



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2019

No. 37

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JUDY CHU of California).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 28, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY CHU to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, through whom we see what we could be and what we can become, I thank You for giving us another day.

With so many dramatic and contentious hearings in these days, grant wisdom, knowledge, and understanding to all Members of the people's House, as well as an extra measure of charity. Give them peace and an abundance of prudence in the work they do.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

STATE-BASED INSURANCE EXCHANGES

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

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to deliver a message from my district. It is a message I have heard in my townhalls and from my neighbors throughout Burlington and Ocean Counties: Healthcare costs are too high, and we need to act now.

That is why I am proud to introduce the SAVE Act. This is bipartisan legis-

lation that would help States establish State-based exchanges that would increase access and drive down costs.

These are solutions that we know work. States with State-based exchanges have higher enrollment rates and more affordable coverage.

Right now, there are a number of States that haven't set up their own exchanges. That is tens of millions of people, including millions of people throughout New Jersey, who stand to benefit.

It is time to listen to our constituents and help them save. I hope Members will join me in acting and moving this legislation forward.

NATIONAL AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

(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, as we close out the month of February, I want to recognize this month as National African American History Month. It is a way for our country to remember and honor African American citizens and events that shaped our Nation's history.

It is also a chance to reflect on the countless contributions made by African Americans while many were faced with racial prejudice, segregation, and slavery. These individuals serve as examples of patriotism and determination. They have given people of all backgrounds courage in themselves, faith in their dreams, and hope in others.

The American story is filled with African Americans who forever changed their communities and our country. We take this month to celebrate the cultural, scientific, political, and economic contributions they have made for the betterment of our Nation.

□ 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.

H2275

We learn from the past so together we can build a better future for all citizens. As we proclaim February as National African American History Month, let us celebrate their lives, understand their adversity, and lead by their examples.

COMBATING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a great sense of urgency.

Every day it seems as if there is another news story about a shooting in a school, a movie theater, a synagogue, or on a city block. We have lost far too many lives due to gun violence.

From my own community, I celebrate the life of Olivia Marchand from Westford, whose mother, Jody, endured years of domestic abuse. In 2010, she survived her husband's brutal attack but lost her beautiful Olivia when her husband shot and killed her and then killed himself.

This tragedy devastated our whole community. As a mother, this loss still fills me with grief and anger.

Today, Jody keeps her daughter's memory alive, educates women on domestic violence, and fights for tougher gun laws. We must answer America's call for action on gun violence, not the gun lobby's call to maintain the status quo.

Yesterday, we passed universal background check legislation, a necessary first step to tackle gun violence in America. I urge my colleagues to continue voting for these critical reforms.

OPPOSING EXTREME PRIORITIES

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise here this morning to speak out against the extreme priorities of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. With so many pressing issues facing the 116th Congress, I find it appalling that H.R. 1 has been reserved for legislation that completely undermines the democratic framework of our country.

Simply put, this bill is nothing more than a thinly veiled power grab through more government, more regulation, and political speech repression. To call this legislation the For the People Act is borderline ludicrous.

H.R. 1 would eliminate States' authority to set voting qualifications, restore voting rights of convicted felons even if it contradicts State or local policy, outlaw voter verification, and force taxpayers to subsidize anonymous donations even if it is for a candidate they do not support.

This is just the tip of the iceberg. H.R. 1 is not for the people but, rather, an attempt to expand power to Federal

bureaucrats and unelected Federal judges, undercutting the will of everyday citizens and the Constitution.

This is not reform. This is a shameless attempt to keep one party in power, and the American people deserve better.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, everyone deserves to feel safe in their community, whether they are at work, at home, at school, or at church.

Less than 2 weeks 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 a horrific act of gun violence. I am committed to honoring the lives of victims of gun violence through action.

H.R. 1112 is a commonsense and bipartisan bill that will help address a deficiency in background check laws by allowing law enforcement to conduct a thorough background check. I am proud to cosponsor an amendment that will help ensure this legislation improves the safety of victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Yesterday was the first time in more than two decades that the U.S. House of Representatives passed a major gun safety bill, and today we have an opportunity to take a further step. H.R. 1112 will help save innocent lives, and I look forward to working on commonsense legislation that balances protecting our gun rights and ensuring the safety of our community.

RECOGNIZING MIKE LONG

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the chairman of the Conservative Party of New York and my good friend, Mike Long, who has stepped down from this position after decades of service.

Mike Long was born in Brooklyn, New York, and raised in southern Queens. In 1959, Mike Long dropped out of the 12th grade to enlist in the United States Marine Corps. He felt strongly that his duty was to our country.

That commitment to sacrifice and service above self is a common thread throughout Chairman Long's life. He served on the New York City Council for a term representing Brooklyn, and he stepped up to become chairman of the Conservative Party, a position he held for 30 years, which is a testament to his character, commitment, work ethic, and determination to stand up for his principles.

He is a lifelong advocate for limited government, economic freedom and op-

portunity, constitutional liberties, and improving the lives of everyday, hard-working New Yorkers. He is one of the rare political leaders in New York who has earned deep respect from both his political allies and his political opponents.

I am proud to count him as a true friend, and I want to thank him, his wife, Eileen, and his family for his lifetime of service to New York State and the United States of America.

CONGRATULATING POLICE CHIEF LYN WOOLFORD, AMERICA'S FAVORITE CROSSING GUARD

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Police Chief Lyn Woolford of the Ashland, Missouri, Police Department for being voted America's Favorite Crossing Guard.

Chief Woolford was recently selected the winner of a contest sponsored by Safe Kids Worldwide, a nonprofit organization that works on behalf of families and communities to keep children safe from injuries. As a result of this competition, the Ashland School District will receive \$10,000 to improve pedestrian safety.

Chief Woolford can be seen every schoolday guarding intersections near Ashland's schools to make sure that children get across the road safely, and the children—many of whom, along with their parents, voted for him online—love him.

It is not unusual to see Chief Woolford wearing colorful hats and outfits as he guides the children safely across the road. It might be a bright chicken hat or a multicolored parrot hat. No matter the hat, the mission is the same: to brighten the children's day and to see that they get to school safely.

Through his actions, the children have a community role model and a beloved friend in their local police department. Ashland Police Chief Lyn Woolford epitomizes the service of our law enforcement officials and deserves our thanks and appreciation.

Congratulations, Chief Woolford. You truly are making a difference.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF RITA SMITH-WADE-EL

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, today, during Black History Month, I rise to celebrate Rita Smith-Wade-El, a leader in my community of Lancaster. Rita passed away last month, but her impact will be felt in our community forever.

She was a fierce leader on social justice issues and racial equality in our community. Her life can best be described as a life of service and a life of compassion. She served as a lector, eucharistic minister, and social justice

committee member. She was always trying to lighten the load for others and lend a helping hand.

Rita saw those in need and recognized that if she had the power to give, she would, and even if it wasn't in her power, she would try anyway.

Rita was a longtime Millersville University professor of psychology and African American studies and founded the school's African American studies minor.

I am very happy to celebrate her life today. We will miss her in our community, and we will miss her contributions to our community.

ENHANCED BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam 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. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 1112.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0915

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. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee, with Ms. UNDERWOOD 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. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I am pleased that today we are considering H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act.

Yesterday, the House passed H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act, an important bill to expand our national firearms background check system to include virtually all gun transfers.

However, there are also steps we can take to make the current background check system more effective at block-

ing the sale of guns to individuals who are ineligible to purchase and possess them.

That is why I support H.R. 1112, a bill that addresses a dangerous shortcoming in the current firearms background check law.

In most cases, a licensed gun dealer receives notification within a few minutes, often 90 seconds, from the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, sometimes called the NICS, that a prospective buyer has passed or failed the background check.

In a small percentage of cases, NICS examiners may require additional time to complete the background check if information is missing or unclear in a prospective buyer's record. For example, there may be on the record a notation that the prospective buyer was arrested but no notation as to whether the buyer was acquitted or convicted. That would have to be looked into further.

However, under current law, a licensed gun dealer conducting a background check on a prospective purchaser is permitted to sell the firearm to the purchaser if there has been no determination from NICS after 3 business days, even though NICS has not indicated that the person has actually passed the background check.

Often, we refer to this as a default proceed transaction.

These are the very cases that ought to be investigated. In 2017 alone, the ATF determined that over 4,000 default proceed firearms transfers went to purchasers who should not lawfully have gotten them because they could not lawfully own a firearm.

If NICS is unable to return an instant determination, and especially if there is no report after 3 days, there is real cause for concern.

One notable example of the tragic consequences of this loophole is the hate crime murder of nine people at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, in 2015.

In that tragedy, the shooter was not legally allowed to possess a firearm as a result of drug charges, but he still was able to purchase his gun from a licensed dealer, who made the decision to transfer after 3 business days had elapsed, despite not having received a definitive response from the background check system.

The bill before us today, H.R. 1112, would strengthen the background check procedures Federal firearms licensees or dealers must follow before selling or transferring a firearm.

Under this bill, the initial period a gun dealer must wait for an answer from the NICS is extended from 3 days to 10 days. If, after 10 days, the NICS system has not returned an answer to the dealer, the prospective purchaser may file a petition with the attorney general, which should help resolve most applications in short order.

If an additional 10 days elapses without a response from NICS, the licensed

firearms dealer then may sell or transfer the firearm to the prospective purchaser without the background check completion, if the dealer has no reason to believe that the purchaser is prohibited from obtaining a firearm under Federal, State, or local law.

The additional time for checks to be completed will help prevent the transfer of guns to individuals who are ineligible to possess them and will make us safer.

I want to remind everyone that, in 90 percent of the cases, the NICS system gives the answer within 90 seconds. So we are talking about a small number of cases, but a number of cases where we know there have been tragic results. We want to stop that.

I commend our colleague Congressman JIM CLYBURN, the distinguished Democratic whip, for introducing this bipartisan bill, which is a sensible and necessary approach to addressing this dangerous shortcoming in current law.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, here we go again. Just like yesterday, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted to criminalize the transfer of a firearm between two law-abiding citizens.

Today, they further reveal this interest by bringing up a bill that would prohibit law-abiding citizens from ever being able to acquire firearms. And that is not hyperbole, Madam Chair; it is fact.

Let me briefly explain how that would happen. Allow me to walk through the mechanics of this legislation.

Let's start at the beginning of the month. Assume I went to a Federal firearms licensee, an FFL, to purchase a firearm on Friday, February 1, of this month. Under H.R. 1112, the FBI's NICS system has 10 business days to respond to the FFL.

The tenth business day is a Friday, February the 15th. If, after those 10 business days, NICS does not okay the transfer, I must file a petition with the Department of Justice certifying that I have no reason to believe that I am prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from purchasing or possessing a firearm.

Once that petition is filed, the NICS system has an additional 10 days to make a determination. That would be Monday, March 5, in our example because February 18 was a Federal holiday and not a business day.

If, at the conclusion of the 20 business days waiting period, NICS does not deny the transfer, I could then acquire the firearm.

But wait, Madam Chair. Under existing law, the NICS background check is only valid for 30 calendar days from the date it is initiated. Under our example, that would be Saturday, March the 2nd, which is 2 days before my petition is required to be acted upon.

At that point, I would be required to start the process over again entirely. There could be no end to this cycle.

Now, I am not sure if H.R. 1112 was written this way out of just messed-up writing or malice. I am not sure. But it does do this, and there is no mistaking what is written.

As I have said many times, we do not vote on aspirational ideas in this Chamber. They are great to debate, but we do not vote on aspirational ideas. We vote on words on paper, and words on paper are just as I have described.

I will let the American people determine what the intent was here. However, as I noted yesterday, in the rush to put this to the floor, they did not bother to fix some several major issues.

We also know, as we go forward in this that this indefinite and perpetual delay of the transfer of firearms to law-abiding citizens is perhaps the intent of this bill.

Keep in mind, under current law, an FFL has the option to transfer the firearm after 3 business days unless the transfer has been denied by NICS.

I would contend that 3 business days is not instant and a month is anything but instant, particularly as technologies continue to advance.

These laws have real-world consequences, and consequences can be deadly.

Carol Bowne was a New Jersey resident with a restraining order against her ex-boyfriend. Her application for a firearm took longer than 40 days to process, and he stabbed her to death while she was waiting to legally protect herself.

Let that sink in.

This bill would empower abusers and violent predators by making their victims more vulnerable.

Madam Chair, we oppose this legislation. It doesn't make sense in its current form. It will do nothing to make our communities safer, but it will make it harder for law-abiding citizens to exercise their Second Amendment rights and to defend themselves and their families.

Madam Chair, I am not often going to be able to say this, but I am joined today by the ACLU, who is opposing this bill and scoring against this bill.

It is not ready for prime time. It is ready to go back to actually have hearings and actually do markups and actually work with this bill.

I appreciate the gentleman, especially, from South Carolina's intent. No one fights stronger for his constituency than the gentleman from South Carolina. This is just not the right piece of legislation at the right time for the reasons that I spoke of, that have nothing to do with the intent. It has everything to do with words on paper. Remember, Madam Chair, that is what we vote on, not aspirational ideas.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished Democratic whip.

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Chair, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Madam Chair, let me begin my remarks, first of all, by welcoming to our Capitol today Miss Jennifer Pinckney and her two daughters. They are the wife and children of Reverend Clementa Pinckney, who, along with eight of his Bible study parishioners, lost his life to a demented white supremacist who said that he was interested in starting a race war.

He entered their church, participated in the Bible study, into which they welcomed him. And, as they closed their study that evening and prayed for what they had experienced and for their next meeting, this gentleman, while their eyes were closed, opened his and slaughtered them.

I find it interesting that my colleague has talked about the inconvenience of waiting longer than 3 days to purchase a weapon, without mentioning those poor souls of Emanuel AME Church.

He has talked about people who might be inconvenienced; he has talked about something he read in the newspapers; but he has not mentioned them. Well, I am here today to say that the Members of this august body need to think a little bit about the value of those lives.

Are they more valuable than the inconvenience a gun purchaser may have by having to wait 10 rather than 3 days to make a purchase?

What would make one so anxious to purchase a gun in the first place? If you have got to have a gun right now, chances are you have no useful purpose, no redeeming value, in the purchase of that gun.

Maybe we ought to participate here, as Members of this body, in helping this purchaser with a cooling-off period, which is all we are asking to do here.

Charleston, South Carolina, is nicknamed the "Holy City." Churches and steeples dominate the skyline of this historic city, which, until recently, had an ordinance that no building could be constructed higher than 55 feet, wanting nothing to obstruct its steeples.

Faith is fundamental to the Charleston community. However, that faith was rocked in June 2015 when this lone gunman rushed into this Bible study, after having studied the most historic African American churches in the State of South Carolina and developing a list of five churches, one of which was Emanuel AME.

He, by his own admission, selected this church because of its importance to the African American community, being the first organized place of worship in the South for African Americans.

□ 0930

He selected this. This was a hate crime of the first order, and we are saying we should not inconvenience him. And we did not inconvenience him. We allowed him to get that gun after 3 days, when it was around the fifth day that they found the glitch in the system and found him to be ineligible to own a gun.

We just had a gunman go into his workplace in Aurora, Illinois. He was ineligible to have a gun, but he was allowed to purchase the gun. When they found out that he was ineligible to have a gun, they then sent him a letter and said: Please bring us the gun back. You are not eligible to have a gun.

Give me a break. No, he didn't return the gun, because he had no redeeming value in having a gun. And he murdered his coworkers. And you are telling me we should not inconvenience him.

Well, my colleague, the chair of the committee, has laid out for you the procedure in this bill, a procedure that makes it a maximum, irrespective of what my colleague may say, it is a maximum of 20 working days, business days, that one would have in order to purchase a gun.

I would hope, as we move forward here today, we would think about those poor souls of Emanuel AME Church, and we think about those 4,000 people, 4,200 people, who purchased guns in 2016 using this loophole, and the 4,800 people who purchased guns in 2017 using this loophole. Think about their families. Think about their children. And think about what we are about to do here today.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. JUDY CHU of California). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CLYBURN. Let me just take this minute to go back to what I had prepared to say here today.

In troubling times, many of us find solace in the Serenity Prayer: God, grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom—wisdom—to know the difference.

The Charleston loophole is something all Members of Congress should have the courage to change and, by doing so, grant the American people the serenity they deserve in their schools, in their entertainment venues, in their neighborhood streets, and, God forbid, in their places of worship.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019.

Charleston, South Carolina, is nicknamed the Holy City. Church spires dominate the skyline of this historic city, which, until recently, had an ordinance that no building could be constructed higher than 55 feet. In this city, faith is foundational. It is a source of strength and community that dates back centuries.

However, that faith was rocked in June 2015 when a lone gunman punctuated his participation in a Bible study at Emanuel AME

Church with gunshots fired upon the parishioners who had welcomed him, killing nine and wounding three others. The shooter targeted this place of worship because of its historic significance to the African-American community. This egregious hate crime shattered the sanctity of the Holy City, and in response Congress observed a moment of silence and all Americans offered thoughts and prayers.

While a moment of silence and our thoughts and prayers are appreciated in times of tragedy, they do nothing to solve the underlying problem. The real tragedy in Charleston is it could have been prevented. The gunman acquired the weapon used in the massacre because of a fault in the law that is now known as the Charleston Loophole. The gun purchase was subject to a background check; however, when a glitch in the system caused the background review to take more than the three-day limit allowed by law, the gunman was able to purchase the weapon, although it was later found that he was ineligible to purchase a gun. The system failed to stop this gun sale to an ineligible purchaser and 4,864 others in 2017.

It has been 25 years since the Brady Bill became law, and there has been no significant legislation enacted since to stem gun violence. Yet in 2017, 100 people were killed each day in this country with a firearm—which touches every district represented in this august body.

A vote in support of the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019 extends the time allowed for law enforcement to conduct background checks. Under this bill, if the background check isn't concluded within 10 business days, the purchaser can request an expedited background check, which notifies law enforcement of the urgency of the review and starts an additional 10 business day period for the background check to be completed. While more than 96 percent of background checks are completed within three days—and 90 percent of Americans support background checks—this expedited review allows for law enforcement to complete the small percentage that may take longer than three days. If at the end of the expedited review the background check is inconclusive, then the purchase may proceed.

Restricting the Charleston Loophole doesn't prohibit law abiding citizens from purchasing a gun, but it does provide more time, if needed, for law enforcement to ensure weapons are not sold to those with criminal convictions or mental illness. This is an important first step our country should take to protect our citizens and their first amendment rights.

In troubling times many of us find solace in the Serenity prayer—God, grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; courage to change the things I can; and wisdom to know the difference.” The Charleston Loophole is something all Members of Congress should have the courage to change and grant the American people the serenity they deserve in their schools, entertainment venues, neighborhood streets and—God forbid—their places of worship.

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

Look, I have great sympathy for what the gentleman from South Carolina just spoke of. But, also, I have even greater sympathy for the fact it could have been avoided and had nothing,

frankly, to do at the end when the FBI under Mr. Comey actually admitted that there were mistakes made. The FBI could have stopped that instead of letting it happen. They saw problems. They let it go. It could have stopped.

This was already in law, Madam Chair. It could have stopped.

Yes, what I laid out for you is not just simply 20 business days, when you look at the fact that, coupled with other restrictions, it can do what we said.

I have great sympathy and grief for every loss of life, no matter where it comes from. But to simply say that this would have fixed it, when the FBI and others knew they could have fixed it at that moment and could have went later and got the guns, because there was a delay even in the horrific act that happened—again, we are simply talking about what is on the paper.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, we all deplore and mourn the monstrous, despicable, and evil massacre in Charleston. But that terrible crime was committed 67 days after the perpetrator applied to purchase the firearm.

As Mr. COLLINS said, this was preventable if, under current law, it was a failure of the FBI and not of the law.

This bill is not about public safety. Most gun predators already get their firearms illegally. A recent Johns Hopkins study found that California's universal background check had no effect on gun violence.

Their true objective is to make gun ownership by law-abiding people so legally hazardous and so bureaucratically time-consuming that people simply give up. This bill cleverly and, I believe, insidiously sets up a potentially never-ending bureaucratic review process.

As Mr. COLLINS said, a background check is only good for 30 calendar days from the day you apply. But this bill sets up a 20-business-day delay process. Now, what that means is, if a single holiday falls within that window, or the store is closed on weekends, or you slip a single day on that timetable, your background check is no longer valid, and you have to start all over again in a perpetual cycle of Kafkaesque proportions.

Now, would a bureaucracy be so abusive as to play this game? Well, of course it would. Just ask Lois Lerner.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. BASS), the chair of the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Ms. BASS. Madam Chair, I support H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019 as a commonsense measure to improve the current firearms background check system and to save lives.

Twenty-five years ago today, we began implementation of the Brady

Background Checks Act. The system it employs to run background checks on those seeking to purchase firearms from licensed gun dealers has made us safer.

Now it is time to address the circumstances in which the FBI needs additional time to investigate information relating to a prospective purchaser when the records may not be immediately clear as to whether someone is legally allowed to purchase a firearm.

Under current law, after 3 days, a gun dealer has the discretion to sell a gun to a purchaser, if the system has not given a green light to the sale after 3 business days have passed without a denial being issued by the system. In these circumstances, it is the choice of the dealer as to whether to proceed with the sale, which we call a default proceed, or whether to wait for the check to be implemented.

The results of such a choice were tragic in Charleston, South Carolina, in 2015, when a young man filled with hate shot and killed nine worshippers at the Emanuel AME Church. The gun used in this murder had been transferred by a gun dealer to the shooter even though the check had not been completed by the FBI, but would have resulted in a denial had the check been finished.

This is not an isolated incident. Since 1994, gun sellers proceeded with between 3,000 and 4,000 default proceed sales per year. Analyzing data provided by the Department of Justice, one study found that such sales are eight times more likely to involve a prohibited purchaser than other background checks.

In 2017 alone, default proceed sales accounted for more than 4,800 transfers to purchasers who were prohibited from owning firearms. The FBI reported that, in 2007 and 2008, in cases a licensed seller sold a firearm through default proceed transfers—

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. The FBI reported that, in 2007 and 2008, in cases where a licensed seller sold a firearm through default proceed transfers, approximately 22 percent of the individuals investigated were legally prohibited from purchasing or possessing a firearm.

The additional time provided by H.R. 1112 is not too much to ask so that we may help prevent tragedies such as the Charleston shooting from happening. This is why I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill today.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for the time.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1112. This legislation is an attack on the constitutional rights of

Americans. This bill puts incredible roadblocks in the way of law-abiding citizens seeking to exercise their Second Amendment rights that are guaranteed to them in the Constitution.

We should be focused on enforcing the current laws that we have on the books instead of passing Federal mandates that stifle freedom. This bill creates a bureaucratic maze that will allow the Federal Government to sit on its hands and force citizens to submit formal petitions to the Attorney General when they are trying to legally purchase a firearm, to ask permission to exercise their constitutional right.

What other constitutional right would you suggest we put this level of restriction on? The freedom of the press? The freedom of religion? Should we start having the Federal Government review every media outlet's story for 10 days before they can be published? before a church can meet for worship? I don't think so.

It is my hope that we will soon move forward with solutions, solutions that will actually make a difference for hardworking Americans across this great country.

When I was sworn in as a Member of the House earlier this year, I saw great potential for Congress to come together and advance solutions to our Nation's greatest problems. Instead, I find myself standing here on the floor of this Chamber fighting for the basic liberties that our Founding Fathers sought to guarantee for every American.

Madam Chair, I will continue to stand and continue to fight each and every day, and I urge the House to reject this misguided legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, everyone deserves to feel safe in their community, whether they are at work, at home, at school, or at church.

Less than 2 weeks 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 a horrific act of gun violence.

I am committed to honoring the lives of the victims of gun violence through action. H.R. 1112 is an important bill that will help address a deficiency in background check laws by allowing law enforcement to conduct a thorough background check. I am proud to cosponsor an amendment that will help ensure this legislation improves the safety of victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Yesterday was the first time in more than two decades that this U.S. House of Representatives passed a major gun safety bill, and today we have an opportunity to take a further step. H.R. 1112 will help save innocent lives, and I look forward to working on common-sense legislation that balances protecting our gun rights and ensuring the safety of our communities.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise today to fight for the rights of the brave men and women who have risked their lives fighting for our rights.

The bill we are debating, H.R. 1112, would have a significant impact on veterans' Second Amendment rights. A little-known and poorly understood provision of H.R. 1112 would amend the law to make it unlawful for an individual who has been "adjudicated with mental illness, severe developmental disability, or severe emotional instability" to purchase, to possess a firearm. It would make it illegal to sell a firearm to such an individual.

Let's put this in perspective. There are over 1.6 million disabled veterans with service-connected adjudication by VA of mental illness, including 1 million veterans with PTSD. H.R. 1112 has the potential to add all those names of veterans to the FBI NICS list and prevent those veterans from being able to purchase or possess a firearm.

Now, I know that may not have been the intent of the author of this bill, but that is a lot of veterans who will be impacted if this becomes law.

I offered an amendment at the Rules Committee to clarify that veterans with VA PTSD, diagnosed mental illness, and other affected adjudications would be exempted from the bill's standards, but it was ruled out of order.

VA already sends the names of veterans who have a VA fiduciary for inclusion on the NICS list—not because there is a concern that the veteran might be a harm to themselves or others, but because the VA has determined that the veteran needs assistance handling his or her financial benefits.

□ 0945

I am concerned that the expanded definition proposed in H.R. 1112 would infringe on the Second Amendment rights of over 1 million veterans solely because they receive benefits from VA that they have rightly earned through their service to our great country.

The last thing any of us in this room want to do is to discourage veterans from seeking VA benefits and treatment because they are afraid it might cost them a constitutional right. Think about that.

Although there may not have been a finding by a judicial authority that a veteran poses a danger to themselves or society, these veterans will be told that they were good enough to use a firearm to fight for our freedoms, but they are not good enough to have the freedom to bear arms as a civilian.

That is wrong, Madam Chair. Even criminals must be convicted in a court of law before their names are added to the NICS list.

Of all Americans who deserve their constitutional rights, the most deserving are those who fought for our country. Madam Chair, that is why I strongly oppose H.R. 1112, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a member of the committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019.

After losing my son Jordan to gun violence in 2012, I began reaching out to other families who recently lost a loved one to gun violence. I would send them letters. That is how I came to know Reverend Sharon Risher of Charlotte, North Carolina.

On June 17, 2017, Reverend Risher lost her mother, two cousins, and a childhood friend when a young man shot and killed nine people during a prayer service at the Emanuel Church in Charleston, South Carolina. Today, with H.R. 1112, we can close the loophole in background checks for the gun purchase that led to their terrible loss. I support this legislation for Reverend Sharon Risher and the memory of her family and her loved ones.

Tragically, this was not the last time our country witnessed horrific violence in a place of worship. A few months ago, the shooting at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, took the lives of 11 human beings.

Our places of worship, whether they are churches, synagogues, mosques, or something else, should be safe places of love, support, and community. H.R. 1112 would allow law enforcement the time that they need to make sure all these community centers are places of peace and safety.

Yesterday, we voted to expand background checks. Today, we vote to make sure those background checks are thorough, even if a few of them take a few more days to process. Those few extra days will save lives.

In the days after the Emanuel shooting, I was there in the community praying with the community and dealing with their pain and loss. America deserves better than this.

Why not make sure that we are doing everything that we can to protect them? A few more days in making sure that the FBI has the ability to really soundly make a conscious and critical decision, America deserves that.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I heard the argument from the other side a moment ago that people adjudged ineligible for the system by the VA, that their names

should not be given into the system so that they may purchase firearms.

I would point out that one of the largest sources of mortality among veterans is suicide. Veterans are, I think, the highest group in our society in terms of suicide rate. So it really makes sense to make it easier for people adjudged not to be proper to have a gun to have a gun if you are worried about suicides. That argument is, frankly, nonsensical. I am very glad the VA helps protect our veterans by participating in the system.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the committee and the chairman of one of our subcommittees.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I would just point out in further support of Mr. NADLER's remarks, on average, 20 veterans commit suicide every single day in this country, and two-thirds of those suicides are caused by use of a gun. So Mr. NADLER is quite right.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1112 to close the Charleston loophole.

We have heard a lot about what is at stake in terms of constitutional rights as it relates to possession of a firearm. There are other constitutional rights that are at issue here, and that is the right to life, liberty, the right to live free of gun violence and death, the right of a grandmother to sit on her porch and enjoy a summer evening free from the dangers of gun violence, the right of young children to play in a playground and play safely.

So this legislation is very important because it closes a very significant loophole in our law.

Over the last two decades, the Charleston loophole has allowed more than 60,000 purchases of guns by prohibited individuals.

Let that sink in.

Sixty thousand people who are prohibited from having a gun by law were allowed to get those guns because of this loophole.

One of those purchasers was a white supremacist who used the gun that he purchased to kill nine worshippers at the Mother Emanuel Church in South Carolina. Even though he had a felony drug charge on his record, this killer was able to buy a gun because his background check wasn't completed in 3 days.

And he isn't the only one, of course. A 2016 GAO report found that, between 2006 and 2015, guns were transferred to about 6,700 people with domestic violence convictions and more than 500 individuals with prohibiting protective orders.

So there are many, many examples where the American people are less safe because criminals and disqualified people can access a firearm because the background check wasn't completed in 3 days. This is a very simple common-sense solution to that problem.

Our laws will not work if we don't keep guns out of the hands of criminals, dangerous people, other disqualified purchasers, and this bill does that. This is a commonsense proposal.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I thank Mr. CLYBURN for his leadership, and I thank Mr. NADLER for bringing these bills before the Judiciary Committee so we can finally take some responsible action to reduce gun violence in this country.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I am actually glad, and one thing I will agree on with my friend just now is I do agree that there is a right to life, and that is why I would love to see this House bring forth the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which also protects life as well.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, at this time I would like to address a concern that has been raised by one section of the bill that is unrelated to the changes to current law to address the Charleston loophole.

Section 3 of the bill replaces outdated and offensive terminology in the categories of individuals who are ineligible to purchase or possess firearms under current law. Among those included, there are individuals subject to such prohibitions because, as stated by the current law, they are "adjudicated as a mental defective."

At the Judiciary Committee's markup of the bill, we agreed with our ranking member, Representative COLLINS, to replace this offensive language and to insert different terminology in the bill as a placeholder as we work to develop alternative language that does not alter the scope of who is included in these prohibitions and to work with stakeholders who have an interest in how this would be accomplished.

We have heard from various advocates in the mental health, disability rights, and veterans communities who have expressed their desire to develop an acceptable alternative. We agree.

Yesterday, the Veterans of Foreign Wars brought their concerns related to this issue to our attention. The VFW agrees that the current terminology is archaic but is concerned about a potential unintended consequence of replacing it.

Their concern is that replacing these terms with "mental illness," "severe developmental disability," or "severe emotional instability" could result in some veterans who are not now included being added to the NICS index due to their receipt of VA care or benefits for mental illnesses such as PTSD or traumatic brain injury.

It is not the intent of the changes in this terminology made by section 3 to alter the scope of those currently considered to be "adjudicated as a mental defective." It is the intent simply to replace that offensive language, but not to change the underlying law.

We will work with stakeholders, including the VFW, the mental health community, and the disability rights community to address the concerns related to this outdated terminology in a manner that does not change the scope of present law as this bill proceeds.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, I do appreciate the gentleman from New York clarifying that, but he just clarified it in the very way—because we had brought this up. It was late in the day, and we brought this up, and this language was offensive. And, frankly, Ms. LOFGREN, who was in the chair at the time, presented this language as an alternative to get us to a place where, as we talked about, we could get to Rules to actually fix this.

This is why I have said so many times that I have not—I understand the majority's willingness to bring the bill forward. What I didn't understand here is the willingness of this majority to put themselves on a time table to bring bills that were not ready. The reason we did it that night was so that we could get to Rules.

I served on the Rules Committee for 4 years. We could have fixed it at Rules.

Dr. ROE actually just brought an amendment to Rules, but it was rejected.

I understand that now we are going to continue forward.

I have a daughter who has spina bifida, and many would say "mental defective." For anyone in that community who believes that those who are born that way would be a mental defective is a problem. It needs to be fixed.

But the problem that we have here was a committee process that broke and a Rules process that broke. There were plenty of opportunities to address this, plenty of opportunities to discuss this. In the rush to do, again, what I said yesterday many times, what makes you feel good does not always heal you, now you have a problem, a valid problem.

But it was not a problem from the perspective of not trying to fix it. It came from the heart on both sides of the aisle to say this language is archaic, this language should not be there. There were plenty of times to fix it.

I appreciate the chairman. I am glad to hear his willingness to continue to work on this. What would another day have taken? What problem would an amendment voted up or down by Dr. ROE have caused on the floor?

I guess when the ACLU and others started scoring against it, we decided we might need to fix it.

Again, this is a process problem. I know nobody likes to talk about process problems because, at the end of the day, I believe the authors' intents behind these bills, I believe their intents

are good. I believe their process may be wrong, and I will speak to that, but this is a problem that we have.

I am glad the chairman is moving forward, I am glad the chairman is looking at this, and I am glad the chairman is willing to address this going forward, but it is just sad that we had to get here today, because this could have been fixed except for an arbitrary timeline put onto my chairman that he really had no control over, I believe, to bring something forward that is not ready for prime time.

I respect my chairman. I am glad that he has addressed this. I hope that they will give him plenty of time in the future to continue to work these problems out.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, our mistake was in accepting the amendment from the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS). The amendment dealt with the underlying language of the underlying law, not with the bill. We should have insisted that an attempt to correct that language be in a separate bill.

The gentleman from Georgia is now telling us that we should kill this bill that will save so many lives because we have not figured out acceptable language to replace existing bad language in the existing law that had nothing to do with this bill.

