronald L. Green, USMC, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Budget Control Act, focusing on a review of cap-adjusted spending, after receiving testimony from Theresa Gullo, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis, Congressional Budget Office.

Also, committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 116th Congress.

FEDERAL DATA PRIVACY FRAMEWORK

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine policy

principles for a Federal data privacy framework in the United States, after receiving testimony from Jon Leibowitz, 21st Century Privacy Coalition, Michael Beckerman, Internet Association, Brian A. Dodge, Retail Industry Leaders Association, and Victoria Espinel, BSA—The Software Alliance, all of Washington, D.C.; Randall Rothenberg, Interactive Advertising Bureau, New York, New York; and Woodrow Hartzog, Northeastern University School of Law and Khoury College of Computer Sciences, Boston, Massachusetts.

UTILIZING SIGNIFICANT EMISSIONS WITH INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing 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, after receiving testimony from Paul Sukut, Basin Electric Power Cooperative, Bismarck, North Dakota; Steve Oldham, Carbon Engineering, Squamish, Canada; and Kurt Waltzer, Clean Air Task Force, Boston, Massachusetts.

U.S. ROLE IN THE WORLD

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine assessing the role of the United States in the world, after receiving testimony from Stephen J. Hadley, former National Security Advisor, and William J. Burns, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, both of Washington, D.C.

PROTECTING THE ELECTRIC GRID

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting the electric grid from an electromagnetic pulse or geomagnetic disturbance, after receiving testimony from Karen S. Evans, Assistant Secretary of Energy, Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response; Brian Harrell, Assistant Director for Infrastructure Security, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Nathan Anderson, Acting Director, Government Accountability Office; Joseph McClelland, Director, Office of Energy Infrastructure Security, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Scott I. Aaronson, Edison Electric Institute, and Randy Horton, Electric Power Research Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; David W. Roop, Dominion Energy, Richmond, Virginia; Jim Vespalec, American Transmission Company, Waukesha, Wisconsin; George H. Baker, Foundation for Resilient Societies, Dayton, Virginia; Justin Kasper, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; and Caitlin Durkovich, Toffer Associates, Arlington, Virginia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, and John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, both to be an Assistant Secretary, Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training, all of the Department of Labor, Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, Janet Dhillon, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Mary Anne Carter, of Tennessee, to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, William I. Althen, of Virginia, and Arthur R. Traynor III, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

ADMINISTRATION FOR NATIVE AMERICANS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the 45th anniversary of

the Native American Programs Act and the establishment of the Administration for Native Americans, after receiving testimony from Jean Hovland, Commissioner, Administration for Native Americans, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; Joseph M. Socobasin, Passamaquoddy Tribe at Indian Township, Indian Township, Maine; Brian Vallo, Pueblo of Acoma, Acoma, New Mexico; and Joe James, Yurok Tribe, Klamath, California.

FUTURE OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the future of American industry, including S. 2, to safeguard certain technology and intellectual property in the United States from export to or influence by the People's Republic of China and to protect United States industry from unfair competition by the People's Republic of China, after receiving testimony from Brad W. Setser, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York; Robert D. Atkinson, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, and Bonnie S. Glaser, Center for Strategic and International Studies, both of Washington, D.C.; and Andrew Rush, Made in Space, Inc., Jacksonville, Florida.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 33 public bills, H.R. 1384–1416; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 22; and H. Res. 153–156, were introduced.

Pages H2269–71

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H2273

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cárdenas to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H2237

Recess: The House recessed at 10:26 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H2240

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Father Philip G. Salois, American Legion National Chaplain, North Smithfield, RI.

Page H2240

Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019: The House passed H.R. 8, to require a background check

for every firearm sale, by a yea-and-nay vote of 240 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 99.

Pages H2242–63

Agreed to the Collins (GA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 98. Subsequently, Representative Nadler reported the bill back to the House with the amendment and the amendment was agreed to.

Pages H2260–62

Pursuant to the Rule, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–5, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill.