We should pass this bill.

We will work as we go forward to see if we can come up with acceptable language, but in any event, we should pass this bill and deal with the separate problem of bad language in the underlying law separately.

Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

□ 1000

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise today for Myra Thompson and Susie Jackson, people who were murdered in their church during a Bible study. And I rise for the tens of thousands of Americans who will die if Congress does not close the Charleston loophole.

In 2015, the FBI reported that more than 270,000 guns were sold because the NICS system failed to issue a "do not sale" order within 3 days.

One was sold to a man with a hate-filled heart, as we have heard. He walked into Mother Emanuel church in Charleston, South Carolina, a historically Black church, and murdered nine people who were simply seeking to get closer to their God.

Madam Chair, we have seen this time and time again. Our houses of worship are not safe from gun violence: Mother Emanuel, First Baptist Church in

Sutherland Springs, Tree of Life, Oak Creek's house of worship, and the list goes on and on.

We talk about PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder. Just recently, I heard someone in the Chicago area talk about PTSD, but it was "present-traumatic stress disorder" because of all the guns that are in the streets in the hands of people who should not have them.

Madam Chair, today, I challenge my colleagues to do the right thing: Pass this bill and save lives. Pass this bill and prevent dangerous people from getting guns. Pass this law because you never know if it will be your son or mother who could be next, gunned down by doing something as routine as praying.

Today, we need to do the right thing. Today, we need to pass H.R. 1112. Today, we need to honor the Emanuel 9 and close the Charleston loophole.

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

Madam Chair, I can go back through my opening statement and list the many reasons I oppose this bill that have nothing to do with the amendment that should have been fixed by the time we got to Rules, which was agreed upon. Actually, the language was given by Ms. LOFGREN and staff, and we said that we will take that and move to Rules to fix it.

If you go back and look at my statement, I am opposing this bill for many other reasons that are very valid. I believe when you look for timing, you look for other things.

Again, I believe working the process is proper. Working the process will go through. The majority brought this to the floor, and they should have the votes to pass it. If not, then the Senate can work on this language, and we go forward.

I think the bigger issue is the very fundamental issue of the timing of this bill, the timing that it is not just 20 days, and it is not just 10 days. There is another, when you couple it with the actual 30-day restriction on the application itself. So there are plenty of reasons for me to oppose this bill.

The other part was simply a discussion that should have been fixed and wasn't. That is a tragedy, that we are coming to the floor and that even be a problem. But at the end of the day, we pointed it out, we tried to, and that is where it is at.

My problem with this bill is the bill itself and much of the language that we have here.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and Mr. CLYBURN, who, for years, has been working on this issue.

Madam Chair, H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019,

is long in coming. It responds to many people, but it responds to Dylann Roof.

In 2015, he went to a gun store to get a gun. He was not the normal purchaser, and it did not approve in 90 seconds, as most of them do. But in a day or two, when it had not yet been approved, Dylann Roof was able to get a gun. And Dylann Roof's whole message was: I am going to start a race war by going into an unlocked church on a prayer night and kill nine worshippers praying to their God and their pastor—whose wife was here today.

The question has to be: When are we going to stop the senseless killings and the eons and eons of mass shootings?

My good friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is a man of faith. I was in the committee room as a senior member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations as we were trying to deliberate his concern, a very vital concern, one that I have, to love people with disabilities, to love them and treat them with dignity.

The language in this legislation does that as best we could at the time, because it puts the language adjudicated, determined by some objective body, that you have a health problem that deals with a mental concern.

The question has to be, if it is not workable, you pass the bill. All of us have made a commitment to work through this process and to give dignity to every person, including veterans.

But at the same time, would you want to have a situation that happened with Dylann Roof, a convicted felon who grabbed a gun in 2 days and killed nine innocent people, or killed people in various other places, from Columbine, to Aurora, to Virginia Tech?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Look at the stories of mass shootings, or look at the violence in cities where people are getting guns.

Madam Chair, I would make the argument that, today, we must pass H.R. 1112. The mercy of all of us dealing with issues to give dignity to those who suffer from illnesses that embrace mental illness concerns, it was because Mr. COLLINS, a man of faith, offered that suggestion. Therefore, we are going to move forward with the commitment to work it through and provide the dignity necessary, but to save the lives and to give tribute in death to those who lost their lives at the hands of Dylann Roof. Vote for H.R. 1112.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1112, the "Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019," legislation that would strengthen the background check system that is already in place to purchase a firearm.

I thank the Majority Whip, Congressman CLYBURN, for introducing H.R. 1112 in response to the atrocity perpetrated at Mother Emanuel A.M.E. Church in Charleston,

South Carolina, which killed nine members of one of the most historically significant churches in African American history.

One June 17, 2015, Dylann Roof was responsible for the mass shooting that took the lives of nine individuals at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church.

The victims were later referred to as “The Charleston Nine” and “The Emanuel Nine”.

Under current law, after a prospective buyer completes the appropriate form, the holder of a Federal Firearms License initiates the background check by phone or computer.

If a determination is not obtained within three business days then the transfer may legally be completed by default proceeding and that is how Dylan Roof obtain the handgun he used to commit the killings, which he purchased from a retail store in West Columbia, SC.

H.R. 1112, the “Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019,” would strengthen the background check procedures that firearms licensees or dealers follow before selling or transferring a firearm.

As under current law, firearms dealers would be required to run a background check on prospective buyers using the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (“NICS”).

Over 90% of NICS checks are completed within 90 seconds.

Under H.R. 1112, if the NICS system has not returned an answer to the licensed firearms dealer within ten days, the prospective firearms purchaser may file a petition with the Attorney General for review.

Then, after another ten-day period has expired, the licensed firearms dealer may sell or transfer the firearm to the prospective purchaser if it has not received a response through the NICS system and the dealer has no reason to believe that the purchaser is prohibited from obtaining a firearm under federal, state, or local law.

Under this measure, licensed firearms dealers could not sell or transfer under the “default proceed” provision until at least 20 days have passed since the initial background check, thus closing the so-called “Charleston loophole.”

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 State—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.

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 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. 1112, the “Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019.”

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

Madam Chair, in closing, we have had an interesting debate this morning. I think we went back on two points.

One, I believe I laid out the problems in a very methodical way on why this bill has serious defects in it that could possibly be fixed, if given long enough to work. I still may disagree with the premise of the bill, but it could have been worked out, when you actually take one part of law and combine it with another part of law. And we have seen a calendaring problem here. That is one part. That is the main part I have.

I think we have also seen how the process has not worked out again. Sometimes in life, getting it first is not best. Getting it quickly may not always be the best result. I think what we are seeing here is something that when we are dealing with the rights of individuals, especially in this area here and especially for the reasons that were given, which was a tragedy in Charleston that could have been stopped by the FBI that already had suspicions on not selling this firearm and could have went and taken that firearm, this is just a problem.

I have laid out as much as I can. I think the speakers have as well. There are many opposed to this. They will continue to be opposed to it, on both sides of the spectrum, our side from the perspective of our rights and those that are being violated, and the ACLU for what their reasons may be and others.

But it is time we had some honest discussion about what can actually deter this mass violence that we are seeing. Unfortunately, Madam Chair, we always speak of mass violence.

Why do we always have to go to the big violence? Why do we have to go to the ones who were killed that are tragedies that we all see? What about the ones that we can actually work on

where we give better enforcement to our law enforcement, better prosecution of gun crimes, better prosecution that affects a single life in a neighborhood today? Is a single life not as important as the ones that we are not affecting now?

I think as we look forward, I would ask that this, of course, be voted down. I think we have laid out a reason why it at least should be considered by all Members before they put their card in that machine to decide why they are supporting a bill that we believe has some obvious flaws to it. It is not the intent of the individual offering it, but the actual words on paper have flaws in them. That is why we oppose this bill.

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

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

Madam Chair, this is an important bill that addresses a significant, and tragically demonstrated, threat to public safety.

Today is the 25th anniversary of the implementation of the Brady Background Check Act. This lifesaving law has served us well, helping to prevent firearms from getting into the hands of those who are legally prohibited from possessing and purchasing them. But we know that some aspects of this law and the system that implements it must be updated and improved.

Let's remember what this bill does. All this bill does is give the FBI additional time—gives the NICS system additional time—to complete a background check in the 8 or 9 percent of cases where it is not done within 90 seconds. If you haven't gotten a background check back in 3 days, under this bill, you can't get it automatically, and you can't get the weapon automatically.

They have 10 days to do it. If after 10 days they still haven't done it, then you can petition the Attorney General. And if they still don't do it, get your firearm within 10 days. That will save a lot of lives.

We hear about mass shootings, but we also should remember that we are not talking about just mass shootings. Thirty-four people a day are killed in this country by guns—34 a day. Every other industrialized country in the world: 90 deaths with guns a year, 120, 170. The United States: 39,000.

How are we different? Are we thousands of times more mentally ill than people in Europe or Japan? No.

Are we more vicious? No.

Are our habits more degraded? No.

The difference is that this country is awash in guns. The difference is that, in this country, people who are dangerous can get guns.

These are modest steps. We should take much more advanced steps. We should ban assault weapons. We should ban large capacity magazine clips. But we are not doing that. We are starting with very moderate steps.

This is a very moderate step to improve the background check system.

With all the rhetoric we hear, that is all it does. It gives a little extra time to make sure that someone who is dangerous, whose possession of a firearm is illegal, cannot get it.

Enacting this bill will save lives. I urge my colleagues to ignore all the nonsense rhetoric about extraneous considerations. Join me in supporting this bill today. Join me in supporting saving lives. Join me in making the United States a little safer to live in.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 1112, The Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019. This bill will strengthen our federal gun background check procedures by closing the "Charleston" loophole, thus ensuring that guns can no longer be erroneously sold due to incomplete background checks.

This epidemic of gun violence has left its scars on my home state of Texas. A recent study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention revealed that there were 3,353 gun-related deaths in Texas in 2017 alone. Hundreds of these victims are children and teenagers under 19 years of age.

Our country has struggled with gun violence for too long, and the multitudes of loopholes in our laws are complicit in our difficulties. This bill will not only eliminate a significant loophole, but it will do so without infringing upon Second Amendment rights. It will ensure that only responsible and able individuals are able to purchase guns in our country.

I share our nation's concerns about the widespread proliferation of guns in our neighborhoods, and I agree that reasonable restrictions on firearms are essential to a comprehensive strategy to reduce crime and violence in our society. We must take sensible steps to ensure that these firearms do not fall into the wrong hands.

Furthermore, it has come to my attention that the mental illness reference in this bill may be outdated and not in line with current medical and legal standards. I will be reviewing this issue as we progress through the 116th Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The Acting 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, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-6 is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1112

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 "Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. STRENGTHENING OF BACKGROUND CHECK PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED BEFORE A FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSEE MAY TRANSFER A FIREARM TO A PERSON WHO IS NOT SUCH A LICENSEE.

Section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii) of title 18, United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

"(ii) in the event the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section—

"(I) not fewer than 10 business days (meaning a day on which State offices are open) has elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section, and the other person has submitted, electronically through a website established by the Attorney General or by first-class mail, a petition for review which—

"(aa) certifies that such other person has no reason to believe that such other person is prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from purchasing or possessing a firearm; and

"(bb) requests that the system respond to the contact referred to in subparagraph (A) within 10 business days after the date the petition was submitted (or, if the petition is submitted by first-class mail, the date the letter containing the petition is postmarked); and

"(II) 10 business days have elapsed since the other person so submitted the petition, and the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(7) The Attorney General shall—

"(A) prescribe the form on which a petition shall be submitted pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)(ii);

"(B) make the form available electronically, and provide a copy of the form to all licensees referred to in paragraph (1);

"(C) provide the petitioner and the licensee involved written notice of receipt of the petition, either electronically or by first-class mail; and

"(D) respond on an expedited basis to any such petition received by the Attorney General.".

SEC. 3. NEW TERMINOLOGY FOR THOSE WITH MENTAL ILLNESS.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in each of subsections (d)(4) and (g)(4) by striking "adjudicated as a mental defective" and inserting "adjudicated with mental illness, severe developmental disability, or severe emotional instability".

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-14. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed 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 MR. RICE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Chair, 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, after line 23, insert the following:
SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT THE NICS SYSTEM SEARCH THE NATIONAL DATA EXCHANGE DATABASE IN CONDUCTING BACKGROUND CHECKS.

Section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 2 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) The national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act shall search the database of the National Data Exchange in conducting a background check pursuant to this section.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Chair, Dylann Roof is a monster. Dylann Roof should never have been able to buy a gun. Dylann Roof walked into a church in my hometown of Charleston, South Carolina, my birthplace of Charleston, South Carolina, and he slaughtered nine people in a Bible study. I can't imagine a more horrific crime. We all, naturally, look for a response.

My friend, Mr. CLYBURN, and the majority have noted that thousands of people have wrongfully acquired guns because of the failure of our background check system under what has become known as the Charleston loophole.

The stated purpose of this underlying legislation, Mr. CLYBURN's legislation, is certainly noble: to close the Charleston loophole. The only problem is that it does not carry out that purpose.

Too often here, we take up noble causes; we create legislation with noble names; we pass this legislation to feel better; but the legislation fails to solve the problem in the title.

After these horrific murders, the families of the victims sued the Federal Government for allowing this monster to buy a gun.

□ 1015

Charleston Federal District Court Judge Gergen wrote a lengthy opinion in which he laid bare the Federal background check process and its failures in this case, the case of Dylann Roof. His opinion is available for anybody to read.

And in his 22-page opinion, he lays out the various structural flaws in the background check system. Most notably, that the FBI maintains four criminal databases. And under the background check system, the background checker is allowed to check only three of those.

Why? I assume because those are the three that existed in the nineties when the background check came into place.

There is a fourth one. It is more extensive and it is more detailed. It is called N-DEX. In this file was all the information that Dylann Roof's background checker needed to know to deny

him the right to buy the gun. This N-DEX system contained that information, and it is maintained by the FBI. All they had to do was allow this background checker to look at that. The FBI has admitted had they been able to do that, this man—this monster—would never have been able to buy a gun.

My amendment would actually fix the Charleston loophole. The problem is that I cannot support the underlying legislation. Why? Because it creates an undue amount of time to be able to buy a gun.

And number two, the thing that bothers me the most, is that it shifts a part of the burden to the American citizen trying to exercise his Second Amendment rights. It requires him, in the event that you don't hear back from the government, to file a petition with the Federal court. I think this is an undue interference with his Second Amendment right; therefore, I cannot accept this underlying legislation.

The Senate has indicated it will not be taken up in the Senate; and the President has indicated that, if it passed, he would veto it. Therefore, I plan to withdraw my amendment.

I plan to offer it separately as a new piece of legislation, which will, in fact, close the Charleston loophole. It will allow the FBI background checkers to search the most current N-DEX file that has all this detailed information that was created after 9/11, well after the background check law came into effect.

The FBI has admitted, it would have prevented Dylann Roof from buying a gun and, I suspect, many of the other people who have carried out these horrific shootings in recent years.

It will hopefully garner the bipartisan support necessary to actually become law and fix the underlying problem.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, 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, after line 16, insert the following:
SEC. 3. REPORTS ON PETITIONS SUPPORTING FIREARM TRANSFERS NOT IMMEDIATELY APPROVED BY NICS SYSTEM, THAT WERE NOT RESPONDED TO IN A TIMELY MANNER.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make an annual report to the public on the number of petitions received by the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence

Prevention Act that were submitted pursuant to subclause (I) of section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, with respect to which a determination was not made within the 10-day period referred to in subclause (II) of such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019, and I applaud the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), my good friend, for his leadership and enduring commitment to reducing gun violence and making our communities safer. I also appreciate my friend from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for her leadership on this issue as well.

Madam Chair, it is unconscionable to think that convicted felons, domestic abusers, and others who are prohibited by law from purchasing a firearm could end up with these weapons anyway. Sadly, this is the reality we currently live in due to the default proceed sales, also known as the Charleston loophole.

I have introduced legislation on this problem in the past because we must do everything we can to ensure firearms do not end up in the hands of those who should not have them. This is why I am also a cosponsor of Mr. CLYBURN's Enhanced Background Checks Act.

The FBI should and, in fact, needs to know if a default proceeds sale has taken place. Currently, this is not the case unless the FBI eventually completes a background check, determines the purchaser should be prohibited from owning a firearm, and subsequently contacts the dealer.

We need more information throughout this process, and my amendment would do just that: require the FBI to report on the number of background checks that they are not able to complete within the designated time period.

This information will help keep track of the FBI's ability to clear background checks in a timely manner as well as give better understanding of where there is still room for improvement. It will also provide much-needed transparency to the default proceed process.

All who support commonsense solutions to reduce the gun violence epidemic in this country should support this amendment and the underlying legislation. I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my dear friend and a tireless champion and leader on the efforts to reduce gun violence.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman very much, and I thank him for his leadership on a very

important enhancement to the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019, which requires the FBI to report on the number of petitions it was not able to make a determination on within the 10-day period.

I think Mr. SCHNEIDER knows that why we are here on the floor is to save lives, to be able to protect innocent people from being subjected to what the Emanuel Nine were: worshippers in a church with their pastor, praying, as this country allows one to do.

It is my belief that the Schneider-Jackson Lee amendment should be passed, because with this critical data and compliance reporting we can learn more about legislative injustices like the one that enabled Dylann Roof to process a handgun used to murder the nine innocent persons at Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, and to remind everybody he had not been approved by the NICS reporting system, and he was able to come back. This system allows us to know how many have not been approved, to be able to address the question, to have better policies dealing with protecting gun violence.

It is my privilege to join my colleague in supporting the Schneider-Jackson Lee amendment.

Madam Chair, I close by saying that this tracks the Accidental Firearms Transfer Reporting Act that I introduced in previous Congresses in H.R. 3125 and H.R. 57.

I look forward to working with my colleague as we expand reasonable gun safety legislation to protect our children, our families, and Americans.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment which I am proud to cosponsor with the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman BRAD SCHNEIDER.

I thank the Rules Committee for making the Schneider/Jackson Lee Amendment in order and thank the Majority Whip for introducing the underlying legislation, H.R. 1112, the "Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019."

H.R. 1112, the "Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019," would strengthen the background check procedures that firearms licensees or dealers follow before selling or transferring a firearm.

As under current law, firearms dealers would be required to run a background check on prospective buyers using the National Instant Criminal Background Check System ("NICS").

Over 90% of NICS checks are completed within 90 seconds.

If the NICS system has not returned an answer to the licensed firearms dealer within ten days, the prospective firearms purchaser may file a petition with the Attorney General for review.

Then, after another ten-day period has expired, the licensed firearms dealer may sell or transfer the firearm to the prospective purchaser if it has not received a response through the NICS system and the dealer has no reason to believe that the purchaser is prohibited from obtaining a firearm under federal, state, or local law.

Under this measure, licensed firearms dealers could not sell or transfer under the "default

proceed" provision until at least 20 days have passed since the initial background check.

The Schneider/Jackson Lee Amendment strengthens the bill by requiring the FBI to report on the number of petitions on which it was not able to make a determination regarding the eligibility of the transferee to possess a firearm within the 10-day period allotted by H.R. 1112.

I urge my colleagues to support the Schneider/Jackson Lee Amendment because, with this critical data and compliance reporting, we can learn more about legislative interstices like the one that enabled Dylan Roof to possess the handgun used to murder 9 innocent persons at Mother Emanuel A.M.E. Church in Charleston, South Carolina, as well as the numerous other cases where a firearm was handed over to an unintended and potentially dangerous recipient.

Making sure that policy makers have the most accurate, reliable, and current data regarding background checks is one of the main reasons I introduced the Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act in the 114th and 115th Congress (H.R. 3125 and H.R. 57 respectively).

Madam Chair, if anything, it is gun violence that is a national emergency, and reducing gun violence should be one of Congress's highest priorities.

The Schneider/Jackson Lee Amendment will help to do that.

I ask my colleagues to support the Schneider/Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

Again, I thank Majority Whip CLYBURN for introducing the underlying legislation and Congressman SCHNEIDER for his work on this salutary amendment.

I urge all Members to support the Schneider/Jackson Lee Amendment.

[Feb. 20, 2018]

LIST OF MASS SHOOTINGS SINCE COLUMBINE MASSACRE

(By Zayed Abdalla)

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), chairman of the committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support this amendment, which requires the FBI to report on the number

of petitions it was not able to resolve with a determination within 10 days.

We know that providing more time for checks to be completed in the instances that more time is needed will help prevent guns from getting into the hands of those who are ineligible under current law from purchasing and possessing the guns.

The goal of this bill is to do just that, and to allow individuals whose checks take longer than 10 days to complete the opportunity to petition for their case to be reviewed within another 10-day period.

Madam Chair, the report required by this amendment will help us oversee the implementation of this new process and the changes instituted by this law. I urge my colleagues to support this salutary amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, does the gentleman from Georgia have any speakers on this issue?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. To the good gentleman, I do not.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, 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, after line 16, insert the following:

SEC. 3. GAO REPORTS.

Within 90 days after the end of each of the 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year periods that begin with the effective date of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a written report analyzing the extent to which, during the respective period, paragraphs (1)(B)(ii) and (7) of section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code, have prevented firearms from being transferred to prohibited persons, which report shall include but not be limited to the following—

(1) an assessment of the overall implementation of such subsections, including a description of the challenges faced in implementing such paragraphs; and

(2) an aggregate description of firearm purchase delays and denials, and an aggregate analysis of the petitions submitted pursuant to such paragraph (1)(B)(ii).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I am proud to cosponsor the Enhanced Background Checks Act, H.R. 1112, and I am also proud today to present an amendment that will make sure we can track and learn from the good that this bill will accomplish once it becomes law.

In 2017, 39,773 Americans died from gun violence. This is a public health epidemic.

Under current law, if a background check is not completed within 3 business days, a federally licensed firearm dealer may move forward with a firearms transfer or sale.

The devastating reality is that many horrific acts of gun violence, including the massacre of the Emanuel Methodist Church in Charleston, South Carolina, which ended nine lives and left several people wounded, could have been avoided.

Today, we will vote to close the loophole that allowed for that tragedy by closing what has become known as the Charleston loophole. The Enhanced Background Checks Act will provide the background check system with additional time to make a final determination on a potential firearm purchaser before a licensed dealer can transfer a gun.

We have an obligation to the American people and to the victims of the shooter at the AME church to pass the bill before us today, and I am proud to be part of this effort to protect our communities from gun violence.

My amendment to H.R. 1112 will require the Government Accountability Office to submit a report to Congress 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years following the implementation of this law. These reports will analyze the extent to which the changes made by this law will prevent firearms from being transferred to prohibited persons.

I am proud that this amendment has broad support from all stakeholders that have been involved in making this bill a reality.

We must strive for effective, evidence-based policies that promote public health and protect our communities. My amendment will cost us nothing, but it will help build the evidence base around the effectiveness of good gun violence prevention policies like this one.

This amendment is all the more important, given the regrettable lack of Federal funding for gun violence research. My amendment will finally

help us demonstrate with data that gun violence prevention measures like the one before us today will prevent firearms from ending up in the hands of people who should not have them.

I came to Washington because the people of southern Macomb and southeastern Oakland Counties sent me here on a mission, and that mission includes protecting our communities from senseless gun violence.

I stand today in solidarity with the courageous people of Michigan's Ninth Congressional District's Moms Demand Action and Students Demand Action.

We have a responsibility as Members of Congress and as human beings not just to talk about the horrors of gun violence, but to do everything in our powers to end it. Today, we will take the critically necessary step to do just that.

I would like to thank Congressman JIM CLYBURN, PETER KING, and JOE CUNNINGHAM for their leadership to ensure that we close the Charleston loophole. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1112 and support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

□ 1030

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support this amendment to require the GAO to submit a report to the relevant congressional committees analyzing the extent to which the additions required by this bill prevent firearms from being transferred to prohibited persons.

It will be important for us to get information about the implementation of the law and its impact on so-called default proceed transactions. The amendment also requires that the GAO report its findings after 90 days and again after 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years.

I think it is always a good idea to actually track the effect of new legislation and see how effective it is.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, and I commend the sponsor for doing so.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-14.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, 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, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. __. REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.

Within 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and Firearms, shall submit to the Congress a report analyzing the effect, if any, of this Act on the safety of victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and whether any further amendments to the background check process, including amendments to the conditions that must be met under this Act for a firearm to be transferred when the system has not notified the licensee that such transfer would not violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, would likely result in a reduction in the risk of death or great bodily harm to victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Chair, when we discuss the epidemic of gun violence in our country, we must confront the issues of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

According to the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, firearms pose a significant danger to victims of domestic violence, and this is true no matter who owns the firearm. Research shows that a male abuser's access to a firearm increases the risk of intimate partner femicide fivefold and does not support the contention that firearm possession is a protective factor for the victim.

The fact is, prohibited buyers who obtain a firearm through the Charleston loophole are disproportionately likely to be prohibited because of domestic violence. Indeed, in 2017, 23 percent of cases where a gun was transferred to a prohibited purchaser through a default proceed sale involved a person prohibited due to a conviction for domestic violence, or prohibited due to a domestic violence restraining order.

Denials related to domestic violence often require more investigation than denials based on other factors.

I am offering this amendment so that this bill's background check process, before it goes into effect, Congress can hear from experts in the Justice Department and at the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and Firearms on whether any changes could be made to better protect victims of domestic violence.

This amendment requires the study on domestic violence to be completed

within 150 days. If the Van Drew amendment passes, this bill will have an effective date of 210 days after enactment.

If the study finds that further changes would be advisable to better protect domestic violence victims, Congress will have enough time to make those changes.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, let me thank the gentlewoman for offering this amendment, along with our other colleagues, to H.R. 1112 that would simply require the Department of Justice to release a report analyzing the effect of this bill's provisions on the safety of the victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Madam Chairwoman, I am here on the floor today with the hopes that my colleagues will listen to the 10 million men, women, and children who experience domestic violence each year. Domestic violence is a horrible scourge, and the presence or possession of a gun only worsens these tragedies.

You heard my colleague, Representative PORTER, say that women are five times more likely to die or be killed in a domestic violence situation if a gun is owned, which is one of the reasons, Madam Chair, I have introduced legislation to help incentivize States to adopt laws that ensure that we do everything to take guns from those with a court restraining order or other protective order.

I hope, Madam Chair, that my colleagues will listen to the one in three women and one in four men who have been victims of intimate partner violence. I sure hope that my colleagues will listen to me as one of the 4.5 million women who have experienced gun violence firsthand.

There is much discussion in these Chambers about a national emergency. Gun violence and domestic violence are a national emergency, and that is why we have offered this amendment so that our laws actually reflect the realities.

The data collected will be critical to inform Congress about ways to prevent needless tragedies in our country, and to help us evolve in a way that will more accurately protect our constituents.

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

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

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

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. VAN DREW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-14.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Chairwoman, 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 16, strike the close quotation marks and the following period.

Page 3, after line 16, insert the following:

“(8)(A) If, after 3 business days have elapsed since the licensee initially contacted the system about a firearm transaction, the system notifies the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would not violate subsection (g) or (n), the licensee may continue to rely on that notification for the longer of—

“(i) an additional 25 calendar days after the licensee receives the notification; or

“(ii) 30 calendar days after the date of the initial contact.

“(B) If such other person has met the requirements of paragraph (1)(B)(ii) before the system destroys the records related to the firearm transaction, the licensee may continue to rely on such other person having met the requirements for an additional 25 calendar days after the date such other person first met the requirements.”.

Page 3, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. __. EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

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. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment will ensure that from the date a firearm purchase is legally authorized under the bill, the firearm purchaser has 25 calendar days to pick up their gun, regardless of how much time has elapsed since the background check was first initiated.

This would prevent a situation under the bill as it is written that, although rare, would still be possible, where the maximum allowable number of business days, 20 business days, that a purchaser would have to wait for an approval could actually run longer, hypothetically, than the 30 days.

That would be problematic because under a current ATF, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives regulation, a gun cannot be transferred after 30 days once a background check begins.

Where more than 30 calendar days have passed since the licensee first contacted NICS, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, the licensee must initiate a new NICS check prior to transferring the firearm. My amendment would prevent an unnecessary background check do-over.

For those who get approved by the FBI after 3 business days, my amendment would essentially nullify the 30

days ATF regulation, allowing prospective firearm owners the peace of mind that they do deserve.

After this bill went through the Judiciary Committee, the point was raised that an existing ATF regulation, if left unchanged, could result in a situation where even after a background check was approved or a petition process was followed, the lawful gun buyer would still not be able to get the gun without doing a second background check because too much time had elapsed since the first background check began.

This is clearly not the intent of the bill, and while I believe that ATF would amend the regulation if this bill is passed, this amendment removes all doubt. Anyone who is legally authorized to obtain a firearm under the new process will have ample time, 25 days, to return to the dealer and retrieve the gun.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman here on this. It is good to fix this. But the only problem is, it doesn't fix it—I think that is the problem that we are looking at—as written. As we discussed earlier, your amendment claims to prevent this endless loop, but it fails to do so.

Per ATF regulation, a NICS check is only valid for 30 calendar days from when the NICS is initially contacted. This language does not extend the timeframe in the event of a delayed response, nor does it direct the attorney general to do so.

So if the purchaser completes the three-step process under H.R. 1112, then attempts to take possession of the firearm on calendar day 31, ATF regulations would suggest it is too late. The NICS check has expired, and as a result, the federally licensed firearms dealer would need to conduct a new NICS check while restarting the process.

Madam Chair, I did offer an amendment to extend the validity of the NICS check to 60 days to cure this deficiency, however, the Democrats refused to make my amendment in order. For that reason, I am glad that the gentleman is trying to fix this, which is where it should be, but it just doesn't fix it.

So we are again searching for an amendment and solution to a problem that could have been fixed, but this amendment does not fix it. I am glad the gentleman brought the amendment and in the plain reading of the statute and the plain reading of this amendment, this is a great attempt. It just falls short.

For that reason, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment because it does not actually fix the problem we outlined earlier.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Chairwoman, I would just again emphasize that this is 25 days after the approval, and also that law supersedes regulation. There is no question that that 25 days would be in place and that would give more than a sufficient amount of time, in fact, a lenient amount of time, just to ensure that there aren't any problems here.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chairman, to speak in favor of this amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment, and this completely takes care of Mr. COLLINS' concern, whether he realizes it or not. Because this says that the transfer can take place for 25 days after the transfer becomes legally permissible.

In other words, under the longest timeframe, the background check doesn't come back within 10 days. The purchaser waits a few days, and then petitions the attorney general. It takes another 10 days. Then it becomes legally permissible.

This says the transfer can take place for 25 days after that. So there is no way that this doesn't take care of the problem that Mr. COLLINS raised, and then some.

The current procedures in place do not take into account the longer waiting period in the petition process that H.R. 1112 requires. This amendment more than takes care of that. It is a salutary amendment. It makes the system work, and I can't understand anybody, whether they support the bill or not, who wouldn't want to support this, so I support the amendment.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman, and just as a couple of other points, on a personal level, I have always been a supporter of Second Amendment rights and continue to be. The purpose of this amendment is to, obviously, do so, support Second Amendment rights.

□ 1045

Secondly, I know that there is language in another part of the bill that many people have asked me about which is not something that I am amending or had to do with, but I know that there is a commitment from leadership that that language is going to be completely redone and that language will be totally appropriate and actually will be a major improvement.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate my chairman, but I disagree, because there is still the 30-day limitation. The 30-day limitation is not done here, and so there is and could be a problem if it was done. I still have my time, and there is no time remaining.

The issue here is that if it is approved after the 30 days, then this bill does not fix it. The easy fix here was an

amendment we offered that simply extended it for 60 days. That is your fix. Instead, we go through this where there can be, as all good things lawyerly, we can have lawyerly disagreements. I think in the end, when you actually go back and look at this, you will see that there is an interpretation problem here. The 30 days still exists.

Why could we have not just simply extended the NICS date for 60 days instead of 30 days instead of going through this exercise of legal interpretation?

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings now will resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-14 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SCHNEIDER of Illinois.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. VAN DREW of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 144, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

AYES—282

Adams	Barragán	Blumenauer
Aguilar	Bass	Blunt Rochester
Allred	Beatty	Bonamici
Arrington	Bera	Bost
Axne	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Bacon	Bishop (GA)	F.

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

NOES—144

Aderholt	Balderson	Brady
Allen	Banks	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Barr	Buchanan
Amodei	Bergman	Buck
Armstrong	Biggs	Bucshon
Babin	Bilirakis	Burchett
Baird	Bishop (UT)	Burgess

NOT VOTING—11

Abraham	González-Colón	Plaskett
Byrne	(PR)	Radewagen
Frankel	Katko	San Nicolas
Garamendi	Marchant	Soto

□ 1115

Messrs. BALDERSON, MOOLENAAR, MITCHELL, JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. POSEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Messrs. WOODALL, SHIMKUS, COLLINS of New York, McHENRY, and YOHIO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. VAN DREW

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) 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 234, noes 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—234

Adams	Allred	Axne
Aguilar	Amash	Barragán

NOES—193

Aderholt	Buchanan	Cook
Allen	Buck	Crawford
Amodei	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Armstrong	Budd	Curtis
Arrington	Burchett	Davidson (OH)
Babin	Burgess	Davis, Rodney
Bacon	Byrne	DesJarlais
Baird	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Duffy
Banks	Carter (TX)	Duncan
Barr	Chabot	Dunn
Bergman	Cheney	Emmer
Biggs	Cline	Estes
Bilirakis	Cloud	Ferguson
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Fleischmann
Bost	Collins (GA)	Flores
Brady	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Brooks (AL)	Comer	Fox (NC)
Brooks (IN)	Conaway	Fulcher

Gaetz	Latta	Rutherford
Gallagher	Lesko	Scalise
Gianforte	Long	Schweikert
Gibbs	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Gohmert	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Gooden	Marchant	Simpson
Gosar	Marshall	Smith (MO)
Granger	Massie	Smith (NE)
Graves (GA)	Mast	Smucker
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Spano
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Stauber
Green (TN)	McClintock	Stefanik
Griffith	McHenry	Steil
Grothman	McKinley	Steube
Guest	Meadows	Stewart
Guthrie	Meuser	Stivers
Hagedorn	Miller	Taylor
Harris	Mitchell	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Moolenaar	Thornberry
Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)	Timmons
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Tipton
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Turner
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Upton
Hill (AR)	Nunes	Wagner
Holding	Olson	Walberg
Hollingsworth	Palazzo	Walden
Hudson	Palmer	Walker
Huizenga	Pence	Walorski
Hunter	Perry	Waltz
Hurd (TX)	Peterson	Watkins
Johnson (LA)	Posey	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)
Johnson (SD)	Reed	Wenstrup
Jordan	Reschenthaler	Westerman
Joyce (OH)	Rice (SC)	Williams
Joyce (PA)	Riggleman	Wilson (SC)
Kelly (MS)	Roby	Wittman
Kelly (PA)	Rodgers (WA)	Womack
King (IA)	Roe, David P.	Woodall
King (NY)	Rogers (AL)	Wright
Kinzinger	Rogers (KY)	Yoho
Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)	Young
LaHood	Rose, John W.	Zeldin
LaMalfa	Rouzer	
Lamborn	Roy	

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham	González-Colón	Radewagen
Frankel	(PR)	San Nicolas
Garamendi	Katko	Soto
	Plaskett	Wilson (FL)

□ 1126

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. LEE of California changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts) having assumed the chair, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, 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. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee, and, pursuant to House Resolution 145, she reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments 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 further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlemanwoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. LESKO. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Lesko moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1112 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 13, insert “(I)” after “(ii)”;

Page 1, line 17, strike “(I)” and insert “(aa)”.

Page 2, line 9, strike “(aa)” and insert “(AA)”.

Page 2, line 14, strike “(bb)” and insert “(BB)”.

Page 2, line 21, strike “(II)” and insert “(bb)”.

Page 3, line 1, insert “or” after the semicolon.

Page 3, strike line 2 and insert the following:

“(II) in the case that the transferee is a victim of a crime of domestic violence, 3 business days (meaning days on which State offices are open) have elapsed since the licensee contacted the system. In this subclause, the term ‘crime of domestic violence’ means an offense that has, as an element, the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force, or the threatened use of a deadly weapon, committed by a current or former spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the victim as a spouse, parent, or guardian, or by a person similarly situated to a spouse, parent, or guardian of the victim; and”;

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlemanwoman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit will not kill the bill or send it back to committee, to be clear. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

My Democratic colleagues are set to pass this bill despite the fact that the ACLU opposes it.

Let me repeat that. The ACLU opposes H.R. 1112 because it is so sweeping and improperly perpetrates unfounded assumptions that people with mental disabilities should be considered dangerous and are prone to violence without any meaningful due process.

As most of you know, I am a survivor of domestic violence, and that is why this motion to recommit is so personally important to me. This motion to recommit, in contrast, is narrowly tailored. It would simply allow victims of domestic violence who go through a NICS check to receive their firearms in 3 days, which is the status quo, if NICS

has not responded with a denial or approval in 3 business days—again, the status quo.

Do we really want to tell victims of domestic violence they have to wait up to 20 business days, which is under this bill, before they are allowed to adequately defend themselves?

Do we really want to tell them: Sorry. I know you are purchasing a firearm to protect yourself, but you have to wait 20 business days?

Should we tell them: Hopefully you can hide from your abuser for the next month?

The Judiciary Committee recently heard testimony from a young woman who was raped on her college campus. She did not have a gun on campus because the State did not allow her to carry a gun in order to defend herself. This is a clear example of how law-abiding citizens, not criminals, follow the law and how this law-abiding young woman was harmed by gun control laws.

Another specific example related to this bill of a well-intentioned law gone wrong is Carol Bowne, a New Jersey woman stabbed to death while waiting to be approved for her firearm application. She already had an order of protection from the courts, but that wasn’t enough for her. She needed more than just that piece of paper. She needed to protect herself, so she went and tried to get a gun to defend herself, but because of the waiting period, she was killed.

Let me repeat that. Carol Bowne had an order of protection. She attempted to purchase a firearm, and she was tragically murdered by her abuser while waiting to be approved.

H.R. 1112 will make the realities of Carol’s story happen across the country, putting millions of women and law-abiding citizens in danger. Women who seek avenues of protection will be forced to wait almost a month, like Carol.

How many women will potentially suffer like Carol? And what will the Democrats say: Sorry; we hope you can hide from your abuser for a month?

Madam Speaker, that would be foolish as well as heartless. It would be an infringement of Second Amendment rights for someone who needs them the most.

Given the insidious flaws in this bill, do we really want to burden law-abiding victims by placing them in a never-ending cycle of background checks? Of course not.

This motion to recommit is a commonsense measure. It would ensure that domestic violence victims, many of whom live in fear, can receive the protection they need and deserve.

Vote for this motion to recommit and you vote to protect domestic violence victims. Vote against the motion to recommit and you are telling victims who live in fear: Sorry; we won’t help you.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, the underlying bill, H.R. 1112, is a critical and carefully crafted bill to address the Charleston loophole.

We have discussed it here today, but I will repeat, the very name “Charleston loophole” is a grim reminder of the deficiency in current law that allows killers to get guns even if a firearms background check has not been completed. This is a dangerous flaw that we can address with a minor change to the system.

When a background check cannot be completed within a 3-day period, it is important that the FBI work to resolve the unanswered questions presented, because these are the very cases that present the most danger.

Unfortunately, we have seen many default proceeds go forward in domestic violence cases, allowing an abuser to obtain a firearm even when he or she is prohibited from owning one. The statistics back that up.

In 2013 and 2014, a plurality of default proceed transfers to prohibit a person were related to domestic violence. In that same period, 30 percent of denials due to convictions for misdemeanor domestic violence were issued after the abuser took possession of the gun.

My heart goes out to my colleague, Mrs. LESKO, because she should never have suffered from domestic violence. Unfortunately, we are colleagues that both know it.

I have spent more time thinking about how you keep guns out of the hands of abusers, probably, than anybody in this Chamber. I know better than most the dangers they pose.

It is not easy for me to talk about it this week, but more than once—and I think of the abuser. I will be honest on this floor. My father was mentally ill. I had to hide in that closet with my siblings wondering if we would live or die. One night, I kept my father from killing my mother. He shouldn't have had a gun.

This is what I remember as a child. My mother went out and bought a gun, and then all of us were scared to death about her gun and my father's gun. We had two guns to worry about.

No child, no woman, no man should ever have to go through that.

The additional time provided by H.R. 1112 will help us stop more massacres such as the one in Charleston, and may it prevent another child or family going through what I did as a child.

These amendments made by this motion would undermine the lifesaving improvements to current law that this bill will initiate. I oppose this motion with every bit of my heart and soul and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, let me just take this 1 minute to welcome to this Capitol Ms. Jennifer, Ms. Malana, and Ms. Eliana Pinckney, the widow and two surviving daughters of Reverend Clementa Pinckney.

They hid under his desk in the basement of Emanuel AME Church while a demented gentleman who wanted to start a race war, was welcomed into their Bible study—at the end of that hour, Reverend Clementa asked all of the worshippers to bow their heads and close their eyes as he prayed for what had occurred that evening. While their heads were bowed and their eyes closed, Dylann Roof opened his, after having been welcomed into their midst, and he slaughtered Reverend Pinckney and his eight worshippers.

Why? Because he was allowed to get this gun when he was not eligible to get one. They found out on the fifth day that he was ineligible but, by that point, it was too late. As a result, those poor souls lost their lives.

Let's give the FBI, let's give the authorities, enough time to do their jobs. We will save lives and we will be better off for it.

Mrs. DINGELL. 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.

Mrs. LESKO. 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, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered; and Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 232, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—194

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)

Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot

Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foss (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)

Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—232

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow

Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.

Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui

McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter

Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)

Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Luján
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Abraham
Frankel

Garamendi
Katko

Soto

□ 1152

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

Mrs. LESKO. 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 228, nays 198, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—228

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españolat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher

Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim

King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—198

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann

Flores
Portenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long

Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber

Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small
(NM)

Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Abraham
Frankel

Garamendi
Katko

Meuser
Soto

□ 1200

Mr. TURNER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I was present, did insert card and voted No on final passage on Enhanced Background Checks Act, but my vote was not recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I apologize for not being present to vote. I had a family health emergency in Florida to attend. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 100, “yea” on rollcall No. 101, “nay” on rollcall No. 102, and “yea” on rollcall No. 103.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2019, TO MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2019; AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 2019

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, March 4, 2019, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, March 5, 2019, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

"I AM JAZZ"

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, today I have the great honor of reading again along with my colleague, ANGIE CRAIG, "I Am Jazz." It is a book about a transsexual young boy who becomes a young girl.

"I am Jazz.

"For as long as I can remember, my favorite color has been pink. My second-favorite color is silver and my third favorite color is green.

"Here are some of my other favorite things: dancing, singing, back flips, drawing, soccer, swimming, makeup, and pretending I'm a pop star.

"Most of all, I love mermaids. Sometimes I even wear a mermaid tail in the pool.

"My best friends are Samantha and Casey. We always have fun together. We like high heels and princess gowns, or cartwheels and trampolines.

"But I am not exactly like Samantha and Casey.

"I have a girl brain but a boy body. This is called transgender. I was born this way."

IN RECOGNITION OF FIREFIGHTER DOUG HOPE

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

Mr. YOHO. Today, I would like to recognize the kindness and generosity of one of my constituents, High Springs firefighter Doug Hope.

Last week, Doug responded to a Life Alert emergency call for an elderly woman who lives alone.

Thankfully, the alert was a false alarm, but while assessing the woman, Doug noticed that her microwave wasn't working, so she was unable to heat up the Meals on Wheels food that she relies on to get by. When he realized how long it had been since she had eaten a warm meal, Doug decided to go out and buy her a new microwave.

The High Springs Fire Department shared the story on Facebook, and it

has since been viewed by more than a million people.

Despite this attention, Doug has remained humble. He says he just hopes people who hear about this story are inspired to pay attention to one another and do something for someone else.

Well done, Doug. Your compassion and selflessness are an inspiration to all. And, Doug, thanks for being a great example of passing it forward.

"I AM JAZZ"

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

Mrs. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Jazz and Friends National Day of Readings.

And I continue: "Mom said that being Jazz would make me different from the other kids at school, but that being different is okay. What's important, she said, is that I'm happy with who I am.

"Being Jazz caused some other people to be confused too, like the teachers at school.

"At the beginning of the year they wanted me to use the boys' bathroom, and play on the boys' team in gym class, but that didn't feel normal to me at all.

"I was so happy when the teachers changed their minds. . . ."

"Even today, there are kids who tease me, or call me by a boy name, or ignore me altogether. This makes me feel crummy.

"Then I remember that the kids who get to know me usually want to be my friend. They say I am one of the nicest girls at school.

"I don't mind being different. Different is special. I think what matters most is what a person is like on the inside.

"And inside, I am happy. I am having fun. I am proud.

"I am Jazz."

TYBEE ISLAND MARINE SCIENCE CENTER

(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 Tybee Island in the First Congressional District of Georgia for breaking ground on a brand-new Marine Science Center.

After years of hard work and planning by Tybee residents, local officials, business leaders, engineers, and so many other individuals, a ceremony was held on February 25 to celebrate the start of construction.

Scheduled to open in March of 2020, the programs at the current Marine Science Center have been enormously successful. One program called Sidewalk to the Sea has been able to reach more than 40,000 kids and educate them

about the nearby Atlantic Ocean, which sits only a few hundred yards away from the facility.

Additionally, the new Marine Science Center will include interpretive exhibits, an amphitheater, a shark school, animal rescue activities, a dune habitat trail, and more.

It is so encouraging to see the residents of this local community taking steps to appreciate our oceans, while educating old and young alike on ways that they can pitch in to preserve them.

Congratulations, and keep up the good work.

CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, thank you for allowing me to raise awareness for Children's Dental Health Month.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because tooth decay is the number one chronic infectious disease among children in the United States, and the impact of untreated tooth decay goes far beyond oral health.

Having been a dentist for over 30 years, this issue is something that I have witnessed firsthand, and it is something I have great concern for. This is why the American Dental Association has dedicated February as National Children's Dental Health Month. This annual celebration allows dentists and volunteers to spread awareness and prevention tips that help parents, teachers, and others.

Attitudes and habits established at an early age are critical in maintaining good oral health and oral health that lasts throughout life. Ensuring that children and adults get quality and accessible oral health care should remain a priority for everyone throughout the year.

Remember, if you ignore your teeth, they will go away.

THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

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

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the majority party's attempts to take away Americans' Second Amendment rights.

The legislation before the House this week is a constitutional overreach that would limit the rights of law-abiding citizens and does not address the serious issue of illegal gun transfers.

Madam Speaker, criminals do not follow the law. According to the Department of Justice, 77 percent of State prison inmates convicted of a firearm crime either obtain their firearm through theft, off the black market, from a drug dealer, or on the street.

This legislation would make criminals out of law-abiding citizens, instead, and infringe upon Second Amendment gun rights. I urge my colleagues to protect the constitutional right of the American people to keep and bear arms.

GUN LAWS THAT MAKE AMERICA SAFE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and the privilege of being a Member of the House of Representatives.

I also am speaking without notes because, over 40 years ago, I lost a teenage friend of mine just a few yards from my front door in what was perhaps one of the first drive-bys in the history of Los Angeles, a senseless killing where a young man on drugs decided to shoot through a wall of someone's home—my friend's home. With one shot, Rudy died at the age of 16.

Today, I had the honor and the privilege of voting on a bill that would make our streets safer—not solve every problem, but reduce the amount of crying and dying that goes on in too many communities around America.

I must say this—and it is unfortunate to have to clarify—because I am Latino, people are assuming that the person who shot Rudy was a Latino or a Black male or what have you. He was not. He was a young man—a victim, himself, of drug abuse—a White young man.

It should never happen to anyone, and people should never assume that it only happens to certain people in certain communities. Tens of thousands of human lives are lost every year in the greatest country, America, and we need to make it better.

□ 1215

IN COMMEMORATION OF JUDGE JAMES DEAN

(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 bring attention to an unsung hero in Florida's history.

In 1858, James Dean was born into slavery in Ocala, Florida. In pursuit of his dream to enter public office, Dean entered Howard University School of Law working part time as a clerk to put himself through school.

He earned a bachelor's and master's of law, graduating as the valedictorian in both degrees. After graduating, Dean returned home to Florida in 1887, taking a position as a school principal and establishing a law practice in Key West.

His practice grew so quick that he had to resign from the school within a

year to care for his clients. As his business grew, so did his standing in the community. In 1888, just a year after moving to Key West, he was nominated to serve as a county judge.

This didn't sit well with many White political leaders in Key West who conspired to have him removed from the bench. They fabricated a story that Judge Dean illegally married an interracial couple and the Governor of Florida removed him from office.

As Black History Month comes to a close today, it is important to not shy away from uncomfortable moments in our history. And while Governor Bush posthumously reinstating his judgeship in 2002 can never make up for the harm suffered, remembering his story makes us all more sensitive to current injustices suffered by our friends in the Black community.

PRESERVING QUINDARO TOWNSITE

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

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Representatives CLEAVER, WATKINS, and LARSEN, for cosponsoring this bipartisan piece of legislation to designate the Quindaro Townsite in Kansas City, Kansas, as a national commemorative site. I would also like to thank Senator PAT ROBERTS for his important leadership on this issue.

The bill that passed this week honors the significant history of Quindaro, which served as a key stop on the Underground Railroad and helps preserve the site for future generations.

Quindaro is an important part of United States and Kansas history in the fight for freedom and equality. It serves as a reminder of a dark chapter in our Nation's history.

Sadly, for too long, the Quindaro Townsite has lacked proper investments needed to preserve it as a historic site. But the community leaders in Kansas never gave up on fighting for Quindaro, people like Marvin Robinson a Kansas City, Kansas, native who spent over 30 years working for this legislation to pass.

He now plans to use the site to improve racial relations in the community and to educate people about our shared history.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to protect Quindaro's history and keep its stories alive for future generations.

ENDANGERING AMERICANS WITH GUN CONTROL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, this week the new Democrat majority has endangered more Americans with its push for more and more gun control.

By definition, criminals don't follow the law. Criminals don't honor gun

laws. They steal. They commit murder, all sorts of crimes without permission. They don't seek permission when they take something from you, when they enter your home.

They don't seek permission to become gun owners. Yet, what happens here in the legislation this week, limits the rights, limits the ability for people to defend themselves, defend their own homes, defend their own families, by having less options or less ability to get a weapon if they need it, especially timely.

These measures do not work. They do not work to stop the shootings that are often cited as the reason to deny people their Second Amendment rights in this country.

Indeed, it is a political agenda that gets pushed in every election, every possible time in legislation, and finally, with the majority they have, they are able to push this stuff through and harm innocent Americans and their ability to defend themselves.

This has to come to a stop. I hope the Senate will defeat this measure.

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I do appreciate the Speaker's new policy that says a Member of Congress can only have one Special Order in which they are in charge of the time each week once a week. I have been trying to get Republicans to take our time, much in the way my colleague, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and the group they call the "30 Somethings" did in 2005 and 2006.

I have not had a great deal of success in getting a lot of people to take Special Order time. But with this new rule and some of the terrific freshmen that we have got who have come in—some of the folks who have been here a term or two—they are stepping up and taking our time to discuss critically important issues for our country. Today, I am it from our party, and I am honored to be here.

We have heard a lot of talk, and the reason we say have heard a lot of talk is because there is truth in seeing a double standard at the Department of Justice for a number of years now.

There was a time when it was the Department of Justice that Jeff Sessions remembered back in the 1980s during his time as U.S. attorney. That time changed with top people in the FBI and top people in the DOJ; it became no longer about justice, but just us and what we want at the DOJ and the FBI.

In talking to former Justice attorneys, prosecutors, one dear friend in Texas—not in my district, but a very dear friend—we were talking about how the things that were done by people, including Rosenstein, the former U.S.

attorney, McCabe, Strzok, Page, all of these other people, Ohr, were incredible, just incredible, and I would include Mueller in that.

Mueller as FBI Director, I continue to believe did more damage to the FBI during his 12 years as the director of the FBI than anyone, even the problems that J. Edgar Hoover created, especially in his later years, the wiretapping that he did of people who should not have been wiretapped. Of course, he didn't just do it on his own. As I recall, Attorney General Kennedy had supported wiretapping of Martin Luther King, Jr., if I remember correctly.

But what we have seen in the unmasking of American citizens who have been followed by email, by wire—not taps, but just following their conversations as the NSA and our intelligence community is able to do these days, is absolutely incredible. Hundreds and hundreds of Americans were unmasked. We were assured with the PATRIOT Act when it was up for being reauthorized, oh, no, we are so careful to make sure that we don't capture Americans that should not be captured unless they are involved with a terrorist organization or a known foreign terrorist. They don't get picked up.

But now, if they are talking to a terrorist, a known foreign agent, then it is possible they could be picked up, but those names are masked. They are never unmasked. That is too big of a burden. And then we find out under the Obama administration, the American people have had their privacy violated, like Democrats and Republicans alike swore to us would not happen. Well, it has happened. And it has continued to go on.

I had hoped that Christopher Wray would clean things up at the FBI, but he appears to be more concerned about covering up problems rather than cleaning up the problems. I saw a good example of that at the end of August when, once again, the intelligence community had made clear they sent their investigator, Frank Rucker, over to explain to Peter Strzok, as head of the FBI's counterintelligence—and also Dean Chappell, their liaison—to explain that we now have 100 percent proof, there is no question, Hillary Clinton's private email server was hacked.

They embedded a direction into her server that forced every email coming in and going out into what has now been disclosed publicly by others as a Chinese intelligence agency front.

They were getting every one of Hillary Clinton's—over 30,000 emails to and from. There were four that were glitches, but otherwise, over 30,000 emails. So that must include the ones that President Obama sent using another name so people wouldn't realize it was him using a private server.

But there were also the President's daily intelligence briefings that went through her home. She had somebody at the home print them out for her

without any security clearance. There were all kinds of violations, what appeared from the code to be outright crimes, but the double standard appears to continue.

This is from February 25, an article from CNS News, Terence Jeffrey reported that the inspector general says, "Prosecution Was Declined for Senior DOJ Official Who Sexually Assaulted a Subordinate."

And it goes on to talk about that. The name is not disclosed. He sexually harassed subordinates, sexually assaulted yet another subordinate, and then lacked candor. That is the DOJ's explanation for people they don't want to prosecute when they are actually saying that he lied, committed a crime, but lied when the IG investigated this matter.

So the unnamed prosecutor or prosecutors were not disclosed, but allowed to retire, no consequences, though guilty of sexual assault in the DOJ.

Now, there were a lot of things I disagreed on with a late, former Federal judge in Texas named William Wayne Justice, but one thing I agreed with him on, and I heard him tell people: "You, of all people, especially, knew better."

And he would come down harder on somebody like this who had been part of the DOJ. I would imagine Judge Justice, if he were around, he would throw the book at somebody who worked at Justice and still committed crime and abused the system. I can just hear him still today coming after somebody like that.

But not in the DOJ. We have got lots of carryover from the Obama years, and I know my friend, Jeff Sessions, called them career people because they were in career slots. But he was talking about people who loved Sally Yates, thought she did the right thing in refusing to defend constitutional positions taken by the Trump administration.

Yet, many of those people are still there undercutting President Trump, undercutting Matt Whitaker when he was acting, and will, no doubt, be undercutting Attorney General Barr.

□ 1230

So this is a real problem when the Justice Department, the one we counted on for many decades now, if there was something wrong, whether it is civil rights or others, and justice could not be found, the Department of Justice could be counted on to come in and pursue real justice, to their credit.

FBI agents and prosecutors, some retired now from the Department of Justice, have privately conveyed to me their broken hearts over the damage done to the Department of Justice and to the FBI because they became so caloused, so self-absorbed, and so political that they have damaged not only the FBI and not only the Department of Justice, but this country.

But when you have willing allies in the alt-left media—or some call them

the mainstream media; certainly, alt-left these days—it is understandable that same feeling of desperation is felt by the American people: Where do we turn when the Justice Department is not honest?

It used to be you could trust the media. You could find somebody who would do such great investigative journalism that they would get to the heart of it and bring something to the forefront, to the point that the American people would justifiably become outraged, and that would force either elected or appointed Federal officials with the Federal Government to do something.

But here we have alt-left, lamestream media saying that there is no crisis on our border. Yet if you look at the same things said by Obama officials about the same problems, except now exacerbated on our border with all the caravans that have come, are coming, and are continuing to be established in Central America, it is amazing how some of these media outlets can even continue to call themselves journalists.

An article from Brian Flood, January 10, this year, points out that: "News outlets readily described a 'crisis' at the border under then-President Barack Obama when he sought funding to deal with a surge of migrants, many of them women and children. But now that President Trump is in the White House, the mainstream media seem far more reluctant to use the word."

"Back in the summer of 2014, the headlines and stories referring to the C-word"—apparently the crisis word—"were plentiful as the border surge was taken seriously along the Acela corridor."

"The Washington Post"—now an alt-left medium—"wrote in 2014, 'White House requests \$3.7 billion in emergency funds for border crisis'—there is that C-word, crisis—"while CNN published a feature, 'Daniel's journey: How thousands of children are creating a crisis in America.' It described a problem of 'epic proportions.'"

Now, they point out that: "Around the same time, the Huffington Post declared that 'photos of the humanitarian crisis'—even Huffington called it a crisis—"along the southern border were 'shocking,' and ABC News reported that Obama requested '\$3.7 billion to cope with the humanitarian crisis on the border and the spike in illegal crossings by unaccompanied minors from Central America.'"

The ABC News story even mentioned this word to deal with plans for \$3.7 billion. This was ABC's headline: "Immigration crisis funds." Incredible.

NBC, June 2014, Andrea Mitchell said the undocumented children flooding the border were, in her words, "creating a crisis" for authorities.

How these news outlets can turn around and now say that there is no crisis when the testimony and the evidence is clear that the overall numbers for last year may have been down, but

as the testimony and evidence makes clear, in October, November, December, and January, those numbers spiked to numbers that our Border Patrol has not dealt with before for minors and family units.

Why would they all of a sudden spike during that time? Because it appeared the Democrats had a chance of taking the majority here in the House, and in so doing, Democrats have made clear they wanted to continue to allow illegal immigration. They welcomed the families. Naturally, you were going to see a spike.

These people below our southern border in Mexico, Central America, South America, and now coming from the Middle East and other continents, have been coming for some time from other countries. They are being lured in.

The head of the Border Patrol testified this week in our committee that they were being pulled in. But really, it is being lured. They hear: Gee, if we will just come now, we have people who are in charge of the House of Representatives who want us there, and they are going to try to stop the President from enforcing and securing the border, so now is the time to come.

And they are coming. We heard the testimony that about 80 percent of the people who came across our borders in decades past were normally male adults. It made sense. Usually, it was people who were coming looking for work, and they were going to send money to their families back in Mexico. But the word got out the end of last year and this year that if you will come and bring a minor child, whether it is your child or not, then you have a good chance of staying in the country.

We know that nobody crosses our border illegally on the south unless they have gotten permission by paying the drug cartels. Over and over during the nights I have spent on the border, the question has been asked: Where did you get the money to pay to come?

Oh, 1,000 here, 1,000 from people in the U.S.

Well, what about the rest of the money you have to pay?

The drug cartels are going to let me work it off when I get where I am going.

They would normally have an address. As I understand it, that is often the address the drug cartel told them where they would need to go get set up and work off what they owed to the drug cartels.

But, Madam Speaker, you shouldn't be surprised when you see headlines like: Meth lab in major U.S. city busted, run by drug cartels.

As the Department of Homeland Security folks have pointed out to me before, the drug cartels call us their logistics. All they have to do is get somebody illegally into the country, and they hand us the address of somebody supposedly that they know where they can go live, and we handle the shipping for them. We ship them to wherever they want to go. Sometimes, they are

detained, but we have shipped millions of people around, all over the country.

If what they have told the Border Patrol about working off what they owe the drug cartels is true—I haven't seen or heard any reason it wouldn't be—then our Homeland Security Department for a decade or so has been shipping people to the location where the drug cartels want them. The drug cartels are making billions and billions of dollars a year.

When you hear any Mexican or Central American official who says they want to keep the American border open, you can just pretty well guarantee they are getting money from the drug cartels.

The best thing, the most caring and loving thing, we could do for our neighbors to the south would be to secure our border, put border barriers where they need it, whether it is a wall, a 30-foot barrier, whatever. Secure the border and then that will cut off the billions of dollars of American money going to the drug cartels for them to terrorize people in Mexico and people in Central America.

You care about people south of our border. Of course, we can't bring in all those millions who are suffering under drug cartel rule and reign, but we could secure our border and cut off the domestic terrorists called the drug cartels, cut off their funding so they won't be able to pay people to cut off the heads of police chiefs or mayors who take a strong stand against the drug cartels and put those heads on a pike as an example to anybody who tries to stand up against the cartels.

It used to be that the drug cartels had a deal. It was just kind of a policy that they are not going to allow any kind of crime or violence to tourists because that is too important for Mexico to have those tourists' money coming in. That has long since gone by the way. Tourists are killed and terrorized.

I long for the day when my wife and I can go back to where we honeymooned in Mexico, back to where we celebrated anniversaries. It was wonderful. We don't believe we can do that now.

If we secure our border and dry up the money to the drug cartels, then the money can begin flowing to Mexico for something besides drugs, and we can cut off the fentanyl and the massive amount of drugs that pours across our southern border undetected.

I know some people say the majority of drugs are coming through the ports of entry. That is where they catch more of it. But as it was explained to me and STEVE CHABOT some years back down in Colombia, when they were showing us—we had DEA. The British had people who were helping. They were doing a great job fighting the FARC's drugs down in Colombia under then-President Uribe. They were saying that this guy is fearless. It is hard keeping him alive, but he is amazing. He is fighting the drug cartels down there.

I said, well, so you are saying about two-thirds of the cocaine, the drugs from Colombia, goes up through the Gulf of Mexico into Mexico, so it can cross our southern border. Another one-third apparently goes up to California, trying to cross the border, it goes into Mexico across our southern border. I mean, if they have boats that will go that far, why not just have them pull up to a Texas or California beach that is deserted?

These Colombian, American, and British drug experts explained that it is because the drug cartels are businesspeople. They have a business model. They have a business plan. They play the odds. They know the odds are many times better to get the drugs into America if they don't go to a port of entry and they don't go to an abandoned beach somewhere. They bring it into Mexico, have it cross the Mexico-U.S. border, and they will get most of their drugs in. So that is their business plan.

□ 1245

That is still going on. It was going on during President Bush's administration, probably back to Clinton and the former Bush and even Reagan, to a lesser extent. But it is sure going on in the 21st century.

With all the discussion about there not being a crisis when clearly there has been and is—it is a humanitarian crisis, but it is also a crisis of U.S. sovereignty.

We cannot have a country that is based on laws if we cannot control our own borders. We will be overwhelmed, as we have been, by more and more people who do not observe the laws, do not think the laws are important. They do not understand. They have not been educated how important it is to enforce the law fairly across the board. They don't know what it is to preserve self-government.

Franklin knew that, Benjamin Franklin, when he said: "It is a Republic, madam, if you can keep it." He knew. He had studied history, as had our Founders. They knew that the Constitution that came together, as Washington referenced, had to have divine providence at work, because no way these guys who started out for 5 weeks doing nothing but yelling at each other could have come up with a document that was the best governing document, the best constitution, put together in the history of mankind.

Here is more about the media's hypocrisy, an article from the Washington Examiner, Eddie Scarry. This has a quote: "We now have an actual humanitarian crisis"—there is that C-word again—"on the border that only underscores the need to drop the politics and fix our immigration system once and for all." That was a quote from then-President Barack Obama in the Rose Garden in 2014.

He went on to say—that is, President Obama—"In recent weeks, we've seen a surge of unaccompanied children arrive

at the border, brought here and to other countries by smugglers and traffickers.”

That is basically, as the Examiner points out, what President Trump said. He said: “Last month, 20,000 migrant children were illegally brought into the United States, a dramatic increase. These children are used as human pawns by vicious coyotes and ruthless gangs.”

This article says: “The only difference is how the media are covering it.”

The Washington Post said, 2014—this is The Washington Post’s words—“The current crisis on the Southwest border, where authorities have apprehended tens of thousands of unaccompanied Central American children since October”—well, there you are. There is that C-word they used then and belittle the word being used now.

Anyway, this is an article from The New York Times from 2014 by Michael Shear and Jeremy Peters. They said, talking about the border crossing into Texas, it is “an urgent humanitarian situation.”

Their article said, and this is from Senator MARCO RUBIO: “Let’s remember, this administration”—talking about the Obama administration—“went around for years saying the border has never been more secure than it is now. I think,” and this is MARCO RUBIO, “that’s been exposed as a fallacy over the last 3 weeks.” That is because people were realizing it was a border crisis during the Obama years.

Just the fact that it has gone on for years and years does not diminish the crisis. It actually exacerbates the crisis. When you put the October, November, December, January numbers, record numbers, of people coming in claiming to be family units—why? Because they have heard, if they have minor children, then they will be allowed to stay, and they will be allowed to keep the minor children. It is encouraging a dark market, a criminal market, in children.

Make sure, if you are coming to America, you have a child in your group, because then you claim: Oh, we can’t be separated.

As the Director of Border Patrol pointed out this week in testimony under oath, now the huge majority is people coming who are claiming to be family units. Most of them are, but we don’t know. That is why it is important to check.

So this is a time of crisis, and you would hope that major media, whether it is alt-left or whatever, would be reporting what is happening in America. It is a humanitarian crisis, as they acknowledged during President Obama’s term. It is even more of a humanitarian crisis now that there are so many more minor children who are being brought here.

Once again, for those who bring up the term “war on women,” how about the fact that over a third of the young girls, the young women, who are

brought to our southern border illegally are being sexual assaulted, raped, normally multiple times along the way? Do people not care what is happening? Wouldn’t that be a war on women that some of us want to stop?

The estimate by doctors who have been treating these people say that 17 percent of the young boys coming up and crossing into the U.S. illegally have been sexually molested, assaulted.

Where is the outrage? It ought to be from both sides of the aisle.

These are people whose lives are just being terrorized. When we hear about, “Oh, well, people are just caring about their families,” really? You would subject your daughter to being one of the third who is sexually raped numerous times while you want to come into America? You would do that to your daughter?

We ought to be helping Mexico. They are not helping much. They are helping some. But we ought to be shoring up the border. It is the best thing we can do for Mexico, continue to be the most generous country in the world, in the history of the world, in allowing people to come into our country legally.

Keep that going. It is good for America. But stop the drug cartels from controlling our southern border. It ought to be our authorities controlling our border, nobody else.

If that is not enough, here comes what has been called a Green New Deal. Some have accurately called it more of a green socialist manifesto, a green raw deal.

Rick Manning has a great article this month: “Everyone is talking about the Green New Deal and how it would end domestic airline travel, the internal combustion engine, fossil fuel usage, most electricity generation, and even ban cow flatulence. You have groups guessing what the cost of the Green New Deal would be in terms of dollars on an annual basis. . . . To everyone seeking to normalize this Green New Deal, please just shut up.