Page H2254

Agreed to:

Dean amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–14) that clarifies that the exemption from the background check requirement in instances of

imminent threats of death or great bodily harm would apply to someone who is at risk of committing suicide; **Pages H2256–57**

Van Drew amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–14) that clarifies that the exception for gifts and loans of firearms between parents and their children applies to step-parents and step-children; and **Pages H2258–59**

Kendra Horn (OK) amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–14) that clarifies that “great bodily harm” includes domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse (by a recorded vote of 310 ayes to 119 noes, Roll No. 97). **Pages H2257–58, H2260**

Rejected:

Lesko amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–14) that sought to allow the transfer of firearms to individuals who participate in the TSA Pre-Check program of the Department of Homeland Security (by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 96). **Pages H2254–56, H2259**

H. Res. 145, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 8) and (H.R. 1112) was agreed to yesterday, February 26th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, February 28th. **Page H2263**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2259, H2260, H2262, and H2263. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Committee Meetings

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a business meeting on 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. The Committee adopted its Budget Views and Estimates letter for 2020.

THE STATE OF THE RURAL ECONOMY

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The State of the Rural Economy”. Testimony was heard from Sonny Perdue, Secretary, Department of Agriculture.

ELECTION SECURITY: ENSURING THE INTEGRITY OF U.S. ELECTION SYSTEMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing entitled “Election Security: Ensuring the Integrity of

U.S. Election Systems”. Testimony was heard from Steven Sandvoss, Executive Director, Illinois State Board of Elections; and public witnesses.

REVIEWING THE ADMINISTRATION’S UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN PROGRAM: STATE-SANCTIONED CHILD ABUSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Reviewing the Administration’s Unaccompanied Children Program: State-Sanctioned Child Abuse”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Government Accountability Office. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office.

THE PRESIDENT’S 2019 NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARATION CIRCUMVENTING CONGRESS TO BUILD A BORDER WALL AND ITS EFFECT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND READINESS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “The President’s 2019 National Emergency Declaration Circumventing Congress to Build a Border Wall and Its Effect on Military Construction and Readiness”. Testimony was heard from Phyllis L. Bayer, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Energy, Installations and Environment; Alex A. Beehler, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Installations, Energy and Environment; John W. Henderson, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Installations, Environment and Energy; Robert H. McMahon, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment, Department of Defense; and Robert G. Salesses, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Integration and Defense Support of Civil Authorities, Department of Defense.

OVERSIGHT OF U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID), PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a hearing entitled “Oversight of U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Programs and Policies”. Testimony was heard from Mark Green, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development.

STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES: FAIR HOUSING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Stakeholder Perspectives: Fair Housing”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Government Publishing Office. Testimony was heard from Herbert H. Jackson, Jr., Acting Deputy Director, Government Publishing Office.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held an oversight hearing on the Food and Drug Administration. Testimony was heard from Scott Gottlieb, M.D., Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration.

TRANSGENDER SERVICE POLICY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled “Transgender Service Policy”. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant Commander Blake Dremann, U.S. Navy; Captain Alivia Stehlik, U.S. Army, Captain Jennifer Peace, U.S. Army; Staff Sergeant Patricia King, U.S. Army; HM3 Akira Wyatt, U.S. Navy; James N. Stewart, Performing the Duties of Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense; Admiral Raquel C. Bono, Director, Defense Health Agency; and a public witness.

2017 TAX LAW: IMPACT ON THE BUDGET AND AMERICAN FAMILIES

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “2017 Tax Law: Impact on the Budget and American Families”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CLASSROOMS IN CRISIS: EXAMINING THE INAPPROPRIATE USE OF SECLUSION AND RESTRAINT PRACTICES

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled “Classrooms in Crisis: Examining the Inappropriate Use of Seclusion and Restraint Practices”. Testimony was heard from Jacqueline Nowicki, Director of Education Workforce and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Allison Sutton, Special Education Teacher, Wichita Public Schools; and public witnesses.

CARING FOR OUR CAREGIVERS: PROTECTING HEALTH CARE AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS FROM WORKPLACE VIOLENCE

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled “Caring for Our Caregivers: Protecting Health Care and Social Service Workers from Workplace Violence”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CONFRONTING A GROWING PUBLIC HEALTH THREAT: MEASLES OUTBREAKS IN THE U.S.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Confronting a Growing Public Health Threat: Measles Outbreaks in the U.S.”. Testimony was heard from Nancy Messonnier, M.D., Director, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and Anthony Fauci, M.D., Director, National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health.

CLEAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE WORKFORCE TO BUILD IT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Clean Energy Infrastructure and the Workforce to Build It”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Ethics: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 116th Congress.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy”. Testimony was heard from Jerome H. Powell, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

AN OVERVIEW OF DIVERSITY TRENDS IN THE FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion held a hearing entitled “An Overview of Diversity Trends in the Financial Services Industry”. Testimony was heard from Daniel Garcia-Diaz, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office.

THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY: A MID-TERM ASSESSMENT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "The Trump Administration's Foreign Policy: A Mid-Term Assessment". Testimony was heard from a public witness.

AMERICA'S GLOBAL LEADERSHIP: WHY DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT MATTER

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "America's Global Leadership: Why Diplomacy and Development Matter". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SECURING OUT NATION'S CHEMICAL FACILITIES: BUILDING ON THE PROGRESS OF THE CFATS PROGRAM

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing on "Securing out Nation's Chemical Facilities: Building on the Progress of the CFATS Program". Testimony was heard from David Wulf, Director, Infrastructure Security Compliance Division, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security; and Nathan Anderson, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 560, the "Northern Mariana Islands Residents Relief Act". Testimony was heard from Nickolao Pula, Director, Office of Insular Affairs, Department of the Interior; Lou Leon Guerrero, Governor, Guam; David B. Gootnick, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office; Ralph DLG Torres, Governor, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and a public witness.

HEARING WITH MICHAEL COHEN, FORMER ATTORNEY TO PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Hearing with Michael Cohen, Former Attorney to President Donald Trump". Testimony was heard from a public witness.

SEA CHANGE: IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON OUR OCEANS AND COASTS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled "Sea Change: Impacts of Climate Change on Our Oceans and Coasts". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SUPPORTING AMERICA'S STARTUPS: REVIEW OF SBA ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Supporting America's Startups: Review of SBA Entrepreneurial Development Programs". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING; MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a 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; and 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. The Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Views and Estimates of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure were adopted, without amendment. H. Con. Res. 16, H. Con. Res. 19, H.R. 639, H.R. 1318, were ordered reported, without amendment.

VA 2030: A VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF VA

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "VA 2030: A Vision for the Future of VA". Testimony was heard from Robert Wilkie, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs.

U.S.-CHINA TRADE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "U.S.-China Trade". Testimony was heard from Robert E. Lighthizer, United States Trade Representative.

Joint Meetings**LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION**

Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee

on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion, after receiving testimony from Brett P. Reistad, Joseph Sharpe, Vincent Troiola, Matthew Shuman, Chanin Nuntavong, Ralph Bozella, and Randall Fisher, all of The American Legion, Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine implementing the Agriculture Improvement Act, 9:30 a.m., SR-328A.

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, 10 a.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine nuclear policy and posture, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine legislative proposals on capital formation and corporate governance, 10 a.m., 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, 10 a.m., 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, 10 a.m., 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, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Female Veterans Access to VA", 10 a.m., HT-2 Capitol.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled "The National Emergencies Act of 1976", 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled "Effects of Vacancies at the Merit Systems Protection Board", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, February 28

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, February 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 12:30 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 1112—Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E215, E218
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E216
Collins, Doug, Ga., E218
Costa, Jim, Calif., E216
Davis, Rodney, Ill., E223
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E224
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E220
Gosar, Paul, Ariz., E218
Horn, Kendra S., Okla., E216, E219
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E225

Keating, William R., Mass., E217, E222
Kelly, Robin L., Ill., E215, E222
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E224
King, Peter T., N.Y., E223
Kirkpatrick, Ann, Ariz., E224
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E220
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E222
Mitchell, Paul, Mich., E220
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E222, E225
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E217

Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E215, E216, E217, E217, E218, E219, E219, E220, E221
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E219
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E220
San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E224
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E223
Shalala, Donna E., Fla., E219
Shimkus, John, Ill., E223
Smith, Adam, Wash., E222, E225
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E218
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E215
Wagner, Ann, Mo., E217



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are