“The Green New Deal is the baring of teeth by the new American communist, a new breed unleashed that we have seen in the streets, attacking people attending Trump rallies, screaming at teenagers wearing Make America Great Again hats, shouting down and rioting against conservative speakers on college campuses.

“Here is the truth. Socialism and communism are evil. Putting a shroud of legitimacy and normalcy to the destruction of the American ideal is being a Menshevik in a Bolshevik revolution. You cannot moderate the bloodlust of those who seek to enslave you by trying to come up with common ground or discuss alternatives to meet their needs. The revolution demands immediate payment.

“So let’s stop talking about the symptoms which the Green New Deal represents and actually begin to dissect the disease that is collectivism. First, definitionally, the only dif-

ference between socialism and communism is if you voluntarily surrender your freedom and wealth or have it confiscated. Either alternative ultimately comes from the coercive power of the gun and are based upon the premise that those who have attained wealth used ill-gotten means to get it. As a result, they have no moral authority to keep it from those from whom it presumably was stolen.

“In socialism and communism, individual rights are not derived from God and guaranteed by the Constitution. Instead, everything you have and can expect comes from the goodwill of the government. It is no mistake that John Lennon’s socialist anthem ‘Imagine’ starts with the following words: ‘Imagine there’s no heaven. It’s easy if you try. No hell below us; above us, only sky. Imagine all the people living for today.’

“In order to achieve a kingdom ruled by man, unfettered by morality or rules, you have to nix a sovereign God from the equation. If there is no God, then all rights are nothing more than those that the government chooses to allow you to have, and the only protections that exist are those which they grant. The only question is who gets to be the one holding the keys over everyone else’s life.”

This is what, on one hand, surprises me about billionaires in America funding a move toward socialism. Obviously, these are not stupid people. They can look at the history of socialism, communism. They know that, whether it is socialists or communists, you have two classes. You eliminate the middle class. There is no middle class. You have this small group of ruling class, and then you have everybody else, all the misérables.

I guess they think they get us to socialism and they will be part of that elite socialist class that rules over everybody else.

I have seen it. The summer I lived in the Soviet Union, when it was the real Soviet Union, there were some nice things, but it was clear they didn’t have freedom. The government watched, through spies, everything that those people did.

I asked, on one occasion: Why is that lady running off?

Well, she is going to go report me, he said.

Why would she go report you? You are not anything to her.

No. In your country you can get ahead by making money. In my country, he said, we get ahead by stepping on others. So anybody you can turn in for anything, anybody that you can step on, it elevates you in our system here in the Soviet Union.

He was right. And that is where we are headed with people thinking socialism is a good way to go.

The bumper sticker is true. The big problem with socialism is you can vote your way into it, but you will have to shoot your way out.

That is what we are seeing play out in Venezuela. They voted themselves

into it, and now they are having to shoot their way out. Unfortunately for most of them, they don't have guns, so they are pretty empty-handed in fighting a government that has the guns.

□ 1300

It is a tragic situation. It should be one of the most prosperous countries in the world. It was until socialism took over. And again, as Rick Manning is trying to point out, that is where we are headed.

"It makes one wonder if Ono," he said, "has given up 100 percent of her songwriter royalties to the song to the government as a show of solidarity for the dream.

"And here is what they don't say," he says, "in order for the world to 'live as one' with no possessions, someone is going to have to take all the stuff and hold it collectively for the common good.

"In order for there to be stuff to take and most importantly eat in the future, someone is going to have to do the hard work to produce it. Someone is going to have to figure out how to produce it, and someone is going to have to get it from where it is produced to where the brotherhood is living. And then someone is going to have to distribute it, being certain that everyone gets the same amount of gruel."

And I saw that, too, in the stores back in the Soviet Union. If you were part of that elite ruling class, they would keep back a really nice pair of shoes, maybe the only pair they got, for the highest ranking person that they dealt with.

In the stores, the Soviets would tell me: We never find toilet paper; they hold it in the back for the ruling class. We never find good, fresh vegetables. They hold that back for the ruling class.

It is really tragic the way people are treated, ultimately, in a socialist or communist society, or now called progressivist.

So, good article by Brad Polumbo, February 26, How Socialism Destroys Private Charity and Hurts the Poor. It is tragic.

Between what we see destroying the rule of law in America, coming across our southern border illegally, overwhelming our schools—how fair is it? If you really care about children, how fair is it to this big group of children in school?

And as teachers have pointed out to me: I love my kids. I love the kids that come in and don't speak English. But they throw them into a class of English speakers because we are required to educate them, and we have to stop teaching, basically, the English-speaking citizens and residents and go to teaching the new kids that just got thrown in, no fault of their own. But those that suffer are the kids.

They have dreams, but, unfortunately for them, they were either born here or came here legally and speak English. But their dreams are going to

be put on hold. They are not going to be able to be educated as well because we have not secured our southern border. And children who don't speak the same language are thrown into their classes, and they are harming the dreams and the hopes of the children who were here.

So is the solution to welcome in 30 million or so people from Mexico? No. It would overwhelm this country, and there would be no place for people to flee to when they are trying to find real asylum from danger.

The better thing is just enforce the law. Secure the border. Cut off the flow of money to the drug cartels, and allow people to live freely here, without worrying about extra crime that wouldn't be here if people weren't here illegally.

It is about preserving the Republic that the Founders gave us. It is about acknowledging that we have, as a nation, been more blessed than any nation in the history of the world. Solomon's Israel didn't have the individual opportunities, the individual assets, the freedoms that we have.

When a majority of Americans fail to recognize that we have been blessed by God and His protective hand has secured our Nation, then those blessings and that protective hand will disappear; and we will be the once-great Camelot, where people could live free, and they could work and keep what they grew, built, earned, that once-great country where people were treated the same, whether poor or rich. They were treated the same under the law.

That once-great country. Wow, what a dream. How did it go wrong?

Well, we just talked about it, and it is time we did something together to stop it.

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

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, this week was, for all intents and purposes, D.C. Statehood Week in the Capital. I am pleased that, today, Senator CARPER has announced that he is introducing the Washington, D.C. Admission Act to make the District of Columbia the 51st State. I am grateful to Senator CARPER, who garnered a record number of Senate cosponsors last year and has been a most vigorous champion of statehood for the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor for my first time this session to discuss D.C. statehood because we have many new Members who may be under the mistaken impression that the 700,000 people who live in your Nation's Capital are treated in the same rights that your own residents are. I beg to differ.

In this city, the citizens do not have each and every right in this Congress. To be sure, we have what is called home rule, and I will later indicate that even that is limited.

The reasons for this unique place, for our Capital, left without the full rights of other citizens, has to do with a quirk, an accident, where the Framers came to believe that the Capital should not be part of a State because they were, in the beginning, parts of various States, and they felt that they could not then control what the Capital would do.

Well, of course, they don't want a Capital to be part of a State, but they didn't really envision statehood, the Capital as a State, because they were thinking of the Thirteen Colonies. And since every city had to be in a State, they could only envision putting the city in a State.

We are about 218 years beyond that, and it is time, way past time—shall I say, overdue in time—to understand how the Nation's Capital of the greatest nation in the world should be viewed and what rights its citizens should have.

So I am very grateful to Senator CARPER for the work he has done and for his introduction of the bill in the Senate this week, the counterpart of the D.C. statehood bill, which I have already introduced in the House.

The bill I have introduced already has 198 cosponsors. I bet—I haven't looked closely, but there is probably no bill in the hopper that has more cosponsors than the D.C. statehood bill. It is not bipartisan yet. That will happen, because this is how we make progress on matters in the House of Representatives. We go one House at a time.

Remember, the District doesn't have any representation in the Senate; yet we have gotten a distinguished Senator introducing the statehood bill, and he has been most energetic, getting the majority of the Democratic Senators on the bill last session.

I am particularly moved today because of the record number of D.C. residents and their colleagues who came to the Congress yesterday to demand that they have equal rights with all other American citizens. I greeted a room full of residents who had visited every office to tell Members what they don't know.

I am grateful particularly that the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, has strongly endorsed D.C. statehood. I believe that means that D.C. statehood will be on the floor this session. I want to thank our Speaker for making D.C. statehood a priority, and indicating in her own words how important it is that every citizen be treated equally.

In the same way, Oversight and Reform Committee Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS has committed to holding a hearing on D.C. statehood, and I will predict this afternoon on the floor that that bill will get out of committee and come to the floor of the House for a vote.

The progress we are making on D.C. statehood is also seen in the inclusion of our statehood demands in what is called H.R. 1. That is an all-democracy bill that tries to improve and make sure that full democracy in every form is present in the United States. In H.R. 1 are extensive findings for D.C. statehood.

I thank the Democratic majority for including the District of Columbia and its plea for statehood in this all important pro-democracy bill. It is called the For the People Act, and H.R. 1 was the first bill introduced.

Most Members who come to the Congress come knowing only that the Nation's Capital is where all these wonderful memorial buildings are. They know that it is a tourist mecca. Many may have come as children or even as adults, as tourists. They probably don't know that 30 million visitors from all over the world visit our Nation's Capital.

In other words, most Members of the House who, by the way, will spend more time in the District of Columbia than they will spend at home, still don't know very much about their own Capital City. They probably don't know that only in America does the legislature not grant full representation to their Capital City.

Well, I have just voted on the House floor. I vote on amendments, but I did not vote on the final bill. I do vote in what is called the Committee of the Whole. The reason I am able to vote there is that, when I first came to Congress in 1991, I saw that I could, indeed, vote in committee, and I knew there was something called the Committee of the Whole.

Well, what is the difference between voting in committee, like the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, for example, where I have always served and voted, what is the difference between that and the Committee of the Whole? No difference.

□ 1315

Both are committees that were created by the Congress, not the Constitution.

So, since I vote in committee, I asked for the right to vote in the Committee of the Whole. It was granted.

But only in America, again, could the following happen: my Republican friends sued the House for allowing the vote in the Committee of the Whole.

The courts looked at that, pronounced the right of the Congress to give that vote in the Committee of the Whole, just as the District has the vote in committee, and my Republican friends then appealed.

At the Court of Appeals, the verdict was, yes, the District of Columbia can vote in the Committee of the Whole, as they vote in committee.

And my good Republican friends didn't quite have the nerve to appeal that one to the Supreme Court, but what they did do, when Democrats lost the House 2 years later, was to take

away a vote, that the courts had said was legitimate, from the residents of the District of Columbia, who are number one per capita in taxes paid to support the government of the United States. And therein lies the outrageous anomaly.

Those who pay the most taxes per capita have the least rights. That is why we are determined to get our rights.

Yes, I have just voted on two gun safety amendments that were on this floor today. I couldn't vote on the final bill, but I could vote on those amendments. They were important amendments relating to background checks.

By the way, something like 97 percent of the American people in one poll were shown to favor background checks. That means you check to see if a person has a criminal background and shouldn't have a gun. What is the controversy in that one?

So I was able to vote on those two amendments.

This is all by way of self-help, thinking through what is it I can do to make sure the people I represent have the maximum of representation they can. I sure am not crying about what I cannot do, when you consider what I can do.

I am chair of the most important subcommittee now in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Through that committee, I have been able to rebuild whole parts of the District of Columbia: The Wharf, the Southwest Waterfront as it is called; the southeast waterfront, Capitol Riverfront; parts of Washington, like NoMa.

I have been able to do a great deal. That is not the issue.

The issue is equal. Not equal for me personally; equal for those I represent, who have paid their dues without getting their rights.

When I say, "pay their dues," I want to elaborate on that. The city I represent has one of the strongest economies in the Nation. It has a budget of about \$14 billion. That is larger than the budget of 12 States. Many States are crying poor, trying to tax or not tax their residents, embroiled in that controversy.

The city I represent has a \$2 billion surplus. Its per capita income, the per capita income of the Americans who live in your Capital City, is higher than that of any State.

Now, we are about the equivalent in size of seven states. Our per capita income, though, is higher than that of any State. Take your biggest States, Texas and New York and California: higher per capita income. That tells you about how much economic activity there is in your Nation's capital.

This city, which is something of a city state, has residents whose personal income is higher than that of seven States; we do not cry poor.

Our population growth is among the highest in the Nation. People want to live in your Nation's capital. It is one

of the most pleasant, livable cities in our country.

What do they pay per capita in taxes? \$12,000 per resident in taxes to support a government that does not give them equal rights.

Our Armed Forces—Armed Forces with representatives from every State, it should be known—has always had residents of the District of Columbia who fought and died in every war, including the war that created the United States, the Revolutionary War. You, of course, are aware of that war, the war that was fought for taxation without representation. No wonder District residents are demanding that our Congress live up to that great slogan and standard.

Now, as I indicated, it is not as if we don't have any rights. The Congress passed the Home Rule Act in 1974—I will speak later about the deficiencies of the Home Rule Act—but that means that the city does have its own elected mayor and its own elected legislature, its council.

How did we get that? Well, first of all, it took over 100 years after the Civil War. The first home rule was given to the Capital City by Republicans in the 19th century who had fought and won the Civil War, where those in my party the Democrats had fought on the side of slavery.

Republicans fought on the side of freedom, and when it saw it had a capital that did not have freedom, it gave the District home rule.

Now, the Republicans had rather much lost their way, as the Democrats certainly had, for more than 100 years, but when Richard Nixon was President of the United States, the Home Rule Act was passed.

I would just like to read a few of his words. He said, in signing the bill: "As a longtime supporter of self-government for the District of Columbia, I am pleased to sign into law a measure which is of historic significance for the citizens of our Nation's Capital."

He went on to say: "I," that is Richard Nixon, now, "first voted for home rule as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1948, and I have endorsed the enactment of home rule legislation during both my terms as President."

This was bipartisan, finally. And Republicans, that party, that post-war party, post-World War II party, deserves credit for understanding that the time had come for the Capital City to have home rule.

That home rule was not complete, in the sense that, and most importantly, the District budget has to come here, and it becomes a foil on which to press amendments to overturn laws that people may not like.

I have been able to defeat most of those riders, as we call them, or attempts to take down D.C. laws, but the D.C. budget shouldn't come here at all.

I recognized that while pursuing statehood, I could get close to statehood by simply finishing the Home

Rule Act and making it whole and complete, and so I embarked on a two-track road. One, of course, is the one I have just discussed: D.C. statehood.

The other is what I call free and equal D.C. bills, bills that together bring us close to statehood. I started with a congressional review amendment. This one is really nonsensical.

The District passes a law. Ultimately, most of those laws matter not to the Congress and certainly aren't overturned, but the Home Rule Act says that the law shall not become final for 30 days, and that is 30 consecutive days.

The House is not in session consecutive days. This is Thursday, for example. We are out, so I don't know if it is 3 or 4 days this week that would be counted, but you have to count up till you get to 30 days, and then, of course, the bill can become law.

Well, it always does. No one uses this particular power at all. If they want to overturn D.C. laws, then they simply try to attach it to appropriations as they come.

So this is completely unused, but it is terribly burdensome on the city, because you simply have to keep renewing these bills that have been passed in the District until you get finally through the 30-day period. It is ridiculous: not used by the Congress, burdensome on the city, should and could be gotten rid of without anyone noticing it in the Congress or caring about it. So I began with that one, which the Congress can't possibly care about, because it doesn't even use it ever.

But look at some of the other things that could be done even without statehood, which is leading me to embark on this two-track system.

For example, the District of Columbia does not have a local prosecutor, like a district attorney, for example, or a state's attorney.

The U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, a Federal official, not chosen by the District of Columbia, but by the President of the United States, is essentially the district attorney for the District of Columbia. We have no say in this.

And that U.S. attorney has a jurisdiction that has nothing to do with what U.S. attorneys do in other States. It is local law. 90 percent of what the U.S. attorney has as jurisdiction is local law, like the law a DA would enforce. About 10, sometimes 15 percent of his work is Federal.

We want to send him back to all of his Federal work, give him time to do all of that so that we would have a local prosecutor.

That is one of the bills that this Congress could pass, House and Senate, and hardly think about it, because it is certainly uncontroversial that the city have its own law enforcement officer to enforce its criminal laws.

And there is a National Guard rule act. Now, that is the equivalent of what I am speaking of when I say that the Congress should have no interest, only the District.

The National Guard cannot be called out in the event, for example, of a hurricane or a huge snowfall or a flood, only the President of the United States can.

□ 1330

The President of the United States does not need to be bothered with tasks related to ordinary emergencies in the District of Columbia. Somehow, the Mayor would have to find the President and say: Please call out the National Guard. That is the local National Guard.

We don't want jurisdiction over the National Guard when it comes to national matters. We want the same jurisdiction that the States have. The States have the right to call out the National Guard to protect their residents when there are natural disasters. That is, essentially, what we are asking for. So that, too, is part of my Free and Equal D.C. series.

Again, there are 20 of these bills. Let me just indicate one other: the District of Columbia Home Rule Clemency Act. I investigated how often clemency is allowed or has been afforded, and I found only one instance. I will tell you why.

The President of the United States alone can offer clemency to someone who has broken local law. Do you think he bothers or, for that matter, should bother? That is why they don't post anyone who gets clemency in the District of Columbia.

These are the kind of local matters that are holdovers, absolute holdovers, from the days when the District had no home rule. We can't possibly hold our heads up as a democracy and have matters like this that cannot be attended at the local level.

Occasionally, someone comes forward with the notion: We understand, Congressman. We want to make sure that the residents of the Nation's Capital have the same rights as other places. Here is what we would like to do. You come out of a portion of land, contributed by the State of Maryland, so why not return the District of Columbia to Maryland, then you would get your full and equal rights?

Well, the first thing you ought to do is ask Maryland about that. Then you might ask the District of Columbia. And here I have the answers, I think.

Statehood is endorsed by 86 percent of D.C. residents. Retrocession, as it is called, has no constituency either in Maryland or in the District.

This is how I know that.

There was a poll taken in Maryland asking whether or not they thought the District of Columbia should be returned to Maryland. Now, understand, Maryland is a very progressive jurisdiction, but it only has one big city. That is the city of Baltimore. It apparently is not welcoming of another city which has formed its own identity as a State and, for that reason, has an identity as a big city.

I am not surprised that a poll of Maryland legislators found that 92 per-

cent of Maryland Senators oppose retrocession of the District to Maryland, and 82 percent of Maryland Delegates—that is their lower house—oppose retrocession.

What I think this points up is that there are no easy answers: taking a city that is almost as old as the Nation itself—the District became the Capital City in 1801—and somehow finding some easy answer, which turns out to be even harder. It is hard enough to get the Congress to recognize statehood.

Now, suppose we have to go to Maryland, in the case of retrocession, and D.C. to get that answer. That is a harder road to climb. It is not democratic, because that is not what Maryland wants and that is not what the District of Columbia wants. It is a very mechanical answer to a very deep problem.

I indicated that I just voted in the Congress in the Committee of the Whole, and I have voted now, in this new Congress, which is about 8 weeks old, two or three times. Each of those votes are of such great significance to the people I represent. It encourages them to believe that they will have a vote not only in the Committee of the Whole, but they will have a vote where every other American has a vote.

For them, I can only say that they have overpaid, in every conceivable way, for equal rights—yes, by fighting and dying in every war and, yes, in Federal taxes paid, per capita, a larger amount than any residents.

For me, of course, this is a labor of love because I was born and raised here. I am the daughter of a runaway slave who ran away from Virginia.

It is interesting that he ran away and found himself and settled in the District of Columbia as an illegal immigrant, I suppose—a runaway slave—but there was work here. He found work in the city and began to raise work helping to build the city because they were building the roads of the city at that time in the 1830s.

It was no part of his vision that the District would ever have the same rights as other Americans, certainly no part of his vision, as then still a slave, that he would have anything to do with it.

So, this afternoon, as I think about my city and strive for its equality, I think of my great-grandfather, Richard Holmes, who sought freedom for himself and his family the only way he could: by simply walking off of a plantation and making his way to the District of Columbia. In his name, I am honored to seek more of that freedom and equality for the 700,000 Americans who now live in our Nation's Capital.

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

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the 116th Congress for the Committee on Foreign Affairs for publication in the Congressional Record. The Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, with a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on Tuesday, January 29, 2019.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"), to the extent applicable.

(b) A motion to recess and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged non-debatable motions in Committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules, to the extent applicable.

2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House of Representatives is in session pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no business to be considered.

3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum, and the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall make every effort to ensure that the relevant Ranking Minority Member or another Minority Member is present at the time a hearing is convened. One-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the full Committee by a subcommittee unless half of the subcommittee is actually present. A record vote may be de-

manded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Meetings

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise violate any labor rule of the House of Representatives. No person, other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule.

(2) The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter, or adopting an amendment. The relevant Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. When exercising postponement authority, the relevant Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(b) Hearings

(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day should be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the re-

quisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(3) No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from non-participatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee unless the House of Representatives has by majority vote authorized the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings, on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public.

(4) A Member of the House of Representatives who is not a Member of the Committee may not be recognized to participate in a Committee or Subcommittee hearing except by the unanimous consent of Committee Members present at such hearing. Participatory recognition of a non-Committee Member shall occur only after all Committee Members seeking recognition, both majority and minority, have had their opportunity to participate and question any witnesses.

(5) The Committee or a subcommittee may by the procedure designated in this subsection vote to close one (1) subsequent day of hearing.

(6) No congressional staff shall be present at any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee that has been closed to the public, and at which classified information will be involved, unless such person is authorized access to such classified information in accordance with rule XX of the House of Representatives.

5. CONVENING HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

(a) Hearings

(1) Notice. Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the relevant Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the Committee for the taking of action, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. No change shall be made to a publicly announced hearing title until after consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member and notice to previously announced witnesses.

(2) Member Day Hearing. During the first session of each Congress, the full Committee shall hold a hearing at which it receives testimony from Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner on proposed legislation within its jurisdiction.

(b) Markups and Other Meetings to Transact Business

(1) Convening. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may call or convene, as the relevant Chairman considers necessary, meetings of the Committee or subcommittee for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, or for

the conduct of other Committee or subcommittee business.

(2) Notice. Public announcement shall be made by the Chairman of the full Committee of the date, place, and subject matter of any markup or other meeting to conduct business at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of such markup or meeting, unless the relevant Chairman determines, in consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member, that there is good cause to begin such a markup or meeting on an earlier date. If such determination is made, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring in that determination, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(3) Agenda and Texts. The relevant Chairman shall provide to all Committee or subcommittee Members an agenda for each Committee and subcommittee markup or other meeting to transact business, setting out all items of business to be considered, including whenever possible a copy of any measure scheduled for markup, at least 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before the meeting. Bills on subjects not listed on such agenda shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee, or by the Chairman of the full Committee with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member. The text of any measure to be marked up shall be made publicly available in electronic form at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of the markup meeting, or at the time of an announcement under subparagraph (b)(2) made within 24 hours before such meeting.

(c) Publication. Public announcement of all hearings and markups shall be published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record and made publicly available in electronic form. Members shall be notified by the Staff Director of all meetings (including markups and hearings) and briefings of subcommittees and of the full Committee.

(d) Member Seating. During Committee and subcommittee hearings and markups, chairs on the dais are for Members. No staff member other than a Committee or subcommittee staff director, counsel, or professional staff member may occupy a chair on the dais, unless authorized by the Chairman of the full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Full Committee. Only one staff member each from the majority and the minority may occupy chairs on the dais at any time during a hearing or markup.

6. WITNESSES

(a) Interrogation of Witnesses

(1) In so far as practicable, witnesses shall be permitted to present their oral statements without interruption subject to reasonable time constraints imposed by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with questioning by the Committee Members taking place afterward. Members should refrain from questions until such statements are completed.

(2) In recognizing Members, the relevant Chairman shall, to the extent practicable, give preference to the Members on the basis of their arrival at the hearing, taking into consideration the majority and minority ratio of the Members actually present. A Member desiring to speak or ask a question shall address the relevant Chairman and not the witness.

(3) Subject to paragraph (4), each Member may interrogate the witness for 5 minutes, the reply of the witness being included in the 5-minute period. After all Members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the relevant Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may permit one (1) or more majority Members of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman to question a witness for a specified period of not longer than 30 minutes. On such occasions, an equal number of minority Members of the Committee designated by the Ranking Minority Member shall be permitted to question the same witness for the same period of time. Committee staff may be permitted to question a witness for equal specified periods either with the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee or by motion. However, in no case may questioning by Committee staff proceed before each Member of the Committee who wishes to speak under the 5-minute rule has had one opportunity to do so.

(b) Testimony of Witnesses

(1) Advance Filing Requirement. Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee is required to file testimony with the Committee or subcommittee at least two (2) business days in advance of that appearance. For purposes of this subsection, testimony includes the written statement of a witness, as well as any video, photographs, audio-visual matter, posters, or other supporting materials that the witness intends to present or display before the Committee. Such testimony should be provided in electronic form to the extent practicable. The Committee or subcommittee shall notify Members at least two business days in advance of a hearing of the availability of testimony submitted by witnesses. In addition, each witness shall provide sufficient copies, as determined by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, of his or her proposed written statement to be provided to Members and start of the Committee or subcommittee, the news media, and the general public. The text of the written statement provided pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered final, and may not be revised by the witness after the Committee meeting at which the witness appears.

(2) Witness Preclusion and Waiver. The requirements of paragraph (1) or any part thereof may be waived by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or the presiding Member, or the Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee as it relates to witnesses who are called by the minority to testify, provided that the witness or the relevant Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has submitted, prior to the witness's appearance, a written explanation to the reasons testimony has not been made available to the Committee or subcommittee. If a witness who is not an official of the U.S. Government has not submitted testimony as required by paragraph (1) and no such written explanation has been submitted, the witness shall be released from testifying unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee votes to accept his or her testimony.

(3) Remote Witness Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall promptly, and not later than 48 hours beforehand if possible, notify the relevant Ranking Member of any witness who is likely to present testimony other than in person, such as by videoconference. A witness may not testify via telephone or other audio-only medium without the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee or subcommittee. The relevant Chairman shall make reasonable efforts to verify the identity of any witness participating remotely.

(4) 'Truth In Testimony' Disclosure. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of pro-

posed testimony shall, to the extent practicable, include: a curriculum vitae; a disclosure of the amount and source of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), or of any contract or payment originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness, to the extent that such information is relevant to the subject matter of, and the witness' representational capacity at, the hearing; a disclosure of whether the witness is negotiating or awaiting approval to receive a contract with or payment from a foreign government; and a disclosure of whether the witness is an active registrant under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA). Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy, safety, or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(5) Witness Presentation. A witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of his or her written statement.

(6) Translation. A witness requiring an interpreter or translator should include in the testimony provided pursuant to paragraph (1) the identity of the interpreter or translator that the witness intends to use. Unless properly noticed as a separate witness, an interpreter or translator appearing before the Committee should not present views or statements other than those expressed by the witness.

(c) Oaths. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, or any Member of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness appearing before the Committee.

7. PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and markup sessions. Members of the Committee and any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own remarks and may make any grammatical or technical changes that do not substantively alter the record. Any such Member or witness shall return the transcript to the Committee offices within seven (7) calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after receipt of the transcript, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

Any information supplied for the record at the request of a Member of the Committee shall be provided to the Member when received by the Committee.

Transcripts of hearings and markup sessions (except for the record of a meeting or hearing which is closed to the public) shall be printed as soon as is practicable after receipt of the corrected versions, except that the Chairman may order the transcript of a hearing to be printed without the corrections of a Member or witness if the Chairman determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time to correct such transcript and such transcript has not been returned within such time.

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form, including official prints of hearings and markups sessions.

8. EXTRANEOUS MATERIALS IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS PRINTS

No extraneous material shall be printed in either the body or appendices of any Committee or subcommittee hearing, except matter which has been accepted for inclusion in the record during the hearing or by agreement of the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee within five (5) calendar days of the hearing. Copies of bills and other legislation under consideration and responses to written questions submitted by Members shall not be considered extraneous material.

Extraneous material in either the body or appendices of any hearing to be printed which would be in excess of eight (8) printed pages (for any one submission) shall be accompanied by a written request to the relevant Chairman. Such written request shall contain an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing such material.

9. INFORMATION ON COMMITTEE ACTION

(a) Record Votes. The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee outside of executive session shall be made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Such result shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each Member voting for and against, and the Members present but not voting.

(b) Adopted Amendments. Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the text of each such amendment shall be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) Hearing and Markup Attendance. Member attendance at each Committee hearing and markup shall be recorded and included in the Committee print of the transcript of that hearing or markup.

10. PROXIES

Proxy voting is not permitted in the Committee or in subcommittees.

11. REPORTS

(a) Reports on Bills and Resolutions. To the extent practicable, not later than 24 hours before a report is to be filed with the Clerk of the House on a measure that has been ordered reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall make available for inspection by all Members of the Committee a copy of the draft Committee report in order to afford Members adequate information and the opportunity to draft and file any supplemental, minority or additional views which they may deem appropriate.

With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in any Committee report on the measure or matter.

(b) Prior Approval of Certain Reports. No Committee, subcommittee, or staff report, study, or other document which purports to express publicly the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or a subcommittee may be released to the public or filed with the Clerk of the House unless approved by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day). In any case in which clause 2(1) of rule XI and clause 3(a)(1) of rule XIII of the House of

Representatives does not apply, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be given an opportunity to have views or a disclaimer included as part of the material filed or released, as the case may be.

(c) Foreign Travel Reports. At the same time that the report required by clause 8(b)(3) of rule X of the House of Representatives, regarding foreign travel reports, is submitted to the Chairman, Members and employees of the Committee shall provide a report to the Chairman listing all official meetings, interviews, inspection tours and other official functions in which the individual participated, by country and date. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Chairman may waive the listing in such report of an official meeting, interview, inspection tour, or other official function. The report shall be maintained in the Committee offices and shall be available for public inspection during normal business hours. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no Member or employee of the Committee will be authorized for additional Committee travel until the reports described in this subsection have been submitted to the Chairman for that person's prior Committee travel.

12. REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Except in extraordinary circumstances, bills and resolutions will not be considered by the Committee unless and until the appropriate subcommittee has recommended the bill or resolution for Committee action, and will not be taken to the House of Representatives for action unless and until the Committee or a relevant subcommittee has ordered reported such bill or resolution, a quorum being present.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that contains exclusively findings and policy declarations or expressions of the sense of the House of Representatives or the sense of the Congress shall not be considered by the Committee or a subcommittee unless such bill or resolution has at least 25 House co-sponsors, at least 10 of whom are Members of the Committee.

For purposes of this rule, extraordinary circumstances will be determined by the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member and such other Members of the Committee as the Chairman deems appropriate.

The Committee or a subcommittee shall not consider a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that expresses appreciation, commends, congratulates, celebrates, recognizes the accomplishments of, or celebrates the anniversary of, an entity, event, group, individual, institution, team, or government program, or that acknowledges or recognizes a period of time for such purposes, except in circumstances determined by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

13. STAFF SERVICES

The Committee staff shall be selected and organized so that it can provide a comprehensive range of professional services in the field of foreign affairs to the Committee, the subcommittees, and all its Members. The staff shall include persons with training and experience in foreign affairs, making available to the Committee individuals with knowledge of major countries, areas, and U.S. overseas programs and operations.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee, except as provided in paragraph (c), shall be appointed, and may be removed, by

the Chairman with the approval of the majority of the Members in the majority party of the Committee. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the Chairman, and they shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman. Staff assignments are to be authorized by the Chairman or by the Staff Director under the direction of the Chairman.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee assigned to the minority shall be appointed, their remuneration determined, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the majority of the minority party Members of the Committee. Such staff shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member with the approval or consultation of the minority Members of the Committee.

The Chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee. The Chairman shall ensure that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

14. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Full Committee. The full Committee will be responsible for oversight and legislation relating to: foreign assistance (including development assistance, Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Millennium Challenge Account, HIV/AIDS in foreign countries, security assistance, and Public Law 480 programs abroad); national security developments affecting foreign policy; strategic planning and agreements; war powers, treaties, executive agreements, and the deployment and use of United States Armed Forces; peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions; arms control and disarmament issues; the International Development Finance Corporation, the United States Agency for International Development; activities and policies of the State, Commerce, and Defense Departments and other agencies related to the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act, including export and licensing policy for munitions items and technology and dual-use equipment and technology; international law; promotion of democracy; international law enforcement issues, including narcotics control programs and activities; international cyber issues; U.S. Agency for Global Media; embassy security; international broadcasting; public diplomacy, including international communication and information policy, and international education and exchange programs; and all other matters not specifically assigned to a subcommittee. The full Committee will have jurisdiction over legislation with respect to the administration of the Export Administration Act, including the export and licensing of dual-use equipment and technology and other matters related to international economic policy and trade not otherwise assigned to a subcommittee, and with respect to the United Nations, its affiliated agencies, and other international organizations, including assessed and voluntary contributions to such organizations. The full Committee may conduct oversight and investigations with respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee as defined in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subcommittees. There shall be six (6) standing subcommittees. The names and jurisdiction of those subcommittees shall be as follows:

Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations
Asia, the Pacific and Nonproliferation

Europe, Eurasia, Energy and the Environment

Middle East, North Africa and International Terrorism

Oversight and Investigations

Western hemisphere, Civilian Security and Trade

The subcommittees shall have jurisdiction over the following within their respective regions:

(1) Matters affecting the political relations between the United States and other countries and regions, including resolutions or other legislative measures directed to such relations.

(2) Legislation and oversight regarding human rights practices in particular countries.

(3) Legislation with respect to region- or country-specific loans or other financial relations outside the Foreign Assistance Act.

(4) Legislation with respect to disaster assistance outside the Foreign Assistance Act, boundary issues, and international claims.

(5) Oversight of regional lending institutions.

(6) Oversight of matters related to the regional activities of the United Nations, of its affiliated agencies, and of other multilateral institutions.

(7) Identification and development of options for meeting future challenges relating to U.S. interests in the region including terrorism and cyber issues.

(8) Oversight of base rights and other facilities access agreements and regional security pacts.

(9) Concurrent oversight jurisdiction with respect to matters assigned to the other subcommittees insofar as they may affect the region.

(10) Oversight of foreign assistance activities affecting the region.

(11) Such other matters as the Chairman of the full Committee may determine.

The Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: international health issues, including transboundary infectious diseases, maternal health and child survival, and programs related to the global ability to address health issues; population issues; the United Nations and its affiliated agencies (excluding peacekeeping and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions); the American Red Cross; and the Peace Corps. In addition, legislation and oversight pertaining to: implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; other matters relating to internationally recognized human rights, including legislation aimed at the promotion of human rights and democracy generally; and the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and related issues.

The Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and Nonproliferation: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: nonproliferation matters involving nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction.

The Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy and the Environment: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: global energy trends; energy security, responses to energy crises and challenges; international efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; development of renewable energy technologies; promotion of transparency and good governance in the global energy sector; universal access to uninterrupted and affordable energy; environmental conservation and wildlife protection.

The Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa and International Terrorism: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: international terrorist threats,

United States' efforts to manage and coordinate international programs to prevent and combat terrorism as coordinated by the Department of State and other agencies, and efforts to bring international terrorists to justice.

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations: With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, oversight and investigations of all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

The Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security and Trade: In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: matters relating to international economic and trade policy; commerce with foreign countries; international investment policy; the International Development Finance Corporation and Trade and Development Agency; commodity agreements; and special oversight of international financial and monetary institutions; the Export-Import Bank, and customs; civilian security, including transnational organized crime and preventing violence by state or non-state actors. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, legislative jurisdiction over measures related to export promotion and measures related to the International Development Finance Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency.

15. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) In General. Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it.

(b) Scheduling. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee chairmen, the relevant Ranking Minority Member and other appropriate Members, with a view toward minimizing scheduling conflicts. Subcommittee meetings shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full Committee. Hearings shall not be scheduled to occur prior to the first vote or subsequent to the last vote of a legislative week, or outside of Washington, D.C., without prior consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member. In order to ensure orderly administration and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, the subject, time, and location of hearings and meetings shall be arranged in advance with the Chairman through the Staff Director of the Committee.

(c) Vice Chairmen. The Chairman of the Full Committee shall designate a Member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chairman.

(d) Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may attend the meetings and participate in the activities of all subcommittees of which they are not Members, except that they may not vote or be counted for a quorum in such subcommittees.

(e) Required Oversight Hearings. During each 180-day period following organization of the Committee, each subcommittee shall hold at least one hearing on oversight of U.S. Government Activities.

16. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee and to the extent practicable, all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks. In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee, legislation may also be referred to additional subcommittees for consideration. Unless otherwise directed by the Chairman, such subcommittees shall act on or be discharged from consideration of legislation that has been approved by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks of

such action. In referring any legislation to a subcommittee, the Chairman may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the full Committee.

Subcommittees with regional jurisdiction shall have joint jurisdiction with the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations over legislation regarding human rights practices in particular countries within their regions.

The Chairman may designate a subcommittee Chairman or other Member to take responsibility as manager of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House of Representatives.

17. PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

The majority party caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party Members for each subcommittee. Party representation on each subcommittee or conference committee shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full Committee. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member are authorized to negotiate matters affecting such ratios including the size of subcommittees and conference committees.

18. SUBCOMMITTEE FUNDING AND RECORDS

Each subcommittee shall have adequate funds to discharge its responsibility for legislation and oversight.

In order to facilitate Committee compliance with clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each record vote shall be promptly made available to the full Committee for inspection by the public in accordance with rule 9 of the Committee.

All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as Chairman of the subcommittee. Subcommittee records shall be coordinated with the records of the full Committee, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

19. MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

The Chairman shall call a meeting of the subcommittee chairmen on a regular basis not less frequently than once a month. Such a meeting need not be held if there is no business to conduct. It shall be the practice at such meetings to review the current agenda and activities of each of the subcommittees.

20. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

(a) Authorized Persons. In accordance with the stipulations of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all Members of the House who have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives shall be authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

Members of the Committee staff shall be considered authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee when they have the proper security clearances, when they have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and when they have a demonstrable need to know. The decision on whether a given staff member has a need to know will be made on the following basis:

(1) In the case of the full Committee majority staff, by the Chairman, acting through the Staff Director;

(2) In the case of the full Committee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, acting through the Minority Staff Director;

(3) In the case of subcommittee majority staff, by the chairman of the subcommittee;

(4) In the case of the subcommittee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee.

No other individuals shall be considered authorized persons, unless so designated by the Chairman of the full Committee.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to information classified Confidential. Such designated persons must have the proper security clearance, have executed the oath required by clause 13 of rule XXIII of the house of Representatives, and have a need to know as determined by his or her principal. Upon request of a Committee Member in specific instances, a designated person also shall be permitted access to information classified Top Secret which has been furnished to the Committee pursuant to section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended. Upon the written request of a Committee Member and with the approval of the Chairman in specific instances, a designated person may be permitted access to other classified materials. Designation of a staff person shall be by letter from the Committee Member to the Chairman.

(c) Location. Classified information will be stored in secure safes in the Office of the Security Officer and in the Office of the Minority Staff Director. All materials classified Top Secret or higher must be stored in a Secure Compartmentalized Information Facility (SCIF).

(d) Handling. Materials classified Confidential or Secret may be taken from Committee offices to other Committee offices and hearing rooms by Members of the Committee and authorized Committee staff in connection with hearings and briefings of the Committee or its subcommittees for which such information is deemed to be essential. Removal of such information from the Committee offices shall be only with the permission of the Chairman under procedures designed to ensure the safe handling and storage of such information at all times. Except as provided in this paragraph, Top Secret materials may not be taken from approved storage areas for any purpose, except that such materials may be taken to hearings and other meetings that are being conducted at the Top Secret level when necessary. Materials classified Top Secret may otherwise be used under conditions approved by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

(e) Notice. Appropriate notice of the receipt of classified documents received by the Committee from the Executive Branch will be sent promptly to Committee Members through the Survey of Activities or by other means.

(f) Access. Except as provided for above, access to materials classified Top Secret or otherwise restricted held by the Committee will be in approved Committee spaces. The following procedures will be observed:

(1) Authorized persons will be permitted access to classified documents after inquiring of the Staff Director or an assigned staff member. Access to the SCIF will be afforded during regular Committee hours.

(2) Authorized persons will be required to identify themselves, to identify the documents or information they wish to view, and to sign the Classified Materials Log, which is kept with the classified information.

(3) The assigned staff member will be responsible for maintaining a log which identifies: (1) authorized persons seeking access,

(2) the classified information requested, and (3) the time of arrival and departure of such persons. The assigned staff member will also assure that the classified materials are returned to the proper location.

(g) Divulgence. Classified information provided to the Committee by the Executive Branch shall be handled in accordance with the procedures that apply within the Executive Branch for the protection of such information. Any classified information to which access has been gained through the Committee may not be divulged to any unauthorized person. Classified material shall not be photocopied or otherwise reproduced. In no event shall classified information be discussed in a non-secure environment. Apparent violations of this rule should be reported as promptly as possible to the Chairman for appropriate action.

(h) Other Regulations. The Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such additional regulations and procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Members of the Committee will be given notice of any such regulations and procedures promptly. They may be modified or waived in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

21. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

All Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage in accordance with the provisions of clause 3 of House rule XI.

The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall determine, in his or her discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room, but shall not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two (2) representatives from each medium.

Such coverage shall be in accordance with the following requirements contained in section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) If the television, Internet or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, Internet or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) The allocation among cameras permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and Member of the Committee or its subcommittees or the visibility of that witness and that Member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in po-

sitions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(f) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee or subcommittee is in session.

(g) Floodlights, spotlights, strobe lights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the current state-of-the-art level of television coverage.

(h) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos, United Press International News pictures, and Reuters. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(i) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the Members of the Committee or its subcommittees.

(j) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(k) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(l) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery Committee of Press Photographers.

(m) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

22. SUBPOENA POWERS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee, following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

In addition, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present.

Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

23. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever the Speaker is to appoint a conference committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Members of the Committee who are primarily responsible for the legislation (including to the full extent practicable the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House), who have

actively participated in the Committee or subcommittee consideration of the legislation, and who agree to attend the meetings of the conference. With regard to the appointment of minority Members, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member.

24. GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Not later than March 1 of the first session of a Congress, the Chairman shall prepare, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, an oversight plan for that Congress; provide a copy of that plan to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days before its submission; and submit the plan (including any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a member of the Committee) simultaneously to the Committee on Oversight and Reform and the Committee on House Administration, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of rule X of the House of Representatives.

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2(n) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee or a subcommittee thereof shall hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following its establishment on the topic of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in programs within its jurisdiction, as documented in reports received from a Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States that have been provided to the Ranking Minority Member prior to the notice of the hearing pursuant to Committee rule 5.

25. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Any additional procedures or regulations may be modified or rescinded in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2019.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House rule XI, the Committee on House Administration adopted its rules for the 116th Congress on February 7, 2019, and I submit them now for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson.

RULE NO. 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a privileged motion in the Committee.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) The Committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee, and to make such information available to the public. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee shall be paid from the appropriate House account.

(d) The Committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) The Committee's rules shall be made publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 60 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. 2—REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a)(1) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Tuesday of every month when the House is in session in accordance with clause 2(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. If the House is not in session on the second Tuesday of a month, the regular meeting date shall be the third Tuesday of that month.

(2) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairperson of the full Committee as the Chairperson considers necessary, or at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(3) The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairperson subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. A regularly scheduled meeting may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairperson, there is no need for the meeting.

(b) If the Chairperson is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting.

(c) The Chairperson, in the case of meetings to be conducted by the Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any meeting to be conducted on any measure or matter. Such meeting shall not commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which members have notice thereof. If the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines that there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present, the Chairperson shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The announcement shall promptly be made publicly available in electronic form and published in the Daily Digest.

(d) The Chairperson, in the case of meetings to be conducted by the Committee shall make available on the Committee's web site the text of any legislation to be marked up at a meeting at least 24 hours before such meeting (or at the time of an announcement made within 24 hours of such meeting). This requirement shall also apply to any resolution or regulation to be considered at a meeting.

RULE NO. 3—OPEN MEETINGS

As required by clause 2(g), of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee in open session and with a quorum present determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the

public because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House. Provided, however, that no person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and such other persons as the Committee may authorize, shall be present in any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. To the maximum extent practicable, the Chairperson shall cause to be provided audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

RULE NO. 4—RECORDS AND ROLLCALLS

(a)(1) A record vote shall be held if requested by any member of the Committee.

(2) The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the Committee offices, including a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against; and the members present but not voting.

(3) The Chairperson shall make the record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded available on the Committee's website not later than 48 hours after such vote is taken (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays). Such record shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment; motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

(4) The Chairperson shall make available on the Committee's website not later than 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter the text of such amendment.

(b)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2), the Chairperson may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairperson may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time.

(2) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (1), the Chairperson shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(3) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(c) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chairperson; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(d) House records of the Committee which are at the National Archives shall be made available pursuant to rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairperson shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision to withhold a record pursuant to the rule, and shall present the matter to the Committee upon written request of any Committee member.

(e) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE NO. 5—PROXIES

No vote by any member in the Committee may be cast by proxy.

RULE NO. 6—POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, documents and other materials as it deems necessary, including materials in electronic form. The Chairperson, or any member designated by the Chairperson, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairperson of the full Committee, in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee, following consultation with the ranking minority member.

(2) In addition, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee in accordance with clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority of the Committee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairperson or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(3) At least two business days before issuing any subpoena pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Chairperson shall consult with the ranking minority member regarding the authorization and issuance of such subpoena, and the Chairperson shall provide a full copy of the proposed subpoena, including any proposed document schedule, at that time.

(4) The requirements of paragraph (3) may be waived in the event of an exigent circumstance that does not reasonably allow for advance written notice.

RULE NO. 7—QUORUMS

No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. For the purposes of taking any action other than reporting any measure, issuance of a subpoena, closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders, or changing the rules of the Committee, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

RULE NO. 8—AMENDMENTS

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the Committee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the Committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the Chairperson will allow an appropriate period of time for the provision thereof.

RULE NO. 9—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) The Chairperson shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present, the

Chairperson shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) Unless excused by the Chairperson, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of his or her statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairperson by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(d) All other members of the Committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearing or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall count for a quorum or offer any motion or amendment or vote on any matter before the subcommittee.

(e) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairperson for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended as provided by clause 2(j) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The questioning of a witness in Committee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairperson, followed by the ranking minority member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairperson shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority. The Chairperson may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(f) The following additional rules shall apply to hearings of the Committee as applicable:

(1) The Chairperson at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the Committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness as provided by clause 2(k)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(3) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The Chairperson may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) If the Committee determines that evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—

(A) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness;

(B) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; and

(C) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in paragraph (5) of this subsection, the Chairperson shall receive, and the Committee shall dispose of, requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee.

(8) In the discretion of the Committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee is the sole judge of the pertinence of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee.

RULE NO. 10—PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING MEASURES OR MATTERS

(a)(1) It shall be the duty of the Chairperson to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairperson notice of the filing of that request.

(b)(1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(2) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) The report of the Committee on a measure or matter which has been approved by the Committee shall include the matters required by clause 3(c) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(d)(1) If, at the time any measure or matter is ordered reported by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views, that member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice, commencing on the day on which the measure or matter(s) was approved, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the Committee.

(2) All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(3) The report of the Committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(A) shall include all supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views, in the form submitted, by the time of the filing of the report, and

(B) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views (and any material submitted under subparagraph (c)) are included as part of the report. This paragraph does not preclude—

(i) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for

the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views has been made as provided by subsection (c); or

(ii) the filing of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee upon that measure or matter.

(4) shall, when appropriate, contain the documents required by clause 3(e) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(e) The Chairperson, following consultation with the ranking minority member, is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to going to conference with the Senate, whenever the Chairperson considers it appropriate.

(f) If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings published and available to the members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House.

(g) The Chairperson may designate any majority member of the Committee to act as floor manager of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House.

RULE NO. 11—COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT

(a) The Committee shall conduct oversight of matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee in accordance with clauses 2 and 4 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Not later than March 1 of the first session of a Congress and in accordance with clause 2(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall prepare an oversight plan for that Congress.

RULE NO. 12—REVIEW OF CONTINUING PROGRAMS; BUDGET ACT PROVISIONS

(a) The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriation for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirement, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 4(e) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefore would be made annually.

(c) The Committee shall, in accordance with clause 4(f)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting there from, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE NO. 13—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, as provided in clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, subject to the limitations therein. Operation and use of any Committee Internet broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

RULE NO. 14—COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee on House Administration shall be appointed as follows:

(a) The staff shall be appointed by the Chairperson except as provided in paragraph (b), and may be removed by the Chairperson, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairperson;

(b) All staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed by the ranking minority member, and may be removed by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member;

(c) The appointment of all professional staff shall be subject to the approval of the Committee as provided by, and subject to the provisions of, clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House;

(d) The Chairperson shall fix the compensation of all staff of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party staff, within the budget approved for such purposes for the Committee.

RULE NO. 15—TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of Committee members and staff. Travel for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairperson or her or his designee. Travel may be authorized by the Chairperson for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance at hearings conducted by the Committee and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairperson in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel;
- (2) The dates during which the travel will occur;
- (3) The locations to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each; and
- (4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the Committee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairperson. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairperson, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) The purpose of the travel;
- (B) The dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) The names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, members and staff attending meetings or conferences shall submit a written report to the Chairperson covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

RULE NO. 16—STAFF DEPOSITION AUTHORITY

The Chairperson may authorize the staff of the Committee to conduct depositions pursuant to section 3(a) of H. Res. 6, 116th Congress, and subject to any regulations issued pursuant thereto.

RULE NO. 17—NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) There shall be one standing subcommittee, with party ratios of members as indicated. The subcommittee shall have jurisdiction as stated by these rules, may conduct oversight over such subject matter, and may consider such legislation as may be referred to them by the Chairperson. The name and jurisdiction of the subcommittee shall be:

(1) Subcommittee on Elections (3/1)—Matters relating to voting rights issues and such other matters as may be referred to the subcommittee.

(b) No subcommittee shall meet during any full Committee meeting or hearing.

(c) The Chairperson may establish and appoint members, consistent with the ratio between majority and minority members serving on the Subcommittee on Elections, to serve on task forces, panels, special, or select subcommittees of the Committee, to perform specific functions for limited periods of time, as the Chairperson deems appropriate.

RULE NO. 18—REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES

The Chairperson may refer legislation or other matters to a subcommittee as the Chairperson considers appropriate. The Chairperson may discharge the subcommittee of any matter referred to it.

RULE NO. 19—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

The subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. No subcommittee shall meet during any Committee meeting.

RULE NO. 20—OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The Chairperson may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

RULE NO. 21—DESIGNATION OF CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

For the purposes of these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff director of the Committee shall act as the clerk of the Committee.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 15, 2019, she

presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 31. Making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 4, 2019, at 11:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

249. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

250. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-640, "Students in the Care of D.C. Coordinating Committee Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

251. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-639, "Local Jobs and Tax Incentive Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

252. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-638, "Hyacinth's Place equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

253. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-636, "DC Water Consumer Protection Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

254. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-635, "Repeat Parking Violations Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

255. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-634, "Performing Arts Promotion Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

256. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-632, "Economic Development Return on Investment Accountability Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

257. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-641, "New Communities Bond Authorization Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1);

(87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

258. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-642, "Community Harassment Prevention Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

259. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-643, "Power Line Undergrounding Program Certified Business Enterprise Utilization Temporary Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

260. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-624, "School Safety Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

261. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-623, "Safe Fields and Playgrounds Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

262. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-622, "Insurance Modernization and Accreditation Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

263. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-621, "LGBTQ Health Data Collection Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

264. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-619, "Community Health Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

265. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-618, "Gas Station Advisory Board Abolishment Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

266. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-617, "Opioid Overdose Treatment and Prevention Omnibus Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

267. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-616, "Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

268. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-615, "Principle-Based Reserves Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

269. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-613, "Safe Disposal of Controlled Substances Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

270. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-612, "East End Grocery Incentive Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

271. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C.

Act 22-611, "Disabled Veterans Homestead Exemption Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

272. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-610, "Language Access for Education Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

273. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-609, "Employment Protections for Victims of Domestic Violence, Sexual Offenses, and Stalking Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

274. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-608, "Public Restroom Facilities Installation and Promotion Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

275. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-631, "District Government Employee Residency Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

276. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-637, "Athletic Trainers Clarification Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

277. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-633, "Wage Garnishment Fairness Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

278. A letter from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation [Docket No.: 181218999-8999-01] (RIN: 0605-AA50) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

279. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final regulations — Regulations Regarding the Transition Tax Under Section 965 and Related Provisions [TD 9846] (RIN: 1545-BO51) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

280. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2019-5) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

281. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 199A Trade or Business Safe Harbor: Rental Real Estate [Notice 2019-07] received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

282. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Safe Harbor for Determining Depreciation Deductions for Certain Passenger Automobiles (Rev. Proc. 2019-13) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

283. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 26 CFR 1.199A-2: Determination of W-2 Wages (Rev. Proc. 2019-11) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

284. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — Centralized Partnership Audit Regime [TD 9844] (RIN: 1545-BO03; 1545-BO04) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

285. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — Public Approval of Tax-Exempt Private Activity Bonds [TD 9845] (RIN: 1545-BG91) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

286. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update to Revenue Procedure 2018-4 (Rev. Proc. 2019-4) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

287. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Individual Shared Responsibility Payment Hardship Exemptions that May Be Claimed on a Federal Income Tax Return Without Obtaining a Hardship Exemption Certification from the Marketplace for the 2018 Tax Year [Notice 2019-05] received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

288. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Section 162(a) Safe harbors for certain Payments Made by a C Corporation or a Specified Pass-Through Entity in Exchange for a State or Local Tax Credit (Rev. Proc. 2019-12) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Maximum Values for 2018 for Use With Vehicle Cents-Per-Mile and Fleet Average Valuations Rules [Notice 2019-08] received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

290. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Making Elections under Section 179 and 168 (Rev. Proc. 2019-08) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

291. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — Public Approval of Tax-Exempt Private Activity Bonds [TD 9845] (RIN: 1545-BG91) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

292. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2019-3) received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

293. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Previously Taxed Earnings and Profits Accounts [Notice 2019-01] received February 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DEAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 1417. A bill to establish a trust fund to provide for adequate funding for water and sewer infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Agriculture, 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. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 1418. A bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1419. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish a public health insurance option; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1420. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CASE, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 1421. A bill to repeal debt collection amendments made by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COOPER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1422. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the acceptance by political committees of online contributions from certain unverified sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPIERER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1423. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure the Secretary of Veterans Affairs permits the display of Fallen Soldier Displays in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CRAIG (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1425. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for an Improve Health Insurance Affordability Fund to provide for certain reinsurance payments to lower premiums in the individual health insurance market; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 1426. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to address insufficient compensation of employees and other personnel of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1427. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for priority for making payments for lodging expenses for Federal employees that are booked in places with policies to protect individuals from severe forms of human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TLAI, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 1428. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for the BUILD Discretionary Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TLAI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1429. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ap-

propriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1430. A bill to provide that chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code, relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements, shall not apply to enrollment agreements made between students and certain institutions of higher education; and to prohibit limitations on the ability of students to pursue claims against certain institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TLAI, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the earned income tax credit to account for the amount by which economic growth has outpaced income growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1432. A bill to establish a Minority Business Development Administration in the Department of Commerce, to clarify the relationship between such Administration and the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1433. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. FOX of North Carolina, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BUDD, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARR, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for elementary and secondary students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, 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 Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1435. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take actions supporting non-Federal investments in water infrastructure improvements in the Sacramento Valley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the earned income tax credit to all taxpayers with dependents and to qualifying students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

H.R. 1437. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to achieve security of sensitive assets among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 1438. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to allow same day registration for Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LOEBESACK, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 1439. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide a fiduciary safe harbor for the selection of a lifetime income provider, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SLOTKIN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 1440. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Great Lakes Restoration Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 1441. A bill to require a report on oligarchs and parastatal entities of Iran, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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. BEYER (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1442. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 1443. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DUNN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 1444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for certain casualty losses of uncut timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CHENEY (for herself and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 1445. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue a final rule relating to removing the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1446. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp until all remaining stamps are sold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to equalize the Federal medical assistance percentage applicable to certain individuals in the expansion population of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 1448. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to waive fees for Purple Heart recipients serving on active duty for loans guaranteed under the home loan program of Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY,

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 1449. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3033 203rd Street in Olympia Fields, Illinois, as the "Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MENG, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. PORTER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LAMB, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. KIND, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 1450. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect civil rights and otherwise prevent meaningful harm to third parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 1451. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interfering with voter registration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. KIND (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 1452. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1453. A bill to prioritize the efforts of and enhance coordination among United States agencies to encourage European countries to diversify their energy sources and supply routes, increase European countries' energy security, and help the United States reach its global energy security goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Mr. CASE, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DELAULO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SIRE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1454. A bill to provide for a 3-day waiting period before a person may receive a handgun, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 1455. A bill to protect States and individuals in States that have laws which permit the use of cannabis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and 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 Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1456. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule regarding the application of the Act to marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Natural Resources, 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. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1457. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 1458. A bill to prohibit the Corporation for National and Community Service from removing State offices of the Corporation from States without Congressional approval; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1459. A bill to support security and law enforcement training and cooperation between the United States and Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SOTO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1460. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit voter caging and other questionable challenges; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 1461. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Government of Georgia if the President determines that the Government of Georgia is taking actions to undermine commitments or contractual agreements with United States persons engaging in business operations in the country of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1462. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to submit periodic reports on the cost of presidential travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1463. A bill to limit the use of Federal funds for the use of the travel expenses of senior Federal officials in contravention of certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1464. A bill to enact House Resolution 895, One Hundred Tenth Congress, (establishing the Office of Congressional Ethics) into permanent law; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1465. A bill to require the Speaker of the House of Representatives to convene a session of the House on each day in which a Government shutdown is in effect, to prohibit the use of funds for the official travel of Members of the House of Representatives during any period in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1466. A bill to provide that the salaries of Members of a House of Congress will be held in escrow if that House has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2020 by April 15, 2019, to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress, to prohibit the use of funds provided for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for first-class airline accommodations, and to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a uniform 5-year post-employment ban on lobbying by former Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. OMAR (for herself and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 1467. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to establish a separate unit within the Department of Justice for the investigation and enforcement of such Act, to provide the Attorney General with the authority to impose civil money penalties for violations of such Act, and to require agents of foreign principals who are registered under such Act to disclose transactions involving things of financial value conferred on officeholders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 1468. A bill to promote the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 1469. A bill to amend title IV-A of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide greater access to the supplemental nutrition assistance program by reducing duplicative and burdensome administrative requirements, authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to certain community-based nonprofit feeding and anti-hunger groups for the purpose of establishing and implementing a Beyond the Soup Kitchen Pilot Program for certain socially and economically disadvantaged populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 1471. A bill to require a joint resolution of approval for the entry into effect of a civilian nuclear cooperation agreement with Saudi Arabia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1472. A bill to rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, as the Homestead National Historical Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1473. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to target funds to truly needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 1474. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to submit a pre-election threat assessment prior to each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 1475. A bill to create a publicly available lottery system for permits for the use of motorized or nonmotorized boats in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1476. A bill to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to provide coordinated case management services for TANF recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. SHALALA):

H.R. 1477. A bill to require a threat assessment and strategy to counter Russian influence in Venezuela, an assessment of foreign acquisition of CITGO assets in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 1478. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the importation of affordable and safe insulin by wholesale distributors, pharmacies, and individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 1480. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the CHP Technical Assistance Partnership Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. AMASH):

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any United States-Saudi Arabia civilian nuclear cooperation agreement must prohibit the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from enriching uranium or separating plutonium on its own territory, in keeping with the strongest possible nonproliferation "gold standard"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CRAIG:

H. Res. 157. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit Members of the House from serving on the boards of for-profit entities; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 158. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to recognize Friday, March 1, 2019, as Read Across America Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOODALL:

H. Res. 159. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the March First Movement and Korea's declaration of independence from the Empire of Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANKS:

H. Res. 160. A resolution expressing concern about the threat posed to democracy and human rights by theocratic groups operating in South Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H. Res. 161. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the last day of February each year, as "Rare Disease Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H. Res. 162. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives and honoring the memory of the victims of the mass shooting in Aurora, Illinois, on February 15, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H. Res. 163. A resolution urging action to increase equity within the legal cannabis marketplace; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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. MENG (for herself, Mr. KIM, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 164. A resolution commemorating the centennial anniversary of Korea's March First Movement Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SABLON, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. MCADAMS):

H. Res. 165. A resolution recognizing Chinese railroad workers who worked on the Transcontinental Railroad from 1865 to 1869, and their important contribution to the growth of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H. Res. 166. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 3, 2019, as National Triple-Negative Breast Cancer Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 167. A resolution recognizing the rise of cardiovascular disease as the world's leading cause of preventable death and disability and as the global public health crisis of our generation and supporting the recognition of February 2019 as "American Heart Month"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 1417.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1418.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1419.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1420.

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

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

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1421.

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

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1422.

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

Article I Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause

In 2011, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia held in *Bluman v. FEC* that "It is fundamental to the definition of our national political community that foreign citizens do not have a constitutional right to participate in, and thus may be excluded from, activities of democratic self-government." *Bluman* specifically addressed and prohibited political campaign contributions to U.S. elections.

In 2012, the United States Supreme Court affirmed, holding that the prohibition in 2 U.S.C. 441 (e) on campaign contributions by any "foreign national" was narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling governmental interest.

Given that the Stop Foreign Donations Affecting Our Elections Act supplements the intent of these rulings and the 1966 law that banned such contributions, it is both within the scope of Congress's power and is thus constitutional.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1423.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio:

H.R. 1424.

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

The United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, "To make all Laws which shall be

necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mrs. CRAIG:

H.R. 1425.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1426.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1427.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1428.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1429.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1430.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 1431.

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

The Sixteenth Amendment provides Congress the power to "lay and collect taxes on incomes."

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 1432.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1433.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 1434.

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

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

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1435.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 1436.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 1437.

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

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 1438.

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

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

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1439.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1440.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1441.

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 the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 1442.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. [Page H7089]

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 1443.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1444.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 1445.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1446.

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

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 1447.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 1448.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1449.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 1450.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 1451.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1452.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—"the United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations"

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 1453.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 1454.

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

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1455.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1456.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1457.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 1458.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1459.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 11:

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

And

Article I Section 8 Clause 1:

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

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 1460.

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

U.S. Const. art. I, §1.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 1461.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1462.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1463.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1464.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1465.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 1466.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 1467.

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

Article 1., Section 1. of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 1468.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 1469.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: 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.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 1470.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 1471.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1472.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1473.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 1474.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 1475.

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

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1476.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to “provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 1477.

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

Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1478.

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

Article 1, Section 8, 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..

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1479.

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

Article 1, Section 8, 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.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1480.

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

Article 1, Section 8, 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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 24: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 51: Ms. SHALALA.
H.R. 64: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 144: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 155: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 188: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 230: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 270: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 303: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 305: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 342: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 490: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 500: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 515: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 532: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 553: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 578: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 582: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 587: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 612: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 613: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 625: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 634: Mr. BANKS and Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 636: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 641: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 649: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 652: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 663: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 677: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 712: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 726: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 728: Ms. MOORE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 734: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 739: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 777: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 808: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 823: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 847: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 864: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 897: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 936: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 943: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 945: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 996: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 1004: Mr. KEATING, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WILD, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1008: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1011: Ms. MENG and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 1012: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1013: Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1042: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1044: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1045: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1050: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 1054: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 1066: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1108: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1137: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 1155: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1169: Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1216: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1224: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 1225: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1234: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1241: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 1277: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1308: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1325: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1327: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1351: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1360: Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 1372: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 1377: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1407: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1411: Ms. SHALALA.
H.J. Res. 2: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. Res. 33: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COX of California, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. FINKENAUER.
H. Res. 54: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H. Res. 58: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H. Res. 60: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 63: Ms. HAALAND and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H. Res. 64: Ms. HAALAND and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H. Res. 65: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. MENG, and Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 93: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H. Res. 106: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 110: Ms. CHENEY.
H. Res. 129: Mr. PALLONE.
H. Res. 141: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. MENG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. BANKS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H. Res. 142: Mr. RUTHERFORD.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2019

No. 37

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.

Eternal God, Spirit of light and truth, beauty and freedom, thank You for Your sustaining grace.

Continue to strengthen our lawmakers that they may play their part in the life of our times. Lord, give them wisdom to think clearly, speak kindly, and act bravely. Make them patient and thoughtful with one another as they seek to serve You and country with integrity. May they remember that without You, they will fail to do their best or reach their highest. Keep them from stumbling or slipping.

We pray in Your Holy 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 (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). 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 bill clerk read the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute as in morning business.

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

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, when it comes to considering Presidential nominees, I have said in the past that I don't believe in playing by two sets of rules.

If the Democrats insist on rejecting President Trump's Cabinet nominees or insist on rejecting qualified judges based on an ideological litmus test, they can't expect kid-glove treatment for the next Democratic President.

However, I urge Senators to end this arms race now. We can start the disarmament by agreeing to the Blunt-Lankford proposal based on the bipartisan agreement that was worked out with then-Majority Leader Reid in the 113th Congress.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I would like to begin with a few words on President Trump's Hanoi summit with North Korea. The President should be commended for his personal commitment to persuading Kim Jong Un to pursue a different path.

By January 2017, it was clear the prior administration's policy of strategic patience had not worked. In retrospect, it was not very strategic to sit patiently while North Korea dramatically expanded its nuclear and missile

capabilities. The Trump administration, in taking a different path, moved quickly to adopt the policy of maximum pressure, rallying international partners to respond firmly to North Korea's provocations. The President also demonstrated a willingness to engage the North Korean leader directly, breathing new life into our diplomacy to solve this seemingly intractable problem.

The President has gone the extra mile to demonstrate his sincerity in wanting to resolve this issue. It was smart to bring Kim Jong Un to Singapore and to Vietnam to expose the North Korean delegation to the kind of economic prosperity that could be possible if he were to choose a new path.

High-level diplomacy can carry high-level risk, but the President should be commended for walking away when it became clear insufficient progress had been made on denuclearization. Kim Jong Un now has a long train ride home, and he will have time to reflect on the future that is still within North Korea's grasp, but the President has demonstrated that such a future must be accompanied by real denuclearization.

Every country has a stake in North Korea's denuclearization. I hope China and other countries with influence over Kim Jong Un will do their part to urge him to return to the negotiating table and seize the opportunity to bring prosperity to the people of North Korea and peace and stability to the Korean Peninsula and to the region.

NOMINATIONS

Madam President, on another matter, this week, the Senate has made progress in confirming President Trump's nominees. On Tuesday, Eric Miller became the 31st circuit court judge to be confirmed under this administration. Yesterday, we confirmed Michael Desmond to serve as Chief Counsel at the IRS.

Of course, this progress is only remarkable given the Senate Democrats'

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1555

historic level of obstruction. As I noted yesterday, for example, Mr. Desmond's nomination earned near-unanimous approval from the Finance Committee in August of last year but only this week received a vote on the Senate floor. So many important roles are still vacant with well-qualified nominees who are ready and willing to fill them.

Later today, we will vote on Andrew Wheeler to serve as Administrator of the EPA. Mr. Wheeler has spent the last year as Deputy and now as Acting Administrator. He has wasted no time in proving he has what it takes to lead the Agency. In drawing on a wealth of experience that includes service as staff director of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and a tenure at the EPA that first began back in 1991, Mr. Wheeler has proven his ability to advance pragmatic solutions to pressing environmental challenges. I hope each of my colleagues will join me in supporting yet another well-qualified nominee and vote to confirm him.

Later today, we will also have an opportunity to take care of one other long-overdue item—the nomination of John Ryder to the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Even after being reported out of committee twice on a voice vote, this well-qualified, uncontroversial nominee was nearly subjected to a needless cloture vote this week. I am glad that, instead, we will be voting to confirm Ryder and sending him on to work on behalf of the Tennessee Valley communities.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Madam President, on another matter, I have been spotlighting all week our Democratic colleagues' hard left turn toward socialism—their fixation on gaining more government control over more of our lives. With the Democratic Politician Protection Act, Washington Democrats want to control more of what Americans can say about them and how they get elected.

With the so-called Green New Deal, Washington Democrats want our government to spend more money than the entire gross domestic product of the entire world on new spending programs to forcibly remodel Americans' homes, take away our cars, dramatically increase energy costs, and disarm our economy while China roars straight ahead. You might think that right there is plenty of leftwing social engineering. You might think it is enough—oh, but they aren't stopping there, the Democrats. They are going after Americans' healthcare and their private health insurance plans.

Earlier this week, House Democrats introduced a bill that would take away every private insurance option that American families rely on and force everyone into a single, government-run system. Employer-sponsored coverage wouldn't just be discouraged, it would be illegal. They call this legislation Medicare for All. It is really more like "Medicare for None." It completely explodes the Medicare system as it cur-

rently exists. The program our seniors have paid into for decades and now rely on, the Democrats want gone—wiped out.

Remember, by the time Americans turn 65, most have paid tens and tens of thousands of dollars into the current system through Medicare taxes. According to one estimate, Americans with average earnings who reached the retirement age back in 2015 will have paid a present value of more than \$70,000 into Medicare over the years.

American seniors have counted on Medicare. They have planned around it, and they have paid into it with every paycheck. Yet now House Democrats have decided it is time to change the rules on them in the middle of the game. They want to tear down Medicare until the only thing left is the name and slap that name on a completely different system that a few House Democrats invented and that the Democratic Socialists of America is proud to endorse. The Democratic Socialists of America is proud to endorse that. Then the Democrats propose to take that new government system and pile every single American into it as a one-size-fits-all—long waits for treatment, higher costs, and an end to Medicare as we know it—no choice, no options, and no alternatives allowed.

More than 170 million Americans currently get health insurance through their employers. Surveys show that a majority is actually pretty happy with its own specific plans. Well, too bad. The Democrats want those families thrown off those plans. Within 2 years, their proposal would make private health insurance, as Americans know it, illegal across the board. It would be unlawful for employers to offer health benefits to their employees and their families. It is right there in the bill. It would be against the law for employers to offer healthcare to their employees.

Here is what it reads: "It shall be unlawful for a private health insurer to sell health insurance coverage . . . [or] an employer to provide benefits . . . that duplicate the benefits provided under this Act by the government."

How about that? We all remember ObamaCare's famous broken promise: If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it. If you like the doctor you have, you can keep your doctor too. That was the pledge before the Democrats' policy was actually implemented. Not long after, the fact checkers named that promise their "lie of the year."

Well, this time around, my Democratic friends are not even bothering to pretend that families' lives would not be disrupted. A reporter asked one of our Senate colleagues who is running for President, "So for people out there who like their insurance, they don't get to keep it?" Her response? Listen to this. "Let's eliminate all of that." This is one of our colleagues running for President.

All the plans American families like and rely on made illegal—illegal—by

this bill, not just unaffordable, not just inconvenient, illegal, and all to clear space for a new government takeover.

So how much is this massive takeover going to cost? Well, under even conservative estimates, this proposal would cost more than \$32 trillion over the first 10 years—\$32 trillion over the first 10 years, more than the Federal Government spent on everything over the last 8 years combined.

Where is that money going to come from? Well, I think we all know the answer to that: massive tax hikes on the American people, cuts to services, rationing of healthcare, broken promises, and debt. That is where it is going to come from.

Here is what one economist found in the numbers.

The Federal Reserve's data only go back to 1929, but it's unlikely that the government ever collected more than 20 percent of GDP in taxes. To fully fund Medicare-for-all, that figure would have to rise to more than 30 percent of GDP.

Now, look, I am sure we will hear the class warfare rhetoric about soaking the rich and making a small group of Americans pay for all of this, but it will not be true. We all know it will not be true. The bill for this \$32 trillion takeover would land squarely—squarely—on middle-class families. There is no way around it.

Even if the IRS confiscated every dollar of Americans' adjusted gross incomes over \$1 million—took it all—if the IRS took every cent over \$1 million, it wouldn't even pay for half of the proposal—wouldn't even pay for half of it.

Now, look, class warfare may be a favorite tactic across the aisle, but numbers are stubborn things. Math is math. The costs would have to fall on the middle class. Actually, they would fall on everyone, one way or another.

That economist put it this way, he said: "The simple fact is that financing Medicare-for-all would require a dramatic shift in the Federal tax structure and a substantial tax increase for almost all Americans." Almost all Americans.

So let's sum it up. Washington Democrats want the American people to fork over a recordbreaking percentage of our gross domestic product in taxes for the privilege of having their healthcare plans ripped away from them, even if they are happy with what they have, and the middle class is going to pay for it. What a great deal.

All this, and I haven't even begun to explain how this takeover would cut Americans' access to care and degrade the quality of care. We have all heard horror stories from abroad about bureaucrats making decisions instead of citizens and long waits for treatment.

Last year in Canada, the median wait time for medically necessary treatment from a specialist was 21 weeks—21 weeks. That is the average wait time for medically necessary treatment in Canada—more than double what it was up there just 25 years ago.

In the UK, it is not just long waits patients have to contend with, it is flatout denials of care. In the first quarter of last year alone, Britain's National Health Service abruptly canceled 25,000 surgeries—canceled them.

Imagine that—being fully reliant on the government for healthcare, planning on a medically necessary procedure, and being told at the last minute the whole thing was called off. Welcome to socialized medicine. Needless to say, if some Democrats had their way, you wouldn't have to imagine much longer.

Before I conclude, I want to highlight one more thing. I suppose no far-left wish list like this would have been complete without radical policies on the issue of abortion, without trying to hurt pro-life Americans.

Sure enough, this legislation would shatter the longstanding consensus—consensus—that Federal dollars should not pay for abortions and force taxpayers to fund abortions nationwide. That has been the longstanding consensus. Talk about a perfect case study in the perils of a Federal takeover. Talk about a perfect example of why Washington Democrats should not get the power to twist American healthcare to suit their own radical views—\$32 trillion, every family kicked off its insurance plans, no choice, no options for the middle class, just a huge bill.

The Democrats are so confident the American people will love their new government plan that they feel the need to make other kinds of insurance illegal, and Democratic Presidential candidates are rushing headlong to embrace all of this—watching them embrace all of this. Goodness. If this is one of their best and brightest new ideas, I would sure hate to see the bad ones.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

VIETNAM SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, several hours ago, in the middle of the night here in the United States, we received word that the summit in Hanoi between the United States and North Korea would be ending prematurely. Unable to reach an understanding on either sanctions relief or denuclearization, President Trump decided to walk away from the talks without an agreement.

Though I don't know the details yet, and I look forward to speaking with Secretary Pompeo, I was pleased to see the President recognized North Korea's unwillingness to strike a comprehen-

sive deal. President Trump did the right thing by walking away and not cutting a poor deal for the sake of a photo op.

Just like the President, I want a deal with North Korea that will bring an end to the conflict and change the course of the region. However, I have always been concerned about the possibility of a bad deal, especially with the other pressures currently on the President. A deal that fell short of complete, verifiable denuclearization would have only made North Korea stronger and the world less safe, and it would have squandered the substantial leverage our negotiators have now thanks to the bite of sanctions.

President Trump must now apply the lesson of North Korea diplomacy to our trade negotiations with China. President Trump must have the courage to do the same thing with China as he has done for North Korea. The President must be willing to hold the line and walk away if China does not agree to meaningful, enduring, structural reform of its unfair trading policy. President Trump should not fall into the trap of seeking a deal for the sake of a deal, especially now that talks with Pyongyang are on hold.

What he did in North Korea was right. He must do the same thing in China—hold out because he has the upper hand—until we get China to do the right thing. Just because an accord is, for the moment, out of reach in North Korea does not mean that the President should be any more eager to strike one with China if the terms are inadequate or unacceptable.

The President deserves credit for bringing China to the negotiating table with tariffs, but he must not squander that opportunity by cutting a deal that fails to achieve American priorities. Unless China promises to end its predatory cyber theft of American intellectual property and know-how, unless China promises to stop artificially propping up its businesses, unless China promises to end its practice of forcing American companies to give away their IP to their future Chinese competitors in order to do business in China, President Trump should walk away from the negotiations once again.

As important as North Korea is to national security, China is just as critical—maybe even more critical—to American economic security. President Trump and his team have a generational imperative to get this one right. They have a generational imperative not to squander the chance to achieve permanent reforms to China's economic relations with the world, changes that would finally put American investors, businesses, and workers on a level playing field.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS BILL

Madam President, on guns, I was so glad to see the House passage of a background checks bill. I urge Leader McConnell to take it up in the Senate.

Background checks are supported overwhelmingly by close to 90 percent

of the American people—a majority of Republicans, a majority of gun owners. It doesn't take anyone's guns away. It simply says that if you are a felon, spousal abuser, or adjudicated mentally ill, you shouldn't have a gun, and it takes the means to make sure that happens.

Now there are so many loopholes in the background check law—the Brady law, which I was proud to lead the charge on back in the House in 1994. Now, some 25 years later, they have found ways around it through the internet and through gun shows. Just as it was the right thing to do to close the loopholes that existed in 1994 with the Brady law, it is the right thing to do to close those loopholes that have come about since the law passed. It simply updates the Brady law, which has saved tens of thousands of lives.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, finally, on climate, in a short time, I will be returning to the floor to lead a group of Democratic Senators in talking about climate change. One of the great but positive ironies of Leader McConnell's stunt to put the Green New Deal on the floor is that it has inspired Members of both parties to talk about climate change—more than ever before, maybe—under the Republican leadership in the Senate.

Democrats are more than happy about that. We want to turn the spotlight back to the issue of climate change and keep it there, where it belongs. Climate change is an existential threat to our planet, not just in the future but right now. We should be talking about climate change nearly every day, and more than that, the Senate should be taking bold action to address it.

So I am glad at least Leader McConnell is talking about climate. He just says what he is not for.

So I will repeat the three questions I have asked Leader McConnell repeatedly: One, Leader McConnell, do you believe that climate change is real? Two, do you believe, Leader McConnell, that it is caused by humans? Three, do you believe Congress should take immediate action to address the crisis of climate change?

Until Leader McConnell puts something positive on the floor and starts talking positively, no one is going to pay much attention to his stunts and his gambits, but, certainly, we Democrats are energized to talk positively about the things we want to do to deal with this issue, and we will be positive and discuss positive proposals until we get something done in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, just in getting started this morning, I wanted to take a minute to mention the good news on economic growth we received this morning.

While headlines mentioned the very solid 2.9 percent growth number for

2018, if we use the measure that economists prefer, the news is even better—3.1 percent growth from the fourth quarter of 2017 to the fourth quarter of 2018. This is just more evidence that Republican economic policies are working.

We lifted burdensome regulations and passed a comprehensive reform of our Tax Code to put more money in Americans' pockets and make it easier for businesses to grow and expand jobs. Now we are seeing the effects.

Unemployment is low. January marked the 11th straight month that unemployment has been at or below 4 percent. That is the longest streak in nearly five decades. The number of job openings hit a record high in December, and, once again, there were more job openings than job seekers. Wage growth has accelerated. Wages have now been growing at a rate of 3 percent or greater for 6 straight months. The last time wage growth reached this level was in 2009. Median household income is at an all-time, inflation-adjusted record of \$61,372. The list goes on.

What does all of this mean? It means more money in American families' bank accounts, more jobs and opportunities for American workers, more Americans feeling hopeful about their future.

Republican economic policies are making life better for American families, which is why it is particularly disturbing that Democrats are currently advancing policies that would not only destroy the economic progress we have made but would severely damage our economy for the long term.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Madam President, yesterday, I came down and talked about the so-called Green New Deal, which is a fantasy put forward by a number of our colleagues on the other side. I think 11 Democratic Senators have cosponsored that legislation, which the early analysis shows would cost somewhere between \$51 trillion and \$94 trillion over the next decade. To put that into more personal terms, that is \$600,000 per family in this country—the cost of the Green New Deal.

My colleague from Illinois, the Democratic whip, was asked about it on an interview recently, and he responded by saying that he had read and reread the proposal and still doesn't know what the heck it is. Well, that is an honest answer. But I think what we do know is that this is a proposal that will dramatically, massively drive up costs for American families. It would be a disaster for the pocketbooks of the people of this country, which brings me to my topic for today.

On Tuesday, POLITICO released an article with this headline: "House Democrats to release 'Medicare for All' bill—without a price tag." That was the headline.

This is becoming par for the course for Democrats. First we get the Green New Deal resolution without a

pricetag. Now we get Medicare for All, also without a pricetag. Why? Well, because there is no way to actually pay for these socialist fantasies. They sound nice, until you actually look at the staggering costs.

Imagine if you decided that you needed to repair the plumbing at your house, and the plumber came and suggested that not only should you repair the plumbing, you should rebuild the house from the ground up. Then he wanted you to sign on for demolition and reconstruction without telling you how much it would cost.

That is what Democrats are trying to do on a grand scale here. They want to overhaul large parts of the economy and rebuild them on socialist lines, all without telling you what it will cost or how they will pay for it.

Of course, while it is irresponsible, it is not surprising that Democrats don't want to discuss the pricetag for their fantasies, because there is no way to pay for these massive government takeovers without taxing ordinary Americans.

Democrats make vague suggestions that these programs can be paid for by taxing the rich. That is always the line. But the truth is that taxing millionaires at a 100-percent income tax rate would not pay for these programs. Taxing Americans making much less than \$1 million at a 100-percent rate wouldn't pay for these programs.

The cost of these programs will never be borne just by millionaires. These programs will be paid for on the backs of working families in this country. That is the pure and simple reality.

A left-leaning think tank modeled a version of the Medicare for All plan proposed by the junior Senator from Vermont and found that it would cost a staggering \$32 trillion over 10 years—\$32 trillion—and it is possible that the House Democrats' plan could cost even more.

POLITICO noted in their story that, unlike the plan of the Senator from Vermont, the House Democrats' plan would also "fund long-term care, a particularly expensive part of the health system."

But moving away from the staggering pricetag, let's talk about what life would be like under Medicare for All.

For starters, of course, it would mean that Americans would lose their private insurance, even if they like their private insurance. Democrats have been very clear about this.

At a CNN townhall just this week, the junior Senator from Vermont was asked, "Will these people be able to keep their health insurance plans, their private plans through their employers, if there is a Medicare for All program that you endorse?"

The Senator from Vermont's response: "No."

Another Democratic candidate for President, the junior Senator from New York, was recently asked:

Should ending private insurance, as we know it, be a Democratic . . . goal, and do you think it's an urgent goal?

Her response:

Oh yeah, it is a goal. An urgent goal.

So if you like your health insurance, you definitely will not be able to keep it. You will be forced into the government healthcare plan, whether you like that plan or not. Then, of course, you will be facing long wait times and likely a limited choice of doctors and hospitals, and you will have fewer options if the government decides a particular treatment isn't cost-effective and shouldn't be covered.

Democrats can talk all they want about generous coverage, but what happens when they don't have the money for that generous coverage? We already know this program is likely to cost more than \$30 trillion over just 10 years, and government programs aren't exactly known for staying under budget.

What happens if it ends up costing more or if the government can't even pay the \$32 trillion that we know it is going to cost? Well, there will be still more taxes, undoubtedly, but also reductions in coverage and care.

Our Nation's current Medicare Program is going bankrupt. If action isn't taken, in 2026 Medicare will not be able to pay the benefits that are promised under current law. Yet Democrats are suggesting that we more than quintuple the size of the program and that somehow we will be able to pay for that.

If we ever do pay for Medicare for All, we will pay for it by taking the money from the American people through devastating tax increases that will permanently reduce Americans' standard of living and permanently damage our economy.

Like all socialist dreams, Medicare for All would quickly become a nightmare for the American people.

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. UDALL. 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 remarks of Senator UDALL and Senator COLLINS pertaining to the submission of S.J. Res. 10 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

(The remarks of Mr. SCHUMER pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 9 are printed in today's RECORD under

“Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now I want to address two more issues related to this topic.

First, are the reports that the President is planning to create a panel of cherry-picked scientists who question the severity of climate change to “counter” the scientific consensus. I mentioned these reports earlier this week, but I want to update my friends in this Chamber that Democrats are in the process of preparing legislation that would defund this fake climate panel. We hope this legislation, like our resolution, will eventually be bipartisan because it shouldn’t be partisan to oppose a group of handpicked climate deniers spreading the fossil fuel industry’s propaganda under the imprimatur of the White House. It shouldn’t be partisan to oppose the administration’s setting up its own Orwellian Ministry of Truth on climate change.

So I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle who believe in climate science to sign on to our legislation once we have it ready.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mr. President, second is the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to be the next Administrator of the EPA—a question currently before the Senate. I opposed Mr. Wheeler’s nomination to be the Deputy Administrator, and I will oppose his nomination to be Administrator as well.

I opposed Mr. Wheeler initially because I thought his career as a lobbyist working on behalf of big polluters and climate deniers was exactly the wrong kind of experience for a job at the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency. He spent most of his career lobbying against the same environmental protections he now oversees, and his time at the EPA has done little to assuage my original concerns.

Mr. Wheeler has failed to take meaningful action on toxic chemicals, including the chemical PFAS, which has plagued my home State. He has downplayed the severity of climate change and undermined several EPA programs that seek to address it, including the regulation of poisonous mercury from powerplants, efforts to reduce carbon emissions from cars and trucks, as well as replacing the Clean Power Plan.

At a time when climate change is the No. 1 threat facing our planet, installing a man such as Mr. Wheeler as permanent Administrator of the EPA—the Environmental Protection Agency—is the wrong thing to do.

So as I said earlier this morning, Leader McConnell’s move to bring the Green New Deal forward is nothing more than a stunt, but one of the great and positive ironies is that, finally, folks are talking about climate change again, more than at any time I can think of under this Republican majority.

If and when Leader McConnell brings his version of the Green New Deal forward for a vote, we will demand that Republicans first answer the core questions on climate change.

Again, three simple things: Do you believe climate change is real and happening? Do you believe human activity contributes to it? Do you believe Congress must act to address this pressing challenge?

If Leader McConnell and my Republican friends can’t answer those three questions—run away from them—the American people will see right through the ploy. The American people will see that Leader McConnell and his party stand against science and against facts, ostriches with their heads buried in the sand as the tide swiftly comes in.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, our Democratic leader has set three plain and very obvious questions about fossil fuel-burning carbon emissions and climate change that should be easily answered by every single Member of the Senate, and the fact that this is a problem is a clear indication of fossil fuel influence in this body—the regrettable extent of fossil fuel influence in this body.

It was not always this way. Here is a letter that a number of us came to the floor to talk about yesterday. The letter was written December 23, 1986. There had been hearings on climate change in the Environment and Public Works Committee, and a bipartisan group of Senators wanted some answers. They wrote this letter to what then existed, an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress, inquiring about how serious they felt this was and what could be done about it, signed by Senator Stafford, Senator Chafee, Senator Durenberger, and three Democrats in 1986. I do not believe that a Republican Senator could be found to sign this letter today.

I got here in 2007, and for that year, and in 2008 and 2009, we had multiple bipartisan climate bills being discussed in this body. Over and over again, there were a Democrat and Republican who got together and worked to try to solve the climate problem—more than a decade ago. We have seen bipartisanship on this issue.

We have even seen, in 2009, this New York Times full-page advertisement signed by Donald J. Trump, which said that the science of climate change is “scientifically irrefutable.” Those were his words, not mine, in 2009, which said that if we don’t act there would be “catastrophic and irreversible consequences for humanity and our planet”—his words, not mine. That was 1986, that was 2007, and this was 2009.

Then something happened. Citizens United got decided by the Supreme Court or, to be fair to the Supreme Court, Citizens United got decided by five Republican appointees on the Supreme Court.

In my view, the fossil fuel industry asked for that decision, predicted that decision, and they were off like a sprinter at the gun when they got that decision. From that moment, all of that bipartisan activity on climate change here in the Senate ended, and it ended because the fossil fuel industry was allowed to spend unlimited money in politics. They found out how to spend unlimited dark money in politics. It is politically obvious that if one can spend unlimited money in politics, one can also threaten to spend unlimited money in politics. So between the unlimited spending and the unlimited, anonymous dark money spending and whatever they did in the way of threats and promises, it has been like a heart attack—flatlined—here in the Senate, since that moment. It is a tragedy.

In fact, if you go back to this letter for a minute, there were six signatories. We couldn’t get six States to come to the floor yesterday because one of these States has two Republican Senators, and we couldn’t get either of them to come to the floor.

I don’t know what has happened to the Republican Party that they can’t take this seriously even now—even as States like Florida are flooding on sunny days, even as States see wildfires they have never seen before, even as farmers are recording drought and flood conditions that are unprecedented, even as my State looks forward to 5 or 6 feet of sea level rise.

And then we got a clue as to what goes on here. This is a letter that was written on behalf of Andrew Wheeler, who is the slightly cleaned-up version of Scott Pruitt and who is pending before us to lead the Environmental Protection Agency. It ought to tell us a lot that the Republicans put up a coal lobbyist to represent the people of America leading the Environmental Protection Agency.

What tells you a lot also is this letter of support for this guy. Who is on it? These are these phony-baloney front group organizations funded by the fossil fuel industry that got together to write this letter:

The Heartland Institute. Koch-affiliated groups gave it \$7.18 million, and \$730,000 came from Exxon. Heartland is such a slippery, slimy group that they compared climate scientists to the Unabomber. That is the company that they travel in.

The Cornwall Alliance. Secret funding—we don’t know, but they are always in this climate-denier fringe crowd. The founder doesn’t believe in evolution. He said that tornadoes are a punishment from God, and that AIDS is punishment for being gay. You are running in great company with them, guys.

FreedomWorks is next. They received \$2.5 million from Koch-affiliated groups, and at least \$130,000 from the American Petroleum Institute.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute is next, with at least \$2 million given from Exxon, and Koch-affiliated groups gave at least \$5.2 million.

Americans for Prosperity. This is basically the hit squad for the Kochs in politics. It is one of the largest dark-money election spenders, spending more than \$70 million since Citizens United on Federal elections. They received a minimum of \$12 million, that we know of, in funding from the Kochs and more than \$23 million from the Koch-linked Donors Trust. Donors Trust, by the way, is a big enterprise whose sole purpose is to launder away the identity of big donors so that their money can flow without people knowing who is behind it.

Americans for Limited Government received at least \$5.6 million from Koch-affiliated groups.

Freedom Partners is described as “the Koch brothers’ secret bank.” It has spent more than \$55 million in dark money on Federal elections since Citizens United and received at least \$3 million from the Kochs, but, as usual, its funders are shrouded in secrecy.

Americans for Tax Reform. The American Petroleum Institute gave at least \$525,000, and Koch-affiliated groups gave at least \$330,000.

The Energy and Environmental Legal Institute received at least half a million dollars from Koch-affiliated groups.

CFACT received at least \$580,000 in funding from Exxon and more than \$8 million from Koch-linked groups.

Then, at the bottom is this little Caesar Rodney Institute, which is part of the larger State Policy Network, funded by the Kochs to spread their propaganda and poison into State legislatures.

This crew of fossil-fuel-funded, climate-denying front groups have received a minimum of more than \$63 million from the fossil fuel industry, and this is why we have Andrew Wheeler, a coal lobbyist, lined up to run our environmental agency in this country. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise today to state the obvious—to state in clear terms what scientists have been warning us about for decades. The scientific data couldn’t be any clearer. Climate change is real. Climate change is here, and we are causing its devastating impacts and disruptions. Unless we start to implement policies to curb our carbon emissions and to mitigate its impacts, climate change will continue to wreak havoc upon communities across the Nation and around the world.

These are facts. These facts present us with the greatest and most existential global challenge humanity has literally ever faced. There are not two sides to these facts. The Earth’s five warmest years on record happened since 2014. It is not a coincidence. It is not an unexplained phenomenon. It is the direct result of both our actions and our inactions. Only the willfully ignorant refuse to acknowledge these facts and the gravity and urgency of

what we face because of the fact of human-caused climate change.

Unfortunately, the current occupant of the White House and too many here in Washington can be counted in that camp. President Trump’s decision to upend the Clean Power Plan and pull us out of the Paris climate accord was perhaps the most consequential representation of his inward-looking, isolationist view for America. It was a dangerous abdication of our Nation’s leadership role on the international stage, and if we choose to accept his failure to lead here in Congress, we will continue down a path toward a very real and very costly climate disruption.

In the coming weeks, Majority Leader MCCONNELL says he plans to call a vote here on the Senate on the Green New Deal resolution. I wish this were a genuine effort to address our climate challenges. Clearly, it is not. It is a political stunt by the majority leader to divide those who actually want to rise to the occasion and who actually want to address this crisis, rather than offer up any substantive solutions of his own.

The majority leader would have you believe that solutions to climate change are too costly or they are just too impractical to be taken seriously. I don’t know about you, but to me, it is that view that is wildly out of touch and, frankly, dangerous.

President Trump and Republicans love to talk about the cost of climate action. What we should be focusing on is the much steeper cost of inaction and the economic benefits of America’s leading the clean energy transition.

As an engineer, I am certain that our capacity to confront the challenges that we face, large and small, rests heavily on our ability to make policy that is actually driven by facts, by data, and by the best available science.

The latest data on climate change should be deeply alarming to all of us. Last fall, the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a report based on the research of thousands of our planet’s leading climate scientists. It laid out in stark terms how critical it is for us to find a way to limit the planet’s warming. Unless we can reduce global carbon emissions by 45 percent by 2030 and reach net-zero emissions by 2050, it will be nearly impossible to keep global temperatures below a rise of 3 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century.

I know that is a lot of numbers, but what those numbers mean in terms of real ecological, economic, and humanitarian costs is incredibly important. Global average temperatures have already risen by nearly 2 degrees Fahrenheit, and that change is wreaking havoc on communities around the world.

One month after the U.N. released its landmark report, 13 Federal Agencies finalized the “Fourth National Climate Assessment,” a report mandated by Congress to study the evidence and the

impacts of current climate change. That report provided clear, indisputable evidence that the destructive wildfires, the catastrophic hurricanes, and the extreme flooding that we have seen in just the last couple of years is directly linked to human-caused climate change. These disasters are costing us billions of dollars each and every year.

The Pentagon has correctly called climate change a threat multiplier, meaning that climate impacts will amplify the existing threats to our national security. These are massive problems today—right now—not in some far off future. We need to recognize what the science is telling us. We need to recognize that the impacts and the disasters that we have seen so far are just the beginning.

Things are only going to get more chaotic, more unpredictable, and more expensive unless we change our trajectory. That is going to require global cooperation. It is going to require scientific ingenuity, and serious, sober policymaking based on the facts in front of us to put us on a better path.

I am proud that a number of my colleagues are stepping up to think through what those actions, what those solutions, and what those policies should be. We can have a healthy debate about the best ways to achieve these reductions in our emissions, but we can’t credibly dispute the science, what it is telling us, and the urgency of the need to act. These are facts. It is chemistry. Yet, instead of allowing us to productively debate those solutions, Majority Leader MCCONNELL is planning to waste our time on a political stunt.

Since Republicans took control of the Senate, they have not brought a single bill to the floor that would address emissions—not a single one—and they have taken many actions that have actually made the situation worse. This is not the serious legislating that we were sent here to do. This is not problem-solving.

The Senate is supposed to be the world’s greatest deliberative body. We are supposed to come together here on the Senate floor and in our committees and think through the greatest issues and challenges of our time. We are supposed to propose and debate policies to meet those challenges. I would welcome a long overdue debate on what policies would most efficiently and most effectively address our challenges.

I know that climate change often feels too big and too hard to fix, but, frankly, we all need to get out of that mindset because climate change is a problem we can solve. In fact, climate change is a problem that we must solve.

The good news is that we already have the technologies and the people to do it. Clean energy technologies have been evolving rapidly in recent years, and many of the clean energy technologies that seemed absolutely unrealistic only a decade ago have become

the new normal. I see a future where my two boys will use a reliable, cheap, resilient electrical grid that is 100-percent powered by clean energy because of the technologies invented in this country and because of the technologies built and installed with American labor. We need to invest in actually deploying these technologies with the urgency necessary to make real progress. This should be a bipartisan priority, not only for its impact on curbing carbon emissions but because it will create millions of jobs in communities across this country.

Some States are already moving in this direction. In my home State, new wind farms and new solar generation are bringing in billions of dollars of private investment. They are creating thousands of new jobs. Without aggressive, forward-looking national policies, we will not move fast enough. The scale of this transformation will be gigantic. There is no doubt about that. But this great Nation is up to the challenge.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his comments. I couldn't agree more wholeheartedly with the sentiments that the gentleman from New Mexico just uttered and the others, the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from New York.

This is an emergency situation for the planet. How do we know? We know because the U.N. scientists at the end of 2018 issued a report saying that climate change is an existential threat to our planet. Our own U.S. scientists in the end of 2018 issued their own report. This is the Trump administration's scientists, much to his chagrin, who said: "We must act to avoid substantial damages to the U.S. economy, environment, and human health and the well-being over the coming decades."

These are earth-shattering science reports about the state of our planet. These are doomsday reports, which the scientists of our own country and the world are giving to us. Yet just 3 weeks ago, the "Denier in Chief" stood before the Congress and delivered a message to the American people—not by his words but by the words he did not utter, because in an hour and 20 minutes, President Trump did not even mention the words "climate change." He did not even mention the words "clean energy revolution."

President Trump, further, has sent to us a new person to be the head of the Environmental Protection Agency. Who is Andrew Wheeler? He is a former lobbyist for the coal industry. That is what this Senate will be voting on—a coal lobbyist to take over the environment of our country, as the scientists of our country tell us that we are facing an existential threat if we do not take urgent actions today.

Our majority leader yesterday called the Green New Deal "foolish and dan-

gerous." Well, with all due respect to my Republican colleagues, the only thing foolish and dangerous about the Green New Deal is to ignore the \$400 billion in damages over the last 2 years from supercharged storms and wildfires, to ignore the tens of trillions of dollars in the damage that we will see from climate change in the United States by 2100 if we do not act, and the hundreds of trillions of damage across the entire planet if we are not the leader in creating a clean-energy revolution.

What is dangerous, I say to the leader, is sending our men and women in the military overseas to protect tankers of oil that are coming into our country from the Middle East. Superstorms, wildfires, rising seas, and other extreme weather events are the impacts of climate change if we do not act boldly to stop it. It isn't just dangerous; it is an existential threat to our planet, not from politicians or political scientists but from real scientists—"the" scientists—the Nobel Prize-winning scientists of the whole planet and in our own country. They are telling us we are in danger, and this body has to take positive action to deal with it.

We have a "Denier in Chief" in the White House. We have a Republican leader who has brought climate bills to the floor while he has been leader, but they have been bills to make the climate even more dangerous—the Keystone Pipeline bill and drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for oil. The Republicans are today going to confirm a coal lobbyist to head the Environmental Protection Agency, which is the Agency charged with protecting the planet.

The reality is that the Republicans have no plan to deal with the climate crisis. That is why they want to short circuit this debate on the Green New Deal. Let's have a hearing. Let's hear from experts. Let's hear from scientists. Let's have the evidence in the U.S. Senate. Then we can decide—but, no, there will be no debate in the Senate on science. There will be no debate on the harm that is going to be done if we do not act. Instead, in the same period, there will be just an attempt to confirm a coal lobbyist to take over the Environmental Protection Agency and to derail any real debate on the Green New Deal. That is who they are.

Why is that? It is that the Green New Deal is dangerous. It is dangerous for the status quo to just continue to remain in place on climate change. It is dangerous for the Koch brothers and those who are used to killing 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, from the historic oppression of vulnerable communities, and from the continued destruction of the environment. That is who would

think the Green New Deal is dangerous.

The Democrats want to support working families and support a safe climate future in which all communities are protected. We welcome debate on proposals for how to get there, but the science is clear on what we need to do and the magnitude of the response that we have to unleash in this country.

The Republicans may think the Green New Deal is just a resolution, but it is more than that. It is a revolution, and it cannot and will not be stopped. The science is driving this. It is an intergenerational concern that we are heading toward a catastrophe on this planet that could have been avoided, but we as a nation have stood on the sidelines and have allowed it to happen.

Ladies and gentlemen, this vote that we take as to whether Andrew Wheeler, a coal lobbyist, should be the head of the Environmental Protection Agency goes right through the heart of whether we are going to respond to the magnitude of this challenge. I do not know how anyone can vote for Andrew Wheeler given the science that has been presented to us, given the danger that we now know, given the catastrophe that is going to be created if we don't change course. This is just doubling down on a disaster. Andrew Wheeler is going to be the architect of the Republican plan to ensure that we do nothing about this climate catastrophe. The consequences could not be greater, but the political ramifications in the 2020 elections are going to be great as well. We will see a revolution that rises up across this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Henry David Thoreau asked: What is the use of a home if you don't have a tolerable planet to put it on?

We are here at a unique moment in human history when the planet is threatened. It is not just our local stream that has been polluted by some factory. It is not a river that is so toxic that it catches on fire. It is not just a small section of my home State that has been afflicted by some new disease in the forests. It is our entire planet that is at risk. So any Member of this Chamber who is not coming forward to help figure out how to address that is guilty of vast malpractice, legislative malpractice, and moral malpractice and incompetence because that is what a legislature is about. When there are big problems that we face, we come together. We don't ignore them. We wrestle with the best way to take them on. That is what this conversation is about.

Senator CARPER's resolution says three things, the first of which is we have a real problem, and it is easy to demonstrate that. We can take a look at all of the information we have coming from every major scientific organization that tracks increasing heat on

the planet, but maybe that is a little too complicated. Let's just ask a simple question. What have been the hottest years in human history? When have they been? Were they in the 1700s, in the 1800s, in the 1900s? When were those 5 hottest years? They were the last 5 years—2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018. This is no coincidence because that would be an astronomically unlikely thing to occur. We have enough science to know why this is occurring, not just that it is occurring.

It is occurring because we are generating carbon dioxide, and we are generating methane. They trap heat. We have been told, for the better part of a century, that this was going to be a problem, and the problem has arrived. It is not some theory. It is not some computer model. It is not some ivory tower. The facts are clearly evident. They are evident in our forests with longer and hotter fire seasons. They are evident in more powerful hurricanes than we have seen before because they draw so much more energy from an overheated ocean. We see it in the spread of diseases, like Lyme disease with the spread of tick populations. We see it with changing species. We see it with glaciers. We see it with melting permafrost. We see it with rising sea levels. We see it everywhere unless you are blind to the facts. We are not here to be blind. We are here to act. So we know the problem is real. That is the first point.

The second point is we know what is causing it—human activities, our putting methane into the air and putting carbon dioxide into the air. Therefore, we know the third point, which is our responsibility to act.

So many of us have come forward and have said: Here is an idea. How about this? This will completely change the amount of carbon dioxide from the transportation sector. Here is an idea. This would really change the carbon dioxide generated by power generation, electricity generation. How about this? This would greatly reduce the carbon dioxide generated from heating buildings.

Yet, in that conversation, there is the sound of silence from the right side of the aisle. Do we hear multitudinous ideas? No. We hear none. That is where the legislative malfeasance and where the moral irresponsibility lies—in pretending that you can be a leader in this country, in this Senate Chamber, and not address this major challenge that is afflicting our planet. That is unacceptable. We don't need fake and phone debates on the floor of a resolution that hasn't gone through committee. We need real discussion and real engagement.

It was not that long ago that Republican leaders across this Nation were taking on this issue. H. W. Bush ran for the Presidency to take on climate change. When he got into office, he didn't end up doing a lot, but he ran on it and campaigned on it. Other leaders have said we have a responsibility to be

good stewards of our resources. I have heard that from the Republican side of the aisle for my entire lifetime—good stewardship. So why the silence now? Why the failure to look at the facts? Why the failure to bring forward ideas? This is not OK. We need real debate, real discussion.

I have put forward ideas I would love to see debated, one being that we need to dramatically reduce the fossil fuels, which we own as a public, coming out of the ground. We have to lead the world, and we can't ask the rest of the world not to extract and burn fossil fuels if we are still profiting from doing so.

I laid out the vision—the 100-percent mission in all sectors—and how we can get there over the coming decades. It is a 300-page bill that is full of ideas. Maybe they are not all the best of ideas, but I encourage my colleagues to read them, to find ones they like, and to bring forward their ideas. Where do tax credits play in this conversation? Where do limits play on pollution? Where do incentives to transition to renewable energy come in? Let's have that debate as serious policymakers and leaders of this country who are responsible for our Nation and for the future of our planet.

Henry David Thoreau lived a long time ago, but he laid out the point that we are responsible for the health of our planet. Let's take that responsibility seriously. Let's engage. Let's debate every single idea. There are hundreds of them out there. Let's go through them. Let's forge a bipartisan plan. Let's not let any industry in America contaminate the process, the political process, through these dark donations. Let's not, any party in this country, be misled from addressing the serious issues before us because they are blinded by the hundreds of millions of dollars falling on their campaigns. Let's do what we have to do, what we have a responsibility to do. History will judge whether we have done that which cannot be delayed. That is our responsibility.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, as of now, there are zero climate proposals coming from Senate Republicans—none. So it becomes extraordinarily difficult to debate climate change when only one political party is committed to fixing it. I can't underscore this enough. I don't know if I can sort of stage direct the C-SPAN cameras, but if I can—if they would pan out—they would see an empty Chamber on the other side.

Look, if you don't like our proposals—if you don't like the investment tax credit or the production tax credit, if you don't like planting trees, if you don't like fuel efficiency standards, if you don't like mercury and air quality standards, if you don't like investing in high-tech research to find that next breakthrough or if you think

climate change is a hoax, come down to the Senate floor and make your argument. Yet they are not even doing that. This is a planetary emergency—the most important moment in human history as it relates to the planet Earth—and the party in power is doing its best to make the problem worse.

Democrats want to invest in clean air, clean water, and smarter infrastructure. We have taken every chance we can to talk about climate and how to fix it. Senator WHITEHOUSE alone has given 200 speeches on the Senate floor about the climate crisis.

The Republican response has been to try to make this silly, to score points about something that was posted on a Congresswoman's website and promptly removed and to make false statements saying Democrats want to ban cheeseburgers or whatever. That is because they don't want to debate this issue seriously because they don't have ideas on climate. Their only plan is to actively, aggressively make things even worse.

They need to make this debate about something—anything—other than what it is, which is a planet in crisis; weather getting weirder and worse, wildfires, coastal flooding, fisheries crashing. Pennsylvania farmers say they had the worst season they have had in 30 years because of all the rain they got last year, while farmers in the Midwest didn't get near enough. It is a rolling disaster happening right now.

In response, here is what the Republicans have done. They have put people who make their money from pollution in charge of regulating pollution. They have given oil and gas companies access to millions of acres of land and water that are supposed to be protected for things like conservation, hunting, hiking. They pulled the United States out of the Paris Agreement, which means we are the only country on the planet not at the table when it comes to figuring out what to do about this problem.

They have made it easier for companies to put methane in the air or make cars that pump pollution into the air, and instead of just leaving coal companies alone, instead of saying, hey, let's let the market decide, they are actually looking to subsidize coal because now it is noncompetitive with wind and solar, in a lot of instances, but they actually want to subsidize coal so they can get another 10 or 20 years' worth of fossil fuel pollution. This is not what you would do if you were trying to stop climate change. This is what you do if you are trying to make it worse.

So let's take a closer look at some of the worst things on their list. First, you have to look at the people they have put in charge of conserving public lands and keeping air and water clean. This week, the Senate is voting on Andrew Wheeler to run the EPA. He is a coal lobbyist, and I know politicians are prone to sort of overstatement, rhetorical flourishes, but this guy is actually a coal lobbyist. He made his living working for coal.

I don't know him. I presume he is an honorable fellow, but now we are supposed to believe he is the best person to keep coal companies in line, to make sure they follow the rules and don't hurt the air people breathe or the rivers they fish in.

If this were a movie about corruption in politics, this script would be thrown out because it was too obvious.

Then there is Ryan Zinke, who was supposed to protect public lands but instead opened up oil and gas leases at the Department of Interior, or the guy regulating Federal energy who denies that climate change is real, even though we can all see it with our own eyes. If you don't believe the science, you can at least believe your own experience. The weather is getting worse and weirder and more severe. He says carbon dioxide really isn't a pollutant at all.

So the nominees have been awful, but the policy is bad too. Republicans are trying to pull us out of the Paris Agreement that every other country in the world is part of. We are not even trying to lead on this planetary emergency, and it means that we give the leadership mantle to China to take the lead on how the world is going to fix this problem or make it worse, as if Americans should trust China to do what is best for our country.

Then there is the Republican effort to let polluting companies keep polluting. The whole reason the EPA exists is to make sure the air we breathe, the water we drink and swim in, the land we farm on and live on doesn't get polluted, but Republicans have taken control of the EPA to get rid of these protections, and they are telling the auto industry they no longer need to make cars that put less pollution in the air. They have gutted the Clean Power Plan so carbon pollution could be 12 times worse in the next decade—12 times worse in the next decade.

Researchers have found it would be better if we had no policy at all than if we do the things the Republicans want to do.

They have let energy companies off the hook for leaking methane and made it easier for super pollutants to leak into the air. Again, this is the kind of thing you might hear from a politician who is a little overheated, a little overly angry, maybe taking a few liberties with the truth.

This is literally what is happening. They literally put a coal lobbyist in charge of the EPA. That should be enough for someone on the other side to say: Gosh. I can't vote for a coal lobbyist to run the EPA. Now, I don't agree with the Democrats about climate change, but I can't pretend this thing doesn't happen to my home State. I can't pretend Alaska isn't melting or the fisheries aren't crashing or our farms aren't having great difficulty or that the floods in South Carolina and North Carolina and Florida aren't real, and so we can't put a coal lobbyist in charge of the Environmental Protection Agency.

There was a time when the EPA and environmental protection itself was not a partisan issue. Here we are in the U.S. Senate—which is the place to solve these kinds of problems over the course of this country's great history—and every time we come to the floor to talk about climate change, it is an empty Chamber on the Republican side. We have to do better as a country. We have to do better as a Senate. We have to solve climate change together. Future generations are counting on us to transcend partisanship and to have this great debate.

If Leader MCCONNELL wants to bring a resolution, which he thinks is clever, to sort of divide Democrats, fine. We are not particularly worried about that. We are taking this opportunity to say: Great. Let's talk about climate change.

The first question to ask—the first question to ask—is, what is the Republican plan for climate change? Right now, the answer is very simple. They have no plan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, today I am pleased to join with Senators SCHATZ, MERKLEY, MARKEY, and others who have spoken to highlight the need to act on climate change.

I said on the floor earlier this week that the Democrats may not yet agree on exactly how we must address climate change, but we all agree on at least three things: One, climate change is real; two, we as human beings are the primary cause of the climate crisis we face today, and it has been building for the last almost 100 years; and, three, the U.S. Congress—us, the House—should take immediate action to address the challenges of climate change.

That is why I am introducing a resolution today that says those three things: Climate change is real. Humans are leading to this crisis we face. We have an obligation in this body and the House to do something about it.

Democrats believe in our hearts and our minds that it is possible to have a healthy climate and a vibrant, growing economy, and anyone who says otherwise is preaching a false choice.

Sadly, with President Trump in the White House and this administration, many of our Republican friends across the aisle have chosen to ignore the clear science and threat that climate change poses to our children and to their children.

As we speak about climate change today, this Senate is considering the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to lead EPA. Under Mr. Wheeler's leadership, EPA is rolling back climate regulations that will lead to more carbon pollution in the air while increasing other air pollution that triggers asthma, lung disease, and, in some cases, death.

Mr. Wheeler claims these actions are needed to provide more business certainty. He believes industry is stuck in

on old world order. I would just say to Andrew Wheeler, as Bob Dylan once said, "the times they are a-changin'."

Things have changed a lot in the last 15 years. Industry knows where the future lies, and that future is in cleaner technologies. Companies are making investments now for the next 10 and 20 years down the road. They see where the global markets are going. They need to invest in clean energy or be left behind.

Yet, even when industries ask this administration to support climate policies that will help the bottom line of those businesses, in too many instances, Mr. Wheeler seems to turn a blind eye. In fact, there are policies that this administration could support today, right now; policies that would dramatically help our climate and our economy.

One of those policies is the ratification of something called the Kigali amendment to the Montreal Protocol. You say stuff like that, and my colleagues' eyes glaze over. So I want to take a minute to talk about what they mean.

The Montreal Protocol, ratified by the United States in 1988, is a global environmental agreement mainly focused on phasing down emissions that contributed to the hole in the ozone layer. It was not that long ago—about the time our pages here were born—that it was a burning issue.

Ozone-depleting substances such as chlorofluorocarbons—we call them CFCs for short—were often found in the coolants used to cool food in household refrigerators and the air-conditioners in our homes and in our cars. CFCs are also found in foams and solvents used in industrial processes.

If there was a poster child for a successful global agreement, I think the Montreal Protocol—which most people never heard of—has to be that poster child. This agreement has led to a 97-percent reduction in the global consumption of ozone-depleting substances with little, if any, economic disruption. Think about that.

Over the years, every administration since the Reagan administration has supported the Montreal Protocol and the four amendments associated with it.

However, it turns out a majority of the ozone-depleting substances are actually being replaced by something called HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons. Those HFCs are easy to use. They are efficient. They are safe for the ozone layer. That is good.

Unfortunately, there is a catch. The HFCs have a global warming potential that is thousands of times greater than carbon dioxide. On the one hand, they are good for the ozone layer; on the other hand, they are a killer when it comes to carbon dioxide. So some really smart people decided to see what they could do about this, and what those smart people did is they came up with a follow-on product to HFCs.

It is estimated that left unchecked, HFCs could account for approximately

20 percent of greenhouse gas pollution by 2050, and that ain't good. So by using HFCs, we are fixing one global environmental problem—the hole in the ozone—but we are contributing to another, and that is just as serious.

To address this negative side effect, on October 15, 2016, in a place called Kigali, which is in Rwanda—that is why they call it the Kigali amendment or Kigali treaty—more than 170 countries agreed to amend the Montreal Protocol, including ours.

The goal of this agreement is to achieve more than an 80-percent reduction in global HFC production and utilization by 2047. It doesn't say you have to stop using it tomorrow. This is a phaseout and a phasedown. If we don't do anything by 2047, we will see an increase of about half a degree Celsius—that is almost a full degree Fahrenheit—in global warming by the end of this century. We can't afford to do that. Our planet can't afford to do that. Our kids, our grandchildren cannot afford for us to do that.

U.S. industry strongly supports the Kigali amendment because U.S. companies have already invested billions of dollars in order to be able to produce the next-generation technologies that are going to replace, over time, HFCs. Phasing down HFCs allows U.S. companies to capture a large portion of a global market that is—listen to this—\$1 trillion in size, which will create 150,000 new direct and indirect American jobs in less than a decade.

These new jobs are expected to generate close to \$39 billion dollars—\$39 billion—in annual economic benefits for our country; again, in less than a decade.

Industry also believes ratification of the Kigali treaty will mitigate unfair Chinese dumping of HFCs in the United States, hurting our businesses.

Ratification of the Kigali amendment is a no-brainer, and even those who are skeptical about climate change ought to be able to admit that it would be great for U.S. competitiveness and good-paying American jobs.

This is a real win-win situation. If we don't seize the opportunity, we should have our heads examined. That is why we have some pretty strange bedfellows supporting the Kigali ratification.

There is a chart behind me. Among others, we have the National Association of Manufacturers, Natural Resources development folks, the spirit of enterprise, FreedomWorks, the American Chemistry Council, Business Roundtable, and Sierra Club.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARPER. They are not all wrong. They are right. I say to my colleagues across the aisle: Listen to these folks, and let's use our heads and our hearts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

SOCIALISM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as strange as it seems, socialism is having

a bit of a resurgence here in the Nation's Capital these days.

Why, you might ask, has this failed economic theory that is so destructive of individual freedom captured the attention of some of our friends in the Democratic Party? I admit, to me, it is somewhat of a mystery.

My guess is I am not the only one who assumed that every American has learned the lessons of history and that those lessons are common knowledge. Apparently not. One other possibility is that socialism is a stalking horse for other, less obvious goals. I will have more to say about what the Founders believed about the concentration of government power that would be needed to implement these utopian schemes at a later time. I also will return to the Senate floor at another time to talk about the well-funded efforts, including in the State of Texas, to advance the cause of socialism, unbeknownst to most of my fellow Texans.

Maybe self-identified socialists or democratic socialists—by the way, that is an impossible contradiction in terms. You can't be democratic and a socialist at the same time. Obviously, people put those two terms together to try to mask their true intentions.

Obviously, these self-identified democratic socialists have never learned what it is or what it stands for. Recent polling suggests that Americans have vastly different ideas about what socialism really means. A Gallup poll, for example, found that 23 percent of the people who responded understood that it means economic equality—though the definition of what equality looks like varies pretty significantly. About the same number of people said they didn't know or had no opinion of what socialism means. Roughly 17 percent understand it to mean government ownership or control of business and the economy.

There were a variety of answers, ranging from government-guaranteed benefits to communism, to people simply being social and getting along. That is what some people think socialism is. This confusion about what, exactly, socialism is has allowed its supporters to push this discredited idea back into the political mainstream.

The so-called democratic socialists are trying to convince the American people that bigger government and less liberty are the solutions to economic inequality. But they don't just want economic opportunity or equal opportunity; they want equal outcomes. They clearly want to put the government in charge of Americans' lives.

To be sure, they will not be honest about the means by which that equality would be accomplished under socialism. They use a lot of feel-good phrases to mask the consequences of their argument. They say things like “give a voice to the voiceless” or “to achieve a more just society.” What they don't tell you is that in order to redistribute economic benefits, you would have to marshal the power of the

government to coerce the American people to give up the fruits of their labor in pursuit of socialist, utopian aims.

While socialists will not tell you what the government would have to do to force that redistribution, they like to point to Scandinavian countries as a model for socialism's success. But there are some problems with that.

They will say: Look at Denmark. They have free higher education, universal healthcare, and subsidized childcare, and they are doing great. So, they say, socialism works. But facts are stubborn things. For one, Denmark is not a socialist country. Just ask the Danish Prime Minister, who said:

Denmark is far from a socialist planned economy. Denmark is a market economy.

The left argues: It is still a good model. We want that.

OK, so how are they paying for all of these programs? It is certainly not just from the top 1 percent of the wealthiest of Americans. It is the middle class too. Margaret Thatcher once said: “The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money.”

Let's look at tax rates. Danes pay some of the highest taxes in the world. In the United States, tax revenue accounts for just over a quarter of the size of our economy. In Denmark, it is 50 percent—or double.

Let's also compare our two countries. The population of the country of Denmark is roughly 1/60th the population of the United States. In terms of landmass, it is about 16,000 square miles. Texas is almost 17 times the size of Denmark.

So if the model used in Denmark is, one, not socialism and, two, unaffordable, let's instead look for a better example of a country that has embraced socialism. I would suggest Venezuela would be a good candidate.

In the late 1990s, then-Presidential Candidate Hugo Chavez delivered impassioned speeches promising to lead Venezuela into a socialist paradise. He talked about the country's wealth being stolen by evil capitalists and greedy corporations and promised hope and change if he was elected. That sounds similar to some of the snake oil being sold by a number of radical Democrats today. By the way, you don't see caravans of people attempting to immigrate to socialist countries like Venezuela. It is just the opposite.

We now know that Chavez's promises were empty and dangerous, and while Venezuela certainly saw a lot of change, it wasn't the kind they wanted or the kind they expected. The government took over businesses; they shut down free markets; and they suppressed free speech. As a result, one of the richest countries in the world is now among the poorest. Basic commodities like food, medicine, and water are in short supply; freedom of the press has disappeared; crime rates have skyrocketed; and millions have fled.

Of course, it is no surprise that self-proclaimed socialists in the United

States refuse to accept this as an example of socialism. But this is the truth. That is why socialism must be soundly rejected.

Sir Winston Churchill, who had an incredible gift for words, once said:

The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings. The inherent virtue of Socialism is the equal sharing of miseries.

Clearly, misery would be a result of a current fad celebrating socialism, and we must firmly and clearly reject it.

In a society like ours, based on the free enterprise system, business owners compete for business and make decisions based on what the customer wants and needs, and this helps keep the cost of living low while offering consumers choice.

Competition and free enterprise are the opposite of centrally planned and administered socialist economies and the only economic system compatible with individual liberty.

In a socialist country, the government owns or controls everything. If you don't like it or insist on going your own way, you will be squished like a bug. Socialism forces citizens to be submissive to the government's plan—a far cry from the freedoms and liberties promised under our Constitution.

Most Americans don't want the government to run their lives. They want less government, which is to say they want more freedom. So while things like free healthcare or free higher education or free housing sound pretty good superficially, they are a fantasy and part of the agenda to move the United States toward a socialist, government-controlled economy.

Under our free enterprise system, people work to earn their living. The harder you work, the more you benefit and the better you can provide for yourself and your family. That is something we call the American dream. But with socialism, that kind of motivation doesn't exist at all. Why would you put in the extra effort? Why would you work longer hours when you will receive the same pay and benefits as everybody else? Why would you pursue an advanced degree and pour your heart into researching new medical cures when you know, at the end of the day, the person who chooses to do nothing will receive the same benefits you do? Well, you wouldn't. That is why socialism doesn't work.

In a recent Washington Post column, George Will defined today's understanding of socialism as this:

Almost everyone will be nice to almost everyone, using money taken from a few. This means having government distribute, according to its conception of equity, the wealth produced by capitalism.

The problem is, as he said, the government will take and take until eventually there is nothing more to take. Once that happens, the economy will tank; jobs will dry up; taxes will get higher to pay for the benefits promised; and those utopian sentiments will not feel quite so good anymore.

The enemy of socialism isn't greed. It is experience. That is why there are no socialist success stories. Venezuela, the Soviet Union, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania—time and again, we have seen socialism fail. That has been the universal experience.

As President Trump said in Miami last week:

Socialism promises prosperity, but it delivers poverty. Socialism promises unity, but it delivers hatred and it delivers division. Socialism promises a better future, but it always returns to the darkest chapters of the past.

Slapping the word “democratic” in front of the word “socialism” doesn't make it any less radical or any less terrifying. In fact, democracy and socialism are at war with each other.

This is not about lifting up the poor. It is about taking our freedom away and turning it over to our government overlords and taskmasters.

As so many seem to have forgotten the lessons of history, I plan to return to the Senate floor to discuss this disturbing trend further and remind the American people why socialism is the enemy, not a friend, of our country.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 2 minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I say to our colleagues that I stand before you today as a Vietnam veteran—5 years of naval service during the hot war in Southeast Asia, trying to make sure that the force of communism was stopped. I served another 18 years beyond that, right to the end of the Cold War, as a naval flight officer and retired as a Navy captain.

I am not a socialist. I am somebody who cares deeply about this planet. I am someone who believes it is possible to have clean air, clean water, better public health, and to foster economic growth.

As it turns out, there are a lot of companies in this country that believe the same thing. They believe the same thing. A lot of them build cars, trucks, and vans. They want a 50-State deal on fuel efficiency standards, CAFE standards, and tailpipe standards. They want a 50-State deal so they don't have to build a car for 13 or 14 different States and then a different kind of car or truck for the rest of the country. They don't want to do that. They want certainty and predictability so they can build one model for one car. They want to be able to be successful in competing in the world marketplace in the next 10, 20, or 30 years.

We need someone leading the Environmental Protection Agency who believes that it is possible to have cleaner air and, frankly, to foster economic growth in the auto companies. That is what the auto companies want. They are not socialists. They are free-marketeters.

There is something called HFCs, or hydrofluorocarbons. It is a terrible pollutant for the environment. It is 1,000 times worse than carbon for our global warming challenges. There are a bunch of American businesses that have new technology to replace HFCs. They want to be able not just to develop it, but they want to be able to sell it all over the world. The marketplace is \$1 trillion, and we are holding it back.

Unfortunately, the person whom we are going to be voting on here today to be our EPA Administrator is part of holding us back because he will not agree to a treaty that the administration wants to put forward. It is crazy.

Those companies that developed the follow-on products to HFCs—Honeywell, Chemours, and others—are not socialists. They are business people. They want a piece of the international market, and they want to do good things for the climate at the same time.

I just want to say to my colleagues: We can do both. We can have clean air. We can have clean water. We can have strong economic growth. We need somebody running the EPA who actually believes in that too. I am sorry to say here today that right now I don't believe it is Andrew Wheeler, and I say that with no joy.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, throughout the country and in the great State of Illinois, a host of environmental issues are plaguing Americans. From air pollution, to ground-water contamination, to the increases in climate change-related harm that we are already facing, there is no more crucial time to have strong national leadership on environmental issues than right now. However, in the midst of all these issues comes the nomination of Andrew Wheeler—a former lobbyist for corporate polluters—to lead the Environmental Protection Agency.

If there is one major thing we have learned from the Clean Air Act, it is that regulations save lives and money. Regulations that ensure clean air mean fewer premature deaths and health issues, as well as fewer asthma attacks in children and health-related missed work days. However, the EPA under this administration that is now led by Acting Administrator Wheeler, consistently works to roll back clean air and water rules. This exposes the most vulnerable members of our society—including children and the elderly—to toxic and deadly chemicals. The people in Illinois are no exception. We are facing several environmental issues in Illinois that require immediate action by the EPA, and so far, I am not satisfied that EPA is doing everything it can and should be doing under Mr. Wheeler's leadership.

The Sterigenics facility is causing is a public health threat in Willowbrook, IL due to emissions from cancer-causing ethylene oxide. The EPA's own risk assessment from 2016, showed that ethylene oxide exposure increases the risk of cancer more than what was previously thought. However, given this

information, the EPA has still not taken sufficient actions to protect people of Willowbrook who are exposed to this gas. Concerns about ethylene oxide exposure is not limited to the people of Willowbrook—it is also of concern to the people of Gurnee and Waukegan, IL who also have plants that use ethylene oxide in the middle of their towns. Every time I have spoken with Acting Administrator Wheeler about this issue, I have been disappointed by the lack of urgency to do anything more than monitor and collect more data. When it comes to the facilities in Gurnee and Waukegan, the EPA won't even commit to monitor and collect data, even though I have joined my colleague Senator DUCKWORTH in requesting that monitoring begin immediately. The EPA is 4 years overdue to begin the process to promulgate new standards for this gas, even though they know the increased cancer risk. So I, along with my colleague Senator DUCKWORTH and my colleagues in the House, introduced legislation to require the EPA to promulgate new rules for ethylene oxide. However, the EPA's failure to act to limit toxic chemicals being emitted into neighborhoods does not end with ethylene oxide. There is manganese pollution on the Southeast side of Chicago. Manganese exposure results in serious neurological effects, such as learning difficulties, lower IQ scores in children, and manganese poisoning—a condition that resembles Parkinson's disease. There are several facilities on the Southeast side of Chicago that emit manganese, and EPA is now monitoring these facilities after my colleague Senator DUCKWORTH and I pressed EPA to do so. These facilities contaminate both the air that people breathe and the soil that children play on.

Although the EPA knows how dangerous this neurotoxin is and how high the concentrations are, they will not commit to strengthening manganese standards or take immediate action to clean up sites with soil contamination. We need someone at the EPA that will be aggressive in enforcing the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act.

We also need an EPA Administrator who recognizes how urgent it is to address climate change. The Trump administration's own Department of Defense issued a report last month identifying national security threats to defense missions, operations, and installations, due to climate change. Yet Acting Administrator Wheeler continues to undermine independent science for climate change by appointing members to the EPA's Scientific Advisory Board who are biased by industry or actively deny that climate change is a problem. How can we expect the EPA to lead efforts to address climate change if its leadership doesn't believe it requires immediate action?

I would also like to mention one more thing before I close. This administration promised farmers, biorefineries, and fuels stations that they

would ensure stations could sell E15 fuels this summer. The EPA is coming close to failing to fulfil that promise. I hope the EPA will work with me to ensure stations are able to sell E15 fuels this summer.

We need someone leading the EPA who will put the health and well-being of the people of this country above the profits of corporate polluters. We need someone who is willing to protect families and communities from toxic chemicals in our air and water by fully enforcing the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. And we need someone who will lead the charge to address climate change. I am not convinced that Acting Administrator Wheeler will do these things. As a result, I cannot support his nomination. I hope he proves me wrong.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to express my opposition to confirming Andrew Wheeler to serve as Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

His lobbying activities and tenure, first as Deputy, then as Acting Administrator, show that he should not be leading the EPA in a permanent capacity.

We are at a crossroads for action on climate change. The United Nations issued a special report in October, warning of the catastrophic consequences of allowing global warming to surpass 1.5 degrees Celsius.

The report warned that human activity has already caused about 1 degree of warming and that we need to drastically cut emissions—45 percent by 2030 and 100 percent by 2050—to stay below 1.5 degrees.

The EPA is the strongest institution we have in the United States to combat climate change in terms of technical expertise and legal authority. Unfortunately, I fear that, if the EPA remains under the leadership of Andrew Wheeler, it will continue dismantling critical regulations and rolling back previous efforts to address climate change.

Andrew Wheeler is a former coal and fossil fuel lobbyist. Despite a duty to serve the public's interest, he has instead worked to push a counterproductive agenda of deregulation at the EPA.

During Mr. Wheeler's EPA tenure, the Trump administration has aggressively moved to undermine numerous greenhouse gas emission regulations. This includes President Obama's landmark Clean Power Plan, performance standards for new power plants, and methane emission standards for the oil and gas industry.

I am most concerned that Andrew Wheeler is overseeing the Trump administration's efforts to roll back our national program for motor vehicle emission standards, an issue that I have worked on for decades.

Under the current program, fuel economy standards for new cars and SUVs are set to exceed 50 miles per gallon by 2025. To date, these standards have saved 550 million barrels of oil, \$65

billion in fuel costs for American families, and 250 million metric tons of carbon dioxide.

The success of these standards comes, in part, from the fact that they have been implemented as a single, coordinated national program under the authority of the EPA, the Department of Transportation, and the State of California.

The Department of Transportation implements the Ten-in-Ten Fuel Economy Act, which was signed into law in 2007 following a bipartisan legislative effort over the course of many years. I was proud to work together with our former colleague Olympia Snowe of Maine and many others from both parties to strengthen the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards for the first time in three decades.

This law requires fuel economy standards to increase by at least 10 miles per gallon by 2020. Beyond 2020, the law requires standards to be set at the maximum feasible level based on available technology, which the administration is trying to avoid doing for 2022–2026.

For its part, the EPA implements complementary vehicle emission standards under the Clean Air Act. That law also recognizes California's longstanding authority to regulate its own air pollution and allows other States to choose to follow California's standards in lieu of Federal requirements, as 13 States have now done.

Today these standards are collectively implemented as a single national program under a 2012 agreement between the Department of Transportation, the EPA, and the State of California that applies through model year 2025.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration is working to tear up that agreement and weaken Federal standards starting in 2022. Last week, the administration announced it would refuse to negotiate with California to salvage this program. Instead of seeking consensus, the EPA, overseen by Mr. Wheeler, is proposing to challenge California's longstanding authority. These actions are unjustified and will only create chaos and uncertainty for the automobile market.

Under Mr. Wheeler's watch, the Trump administration has also continued to roll back or undermine many other important EPA environmental health and safety regulations.

From attempts to undermine effective Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, to evading the EPA's commitments to set safe drinking water standards, to failing to fully implement the Toxic Substances Control Act, it is clear that Mr. Wheeler will only continue his efforts to dismantle the EPA from within.

I was a proud supporter of the bipartisan Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act, which passed in 2016. This bill amends and updates the Toxic Substances Control Act, which is the Nation's primary

chemicals management law. Thousands of Californians rely on it to safeguard against exposure to toxic chemicals we encounter every day.

EPA is charged with protecting all Americans from undue and harmful exposure to existing and newly introduced chemicals. However, under the Trump administration, the EPA's safety reviews of toxic substances has fallen far short of the intent of this sweeping, bipartisan toxic chemical reform legislation.

One example of a chemical that I am very concerned about is asbestos. As a result of the administration's lack of action, my colleagues in the Senate and I introduced legislation in 2017 that would have amended the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the EPA to identify and assess all forms of asbestos and ultimately ban this known carcinogen.

This bill was named after Alan Reinstein, who passed away in 2006 at the age of 66 from mesothelioma, a disease caused by exposure to asbestos. Delays in banning asbestos have meant that as many as 15,000 Americans die each year from exposure.

During Wheeler's tenure, the EPA has resisted calls to eliminate exemptions for asbestos in the current Chemical Data Reporting rule, a reporting requirement under the Toxic Substances Control Act, to comply with its mandate to prevent unreasonable risks to health and the environment presented by asbestos.

Despite knowing the health risks for decades, asbestos is still used in a wide variety of construction materials that the public unwittingly comes into contact with every day.

Andrew Wheeler's tenure at the EPA, both as Deputy Administrator for the EPA and as Acting Administrator, has shown a clear disregard for the EPA's mission to protect the public and the environment. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose his confirmation.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for such time as I shall consume as the final speaker before the vote on the nomination.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you very much, Madam President.

Madam President, we are going to vote in just a few minutes to confirm Andrew Wheeler to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. There is no one better to serve in this role, and I would know. Andrew worked for me for 14 years in both my personal office as well as in my capacity as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

He was with the committee back when President Trump nominated Andrew as Deputy Administrator. I said: There is no one more qualified. There is no one more qualified anywhere in

America to handle this job than Andrew Wheeler.

He has been Acting Administrator for the last 7 months. Let's keep in mind that he was the most qualified person 7 months ago, and now he has had 7 months on the job, and he has done a really great job. He has been the Acting Administrator.

It didn't really start when he came on board with any of the governmental Agencies. He has always been concerned about nature and the environment. The guy was an Eagle Scout.

In fact, I remember the discussions of people who were with him when he was actually climbing Mount Kilimanjaro. It was with a group of people who were interested in nature and the environment. This came early on with him. So he has the ability to lead the Agency.

I have always enjoyed following his career. After earning a law degree at Washington University in St. Louis, he joined the EPA as a special assistant in the Agency's Pollution Prevention and Toxics Office in 1991. I am talking about 30 years ago. This guy has been there for a long time. For all practical purposes, he has grown up in that particular discipline.

He was an EPA employee for 4 years, transitioning to the George H. W. Bush administration and then the Clinton administration after that, where he earned three Bronze Medals for commendable service along the way.

By the way, I doubt if there are too many people in this Chamber who know what that is. So I am going to read it to you.

The Bronze Medal is given for "significant service or achievements in support of the Agency's mission or for demonstration of outstanding accomplishments in supervision and leadership."

That is Andrew Wheeler. He received three of those.

I know you have heard a lot of people opposing him. Regretfully, there are a lot of people opposed simply for the reason that this is a nominee of the President. We went through this with Mr. Kavanaugh. We heard all of these things, and people now look back, and many of them regret that they said the things that they said.

It is awfully hard to be critical of Andrew because he is such a nice guy.

He left the Agency. He brought the sense of service and leadership with him to the U.S. Senate, where I had a front-row seat because he worked for me for 14 years.

He just did really tremendous work. There were never any complaints about him. He knew what he was doing. Again, with a 31-year background, there is nothing that he doesn't know about the mission.

Andrew started in my personal office as chief counsel and transitioned to staff director for a Senate subcommittee. I was a subcommittee chairman at the time on the subcommittee called the Clean Air, Climate Change, Wetlands, and Nuclear

Safety Subcommittee. He was the one who did all the work, and I took the credit, but it worked.

In 2003, when I became the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Andrew became our chief counsel. Over the next 6 years, he would eventually become staff director and we worked closely together on highway bills, energy bills, the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act, and the Clear Skies Act.

I can remember when this was taking place because someone who was a very close friend of mine and is no longer here, Barbara Boxer from California, worked together on these things. It was really kind of funny. Philosophically, we were opposed to each other as much as two people could be, but we accomplished everything. We accomplished the things that other people were not able to accomplish.

It is only natural that the President would nominate Andrew to be the Deputy Director at that time of the EPA. That was last April. He was confirmed in a bipartisan vote.

I will always remember that he gave a speech over at the EPA. It was kind of a welcome speech at that time. That was the day that he was confirmed as Deputy Director of the EPA. I think every single employee was in there, really, to kind of pay homage to him. It is a big deal. Here is a guy who started 30 years ago at the bottom. He is just a normal person in the bureaucracy, and all of a sudden—not all of a sudden, it took him almost 30 years to do it—he climbs up to become Deputy Director. So he was really a model. He was a model to those 200 or 300 people.

Andrew didn't even know this as he was making his initial speech, but I watched the looks on their faces, and the model that he was for them was that there is room at the top. Here is a guy who climbed all the way up, and he reached the top.

He knows what it takes to ensure that our environment is cared for within the laws passed by Congress. He will ensure that all stakeholders are heard, and he will provide certainty and stability for the regulated community. That is a switch.

One of the reasons I ran for Congress in the first place many years ago was the fact that I was a builder and developer and I was overregulated. I know what it is like firsthand. He will be a good steward of the environment without punishing our States, without punishing our farmers, and without punishing our job creators just for the sake of it. Those days are behind us.

Andrew has worked on these issues for his entire 28-year career, and I am honored that he chose to spend half of his 14 years working for me. So I have directly benefited from his service. The U.S. Senate has benefited from his leadership, and now America will benefit as well.

Let's vote Andrew in and put him to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wheeler nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 33 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 617 are printed in today's RECORD under

"Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we will be voting on the President's nomination of John Ryder, of Memphis, to be a member of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

To those of us in the seven State region that the TVA serves, it is a very important institution. Its job is to provide large amounts of reliable, low-cost electricity, which is the basis for how we live and how we work. It has a lot to do with our ability to attract jobs. Its job is to provide that energy in a clean way so we can see our mountains and so we meet the emissions standards in our metropolitan areas that allow us to attract and grow more jobs.

The TVA is fulfilling its mission very well. It is heading toward a position in which it will be about 40-percent nuclear in its production of electricity, about 20 percent in natural gas, and about 20 percent in coal or a little less than that. It will have pollution control equipment on all of its coal plants. Most of the rest is hydroelectric power, and a little bit is renewable. In short, it has one of the cleanest portfolios in the country, and it is continuing to do that and is producing a lot of low-cost, reliable electricity.

We are very fortunate to be in a region in which, as we look down the road 5, 10, or 15 years, we will be able to say to people who are thinking of moving themselves to Tennessee or moving their businesses to Tennessee or growing them there that they will be able to get a lot of reliable, low-cost electricity—all that they need. In addition to that, they will be able to see the Smoky Mountains because the air is a lot cleaner now that they have such a clean portfolio.

So John Ryder's appointment is a very important appointment, and he is a well-qualified man for that position. He is one of Tennessee's best known lawyers and has been for a long time. Since the late 1980s, he has been listed as one of Tennessee's best lawyers. He is well respected by everyone who knows him.

Senator Corker and I recommended him to President Trump, and we know him well. Senator BLACKBURN, who is Senator Corker's successor, has a high regard for John Ryder. All of us appreciate his willingness to serve, and we look forward to the voice vote we are going to have in a few minutes that will place him on TVA's Board. The Board has just selected a new chief executive officer. TVA is the largest public utility in the United States, perhaps in the world. It is an important assignment, and it is one I am delighted to recommend him for.

There is one other thing, but I will not dwell on this because I spoke on this Monday night. Unfortunately, Mr. Ryder has been on the Senate's cal-

endar for 9 months. He was nominated by President Trump a year ago. The problem has not been with Mr. Ryder because, as I said, President Trump nominated him after he was thoroughly vetted by the FBI. The Senate's Environment and Public Works Committee considered him, had a hearing, and reported him unanimously to the floor. Yet, for 9 months, he waited there.

One reason is, the Democrats have consistently obstructed the ability of Senator MCCONNELL and the Republican majority to help President Trump form his government. The Democrats have required 128 times that Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, file cloture motions to cut off debate to advance a nomination like Mr. Ryder's.

Now, this is not a Cabinet position. This is not a lifetime judge. This is the part-time Board of an important institution. He is one of 1,200 Presidential nominees that any President has who is subject to confirmation by advice and consent. It is the kind of nomination by which, if a committee unanimously reports it to the Senate, we will normally approve it by voice vote. Yet, on this vote, Senator MCCONNELL was forced to file cloture a week ago. Then we had to wait an intervening day. Only then could we come to this vote.

This is not the way the Senate is supposed to work, and this obstruction has to stop. Senator BLUNT and Senator LANKFORD have introduced a resolution, which has been reported to the Senate by the rules committee, that would cause us to adopt a rule very much like the one we adopted in 2013, when I worked with a large number of Democrats and Republicans for the sole purpose of making it easier for President Obama—and his successors—to promptly confirm the men and women whom he chose to form a government.

It received 78 votes. What we did at that time was simply say: You still keep the cloture motion, and you still wait an intervening day if you need it, but we reduce the postcloture time—not for Supreme Court Justices, not for circuit judges—simply for sub-Cabinet members and for district judges. We would reduce sub-Cabinet members to 8 hours and district judges to 2 hours.

On Monday night, I invited my Democratic friends to work with me in 2019 the way I worked with them in 2013. In a bipartisan way, let's make sure the Senate can do what it has historically done—to have promptly considered and voted up or down, with 51 votes, the nominees of any President of the United States for the 1,200 positions that form the government.

There have been some conversations. I hope Senator BLUNT and Senator LANKFORD will continue to have those conversations with the Democratic Members, but there are nine Democratic Senators, by my count, who are seeking to be the next President of the United States. I hope they can look 20 months down the road and realize that

just one Republican Senator could do to them, if one of them were to become President, what the Democrats have done to President Trump. It would be very difficult for the next Democratic President, if there were to be one, to form a government. We don't want that to happen. That diminishes the advice and consent role of the Senate. It fills up the government with appointees who are acting and whom we don't know, and they are not really accountable to us. That is not the way this place is supposed to work.

So I renew my invitation to my Democratic friends to work with me the way a number of us worked with them in 2011, in 2012, and in 2013. Let's change the rules in the right way. Let's basically adopt virtually the same rule we adopted in 2013 and allow this President and any President to get prompt consideration and up-or-down votes of their nominees.

I congratulate Mr. Ryder on his confirmation. I am grateful for his willingness to serve, and I am sorry he had to wait so long for the opportunity. The people of Tennessee and the seven State region will be much better off for his service within this important institution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation of John Ryder, as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, occur at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Ryder nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Tennessee.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Tennessee.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, President Trump has been in Vietnam this week, meeting with the North Korean leader, Kim Jong Un. I applaud the President for his efforts to improve the U.S. relationship with North Korea.

There is not a more difficult relationship anywhere in the world at this

time than that relationship. But I am glad he chose not to seek a deal just for the sake of a deal.

As he returns from his summit with the North Korean leader and turns his attention back home, I want to make a respectful suggestion, and that is this: that President Trump ask his lawyers to take a second look at existing funding authorities that the President has to consider construction of the 234 miles of border wall that do not require a formal declaration of a national emergency.

I support what the President wants to do on border security, but I do not support the way he has been advised to do it. It is unnecessary and unwise to turn a border crisis into a constitutional crisis about separation of powers when the President already has congressional funding authority to build the 234 miles of border wall that he requested in his January 6 letter to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD following my remarks the text of the President's January 6 letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, there has never been an instance in which a President of the United States has asked for funding. Congress has refused it, and the President has then used the National Emergency Act to justify spending the money anyway.

If President Trump can build a wall when Congress has refused to provide the funding, then the next President can declare a national emergency and tear the wall down or declare climate change an emergency and stop oil exports and offshore drilling. There is no limit to the imagination of what the next leftwing President could do to harm our country with this precedent.

After an American revolution against a King, our Founders chose not to create a Chief Executive who could tax the people and spend their money any way he chose. The Constitution gave that responsibility exclusively to a Congress elected by the people, and every one of us U.S. Senators has taken an oath to support that Constitution.

Separation of powers is a crucial constitutional imperative that goes to the very heart of our freedom.

I don't know how the late Justice Antonin Scalia would have decided a case on this matter, but I do know what he said about separation of powers, and this was what Justice Scalia said:

Every tin horn dictator in the world today . . . has a Bill of Rights. That's not what makes us free. . . . What has made us free is our Constitution. . . . The word "constitution" . . . means structure. That's why . . . the framers debated not the Bill of Rights . . . but rather the structure of the federal government. The genius of the American constitutional system is the dispersal of power. Once power is centralized in one person, or one part [of our government], a Bill of Rights is just words on paper.

That was Justice Scalia.

The President can avoid this dangerous precedent completely. He can use the congressional funding authority he already has to build the 234 miles of wall that he asked Congress to approve in the January 6 letter that I submitted for the RECORD.

Here is how this would work. On January 6 of this year—last month—in his letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee, the President requested \$5.7 billion to build 234 miles of new physical barrier on the southern border.

Then, on February 14, a couple of weeks ago, Congress passed the Homeland Security appropriations bill, which provided \$1.375 billion to build 55 miles that the President had asked for.

On February 15, the day he signed the Homeland Security appropriations bill, President Trump announced that he would use two additional sources of funds that had already been approved by Congress, which could be used to fund the border wall.

The first was \$601 million from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund. The second was up to \$2.5 billion from the Department of Defense accounts to support counterdrug activities and to block drug-smuggling corridors across international boundaries.

The President is authorized to do this because of a provision in law that allows him to transfer up to \$4 billion among the accounts of the Department of Defense. That is \$4 billion in a Department of Defense budget of about \$600 billion.

These three sources of funding that I just mentioned add up to about \$4.5 billion or \$1.2 billion less than the \$5.7 billion that the President requested in his January 6 letter.

So where does he get the rest of the money? He can get it by transferring \$3.7 billion instead of \$2.5 billion from the Department of Defense accounts to support counterdrug activities. Then the President would be able to build the 234 miles of wall he requested on January 6, and he would not need to declare a national emergency.

To be specific, this means the President would use \$1.375 billion from the Homeland Security appropriations bill plus \$601 million from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund plus \$3.7 billion from the Department of Defense accounts to support counterdrug activities, which would add up to equal his full \$5.7 billion request to build 234 miles of border wall.

If my analysis is incorrect, I hope that the President's lawyers will tell me.

Using funds already approved by Congress avoids the constitutional crisis of separation of powers. Using funds already approved by Congress avoids establishing a dangerous precedent, which could be misused by subsequent Presidents. Using funds already approved by Congress avoids taking money from military construction projects specifically approved by Congress for such activities as military

barracks and hospitals. And using funds already approved by Congress avoids months or years of litigation, which could make it unlikely that the full 234 miles are ever built.

It may be a couple of weeks before the Senate votes on a resolution regarding the national emergency declaration, so we don't know yet exactly what we will be voting on. There is time for the President's lawyers to take another look and determine whether we can both build the 234 miles of border wall that the President has asked for and avoid this dangerous precedent. Then the Senate could both support the President's border request and be faithful to our oath to support a Constitution that creates separation of powers as a crucial check on Executive power that goes to the very heart of our freedom.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, January 6, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The President continues to stress the need to pass legislation that will both reopen the Federal Government and address the security and humanitarian crisis at our Nation's Southwest border. The Administration has previously transmitted budget proposals that would support his ongoing commitment to dramatically reduce the entry of illegal immigrants, criminals, and drugs; keep out terrorists, public safety threats, and those otherwise inadmissible under U.S. law; and ensure that those who do enter without legal permission can be promptly and safely returned home.

Appropriations bills for fiscal year (FY) 2019 that have already been considered by the current and previous Congresses are inadequate to fully address these critical issues. Any agreement for the current year should satisfy the following priorities:

—Border Wall, Customs and Border Protection (CBP): The President requests \$5.7 billion for construction of a steel barrier for the Southwest border. Central to any strategy to achieve operational control along the southern border is physical infrastructure to provide requisite impedance and denial. In short, a physical barrier—wall—creates an enduring capability that helps field personnel stop, slow down and/or contain illegal entries. In concert with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CBP has increased its capacity to execute these funds. The Administration's full request would fund construction of a total of approximately 234 miles of new physical barrier and fully fund the top 10 priorities in CBP's Border Security Improvement Plan. This would require an increase of \$4.1 billion over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

—Immigration Judge Teams—Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR): The President requests at least \$563 million for 75 additional Immigration Judges and support staff to reduce the backlog of pending immigration cases. The Administration appreciates that the Senate's FY 2019 bill provides this level of funding, and looks forward to working with the Congress on further increases in this area to facilitate an expansion of in-country processing of asylum claims.

—Law Enforcement Personnel, Border Patrol Agent Hiring, CBP: The President requests \$211 million to hire 750 additional Border Patrol Agents in support of his promise to keep our borders safe and secure. While the Senate's FY 2019 bill supports some Border Patrol Agent hiring, fulfilling this request requires an increase of \$100 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

—Law Enforcement Personnel, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE): The President requests \$571 million for 2,000 additional law enforcement personnel, as well as support staff, who enforce our U.S. immigration laws and help address gang violence, smuggling and trafficking, and the spread of drugs in our communities. This would require an increase of \$571 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

—Detention Beds, ICE: The President requests \$4.2 billion to support 52,000 detention beds. Given that in recent months, the number of people attempting to cross the border illegally has risen to 2,000 per day, providing additional resources for detention and transportation is essential. This would require an increase of \$798 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

—Humanitarian Needs: The President requests an additional \$800 million to address urgent humanitarian needs. This includes additional funding for enhanced medical support, transportation, consumable supplies appropriate for the population, and additional temporary facilities for processing and short-term custody of this vulnerable population, which are necessary to ensure the well-being of those taken into custody.

—Counter-narcotics/weapons Technology: Beyond these specific budgetary requests, the Administration looks forward to working with Congress to provide resources in other areas to address the unprecedented challenges we face along the Southwest border. Specifically, \$675 million would provide Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) technology at inbound lanes at U.S. Southwest Border Land Ports of Entry (LPOE) would allow CBP to deter and detect more contraband, including narcotics, weapons, and other materials that pose nuclear and radiological threats. This would require an increase of \$631 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

In addition, to address the humanitarian crisis of unaccompanied alien children (UACs), Democrats have proposed in-country asylum processing for Central American Minors. This would require a statutory change, along with reallocation of State Department funds to establish in-country processing capacities at Northern Triangle consulates and embassies. Furthermore, for the new procedure to achieve the desired humanitarian result, a further corresponding statutory change would be required to ensure that those who circumvent the process and come to the United States without authorization can be promptly returned home. Without the latter change, in-country processing will not reduce the unauthorized flow or successfully mitigate the humanitarian crisis."

These upfront investments in physical barriers and technology, as well as legislation to close loopholes in our immigration system, will reduce illegal immigration, the flow of illicit drugs entering our country and reduce the long term costs for border and immigration enforcement activities.

The Administration looks forward to advancing these critical priorities as part of legislation to reopen the Government.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL T. VOUGHT,
Acting Director.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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. 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Allison Jones Rushing, of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Allison Jones Rushing, of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, John Thune, John Cornyn, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture motions be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, just a couple of short weeks ago, we finally finished the fiscal year 2019 appropriations bills, and I greatly appreciate those who worked with us to get that done.

I want to talk today about the need to reach a new 2-year budget deal. We have to do that so the Appropriations Committee could then begin to work in earnest on the fiscal year 2020 bills.

We have shown that we can move the appropriations bills quickly, but we have to have the budget deal. In fact, unless we will get a budget deal, sequestration returns in fiscal year 2020. That would mean steep cuts in pro-

grams that invest in America and support working families.

It means we would have to make cuts in our defense programs for the next fiscal year—cuts of \$71 billion. This is real money. There would be a 10-percent cut in funding to support our troops and to invest in military readiness.

It would also require that we cut \$55 billion for nondefense programs in the next fiscal year. That is a 9-percent cut. The reality is, it means less investment in infrastructure, education, housing, or agricultural programs. It means less money for veterans' healthcare, protecting our environment, or combating the opioid epidemic.

These cuts are not just hypothetical numbers on a piece of paper. They affect real people and real families. They affect people in my State. They affect the people in the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer. They affect people in the 50 States represented by all 100 of us.

Of course, the worst part about that is the cuts will come at the same time we are facing significant increases in important programs that we have no control over.

For example, we have to fund the decennial census. The Constitution requires us to have this census, and we have to fund it by \$4 billion if we are going to follow what the Constitution of the United States requires us to do in conducting the 2020 census.

We have all talked about veterans' healthcare. We have had a significant increase in the healthcare costs for veterans, and we have to have significant increases in the budget if we are going to adequately fund their health.

The VA MISSION Act, which provides additional private care options for veterans, becomes effective in June of this year. That is going to cost at least an additional \$3 billion, and estimates could climb significantly higher. That is on top of the \$3 billion increase for VA medical care that we have already enabled through advance appropriations.

Then we are going to need an additional \$1 billion to ensure that an estimated 5 million people who receive affordable housing assistance can stay in their homes. In addition to these increased costs, we expect to lose nearly \$4 billion in receipts and cost savings in other programs compared to this year.

This may sound like just a whole lot of numbers. It is more than that. It means we have \$15 billion right off the bat that we must account for above this year's levels. Of course, I am sure there will be more increases that we will have to address.

As vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I know how hard Chairman SHELBY and I worked with Republicans and Democrats to get through the bills we had this past year. We got them done, but it was not easy staying within levels.

We have to have a 2-year budget deal. We have to negotiate it now. If we wait until the very last second to pass these bills, it will cost the taxpayers a lot more money because the Departments cannot plan. We are not going to bury our heads in the sand and pretend it is going to fix itself.

Of course, again, in the Appropriations Committee, we try to work in a bipartisan way. But we cannot responsibly do our job in the absence of cap levels that allow us to meet the needs of the American people.

Again, this is not just an accounting issue. This is the security and the well-being of the greatest Nation on Earth. It is not rhetoric; it is reality.

The budget deal has to be based on parity if we are going to pass it. It has to have equal treatment for defense and nondefense programs, as we have had in the past.

We have to invest on both sides of the ledger if we are going to create a strong national defense, a strong economy, and a healthy citizenry of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to all Senators that was received yesterday from over 300 retired admirals and generals who agree with this premise.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION: READINESS,

Washington, DC, February 27, 2019.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: We write as retired admirals and generals, and members of the national security organization Mission: Readiness, to urge you to support programs that help America's children grow into healthy, educated, citizen-ready adults. Particularly, we respectfully request that you reevaluate spending caps mandated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and provide balanced investments in both defense and non-defense discretionary (NDD) programs.

As Members of Mission: Readiness, we recognize the fact that the strength of our military—and our Nation—is dependent on the strength of our people. We are deeply concerned that 71 percent of young Americans ages 17 to 24 cannot qualify for military service because they are too poorly educated, medically or physically unfit, or have a disqualifying record of crime or drug abuse. The implications of this recruitment crisis were underscored last year, when the Army fell short of its 2018 recruiting goal by 6,500 soldiers. Further, in 2018 the Army missed its end strength goal for the active duty component by almost 7,500 soldiers, and the Army National Guard and Army Reserve missed their end strength goals by 8,000 and 9,000 soldiers, respectively. The shortage of qualified young people who are willing to serve will continue to erode the strength of our military, unless we address the root causes now.

NDD programs play a variety of roles in supporting and enhancing our national security by contributing directly to the health, education, and development of our youngest generation. These crucial NDD programs include:

Child Care and Development-Block Grants (CCDBG), which help low-income families afford child care. Research shows that access to quality child care has significant positive impacts on children's social, cognitive, and physical development.

Head Start and Early Head Start, which help children from low-income families access early learning opportunities and become prepared for kindergarten. Studies have found that the Head Start participants gain long-term educational benefits, including increased rates of high school graduation.

The sequestration cuts mandated by the BCA pose a direct threat to the effectiveness of these and other key NDD programs. Without a new budget agreement from Congress, NDD funding will be cut by \$55 billion compared to Fiscal Year 2019. These cuts would severely undermine the ability of programs like CCDBG, Head Start, and Early Head Start to serve children and put them on the path toward productive citizenship.

Last year, Congress worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass a two-year budget agreement that avoided sequestration cuts, provided key new investments for important programs, and did so in a balanced manner that strengthened both defense and NDD activities. We strongly urge you to follow this example for the coming fiscal years and avoid the drastic cuts of sequestration, while maintaining a balanced approach to setting discretionary budget levels.

Providing for the common defense is one of the most fundamental and important constitutional duties of Congress. By providing balanced investments across both defense and non-defense discretionary programs, Congress will continue to ensure our national security, both now and for generations to come.

Mr. LEAHY. These admirals and generals, many of whom I know and a lot of whom I do not, have been here with Republican and Democratic administrations, but they are all people who have served our Nation and care about our Nation. They are part of a coalition called Mission: Readiness, Council for a Strong America. They call on Congress to negotiate balanced investments in both defense and nondefense programs.

They wrote: "As members of Mission: Readiness, we recognize the fact that the strength of our military—and our Nation—is dependent on the strength of our people."

We have certainly seen this. You can go back to the time of World War II, when Harry Truman found that we could not find the people we needed in our military because of things like malnutrition or a lack of education; we needed to improve the nutrition programs in our schools. This is not rhetoric; it is reality.

These admirals and generals want a strong United States of America, just as I do and just as every single Member of this body—of either party—wants.

If the press reports are accurate, the President is planning to send up a budget on March 11 that not only fails to provide a constructive path forward, but it is going to be dead on arrival. If press reports are accurate, the President will, yet again, propose deep cuts to nondefense programs, even though Congress has rejected President Trump's cuts for the last 2 fiscal years. Every Republican and every Democrat knows that you have to have a balance between defense and nondefense programs.

President Trump also proposes large increases for defense programs, paid for

using a budget gimmick that his own Acting Chief of Staff, Mick Mulvaney, would rail against when he was in Congress. He says he will move large portions of the defense base budget into the Overseas Contingency Operation, or OCO, account so that it will not count against the budget caps. Mick Mulvaney and most Republicans and Democrats have said we cannot do this. It is not a recipe for success.

OCO is meant for costs associated with military operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria. It is there to address crises overseas. It supports our men and women deployed and in harm's way.

The OCO account should not be used as a slush fund to pay for the everyday operations of the Department of Defense or to avoid a real debate on the budget caps.

To suggest we should move billions in the base defense budget into OCO at a time when the President is actively reducing our troop presence overseas shows what a disingenuous move it is.

I went back in my notes, and I found a letter written by then-Congressman Mick Mulvaney—now the acting Chief of Staff for President Trump. He wrote this in March of 2014. It is strikingly relevant today, 5 years later. Then-Congressman Mulvaney wrote a letter signed by numerous Members. He opposed a \$10 billion increase in OCO, calling it a "misuse" of funds and an attempt to "circumvent the caps" for things unrelated to overseas combat at a time when war operations were "winding down." He opposed the gimmick. He argued for greater transparency and discipline in the budget process.

He said he would not want any President—well, of course, in that case, it was President Obama—to have this power. Now he is Acting Chief of Staff of another President, and we are told the President may propose an increase of \$105 billion, more than doubling OCO funding, as we are withdrawing troops. That is not the way forward.

Let's have an honest conversation, Republicans and Democrats together, about our needs as a nation. We have to do the hard work to set new caps. It is not easy. Every one of us will have to cast difficult votes. Well, so what? We are elected to a 6-year term. There is not a single Member of this body who, at one time or another during their campaigns, did not say something to the effect of "I am willing to cast tough votes."

Well, let us have it, this onerous conversation. Let us do the hard work to set new caps. Let us cast those difficult votes. Let us show the people who elected us they did the right thing. Let us invest in the programs. Let us strengthen our military, grow our economy, improve our infrastructure, and build the future of this country we love. Let us not use a budget gimmick to frustrate that debate. Trust me, the American people will see through that kind of a gimmick.

I am ready to have those conversations. I want to move forward with the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bills. Let's get the work done the American people sent us here to do. If we have to stay a few evenings and if we have to stay a few weekends, let's do it. It is for the greatest Nation on Earth. Let's do it. I urge leadership on both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers of Congress, to begin these negotiations now.

Then we have to take up, with urgency, a disaster package. In the last 2 years, we have had the deadliest disaster seasons in recent memory—Hurricanes Michael, Florence, Irma, and Maria, the California wildfires, volcanic eruptions in Hawaii, and typhoons along the Pacific coast. These communities, States, and territories need our help.

When Tropical Storm Irene hit Vermont in 2011, I found out firsthand how devastating natural disasters can be. Roads were washed away, towns and villages were cut off from vital services, and people's homes were destroyed.

The day after Irene, I went around the State of Vermont with our Governor and with the head of our National Guard in a helicopter, landing in small towns. Many times the only way you could get into these towns was by helicopter because roads were gone and the bridges were gone.

You would see bridges, like a child's toy, twisted and a mile from where it was supposed to be. A farmhouse that had been on the north side of the river was now upside down on the south side of the river. We were in the middle of the State, and we knew it was critical. The Federal Government provided assistance to help recovery because we are part of the United States of America.

The people of Puerto Rico and others that have been so badly damaged, these are Americans. We should stand together to help them. I am sorry we were not able to reach agreement to include a disaster package in the fiscal year 2019 minibus we passed just 2 weeks ago. We were so close to an agreement on a package—so very close, Republicans and Democrats alike. It would have addressed the needs of all impacted communities.

It broke down because the President insisted we eliminate disaster assistance for Puerto Rico. I guess he thought tossing rolls of paper towels for the people is good enough. Puerto Rico is part of the United States. It is not, as the White House described it, an island surrounded by water, I guess, as compared to those other islands. It is a part of the United States. These are American people. They have served in our military. They help us in our medical facilities. They are Americans, and they cannot be left out.

Hurricanes Maria and Irma—they had two hurricanes—devastated Puerto Rico. They destroyed the island's homes and infrastructure. They caused the deaths of an estimated 2,975 people.

It was one of the deadliest hurricanes our country has ever seen, certainly in my lifetime.

Now, we provided Puerto Rico assistance in past disaster bills, but they have so many unaddressed needs that have to be met. Many people, even after the hurricane, are still living in temporary housing. Roads, bridges, and communities still need to be rebuilt. One of the largest infrastructure projects to be undertaken on the island is the rebuilding of Puerto Rico's energy grid, which needs more assistance.

Most importantly, in the absence of supplemental assistance, we estimate that 140,000 Puerto Ricans, U.S. citizens, are going to lose nutrition assistance at the end of March.

We are the United States of America—United States of America—and this is the U.S. Senate. We are supposed to take care of all our citizens when they have crises. We do not pick and choose based on with whom we are politically aligned.

I voted for disaster relief for States that were predominantly Republican and other States that were predominantly Democratic, but I don't look at it like that. I look at the fact that they are part of the United States of America, and they had a disaster. They should be helped.

Last month, the House passed H.R. 268, a comprehensive disaster package that provided over \$14 billion to help all States and territories impacted by recent disasters to help them recover and rebuild. I worked closely with the House on this bill. I believe it will address the needs of all disaster-impacted communities.

On Tuesday, Senators PERDUE and JONES and others, working very hard, introduced a similar but not identical bill. I am taking these bills with me this weekend. I am going to review them carefully. I thank the bipartisan group of Senators—Senators PERDUE and JONES and others—for bringing the issue back to the forefront of the Senate. I am certainly committed to working with my good friend Chairman SHELBY. I also worked with Republicans and Democrats in the House Appropriations Committee. I want a package that can pass both Chambers in addressing the needs of all States and territories hit by recent disasters.

I certainly urge the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, to commit to bringing this to the floor as soon as possible. With that, I see other Senators on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

REMEMBERING OTTO WARMBIER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, in the context of the ongoing negotiations with North Korea, there has been a lot of discussion today in the media about Otto Warmbier.

Otto Warmbier was a young man from my hometown of Cincinnati, OH. This is an emotional issue for me because, through the process of trying to

bring Otto home, I got to know his family very well.

He was a young man with a lot of promise, 22 years old, and a college student at the University of Virginia. He had gone as a tourist to North Korea. He was pulled out of the line at the airport.

Here he was, a kindhearted college kid, found himself a prisoner in North Korea. He was there for about 18 months. His detainment and his sentence were appalling; unacceptable by any standards. At some point soon after being sentenced to 15 years of hard labor, from what we know, Otto suffered a severe brain injury. What happened? We may never know the details, but we do know one thing, and that is he was severely mistreated.

Who did the North Korean Government tell about the fact that he had this brain damage? No one. Unbelievably, for the next 15 months of his life, they kept this a secret. They denied him access to the best medical care he deserved, which of course we would have provided.

I was in communication with the North Korean Government during this time through their offices at the United Nations in New York. They didn't even tell us about the terrible mistreatment he had suffered and the condition he was in. They refused repeated requests for consular access that normally would have been provided to someone who has been detained, regardless of their health situation. This included denying requests, of course, from me, from others in this body and other bodies of Congress but also from the Obama administration, the Trump administration, the Red Cross, also from the Government of Sweden, which typically acts for us in North Korea as a consular service. I say that because while I support engagement with North Korea—in fact, in my experience with Otto Warmbier, it makes me even more convinced we need to have communication because we had no good lines of communication.

I support the ongoing talks with North Korea, specifically about denuclearization. I want to make clear that we can never forget about Otto. His treatment at the hands of his captors was unforgivable, and it tells us a lot about the nature of the regime. We can't be naive about what they did to Otto, about the brutal nature of the regime that would do this to an American citizen.

Of course, it is not just about Otto or other visitors. It is about how the people of North Korea are treated, many of whom also have had their human rights violated. No one should have to go through what the Warmbier family has gone through. They have been incredibly strong, by the way, through this whole ordeal. I watched them channel their grief into something constructive, exposing some of the human rights abuses in North Korea, as an example.

Throughout this ordeal, I have stood with Fred and Cindy and their entire family. I will continue to, but I also want to say today, as we discuss these broader issues with North Korea, let's keep Otto Warmbier at the front of our minds. Let's be sure he is high on our agenda and in our consciousness as we deal with North Korea and, again, understanding, because of our experience with Otto, the brutal nature of this regime.

CHINA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, I will now talk about the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations' hearing we had today.

I am here to talk about China and the impact it is having on the U.S. education system. I chair the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which is a subcommittee of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee. My colleague TOM CARPER, on the other side of the aisle, is the ranking member. We worked together on bipartisan—I believe you would say nonpartisan investigations.

We had success working on the opioid crisis in coming up with legislation to stop fentanyl from coming through the mail, the deadliest of all the drugs. We also had success in pushing back against human trafficking, leading to actually shutting down the website that trafficked more women and children than any other one, backpage.com.

Today we looked at something that is also very important for our country; that is, understanding better how these Confucius Institutes work. We issued a bipartisan report today talking about how there is a lack of transparency in how American colleges and universities manage their Confucius Institutes. These are located at more than 100 colleges and universities around the country. These institutions in America have received more than \$150 million in support from the Government of China for these Confucius Institutes since 2006.

Confucius Institutes are enterprises that engage in the teaching of Chinese culture and language, and they are at universities and colleges around the world. These Confucius Institutes are designed, funded, and primarily staffed by the Chinese Government. The Chinese Government bills them as an opportunity for cultural exchange, and the funding comes from them. It is an appealing prospect for many U.S. schools trying to meet their demand for language instruction, but we need to be careful.

There needs to be more transparency in how these institutes operate in the United States, and there needs to be more reciprocity so the United States can also provide its cultural institutions in China. That is not happening now because China has systematically shut down comparable U.S. State Department public diplomacy efforts on college campuses in China.

Let me be clear. I do support cultural exchange—we all should; it is a good

thing—with China and with the international community more broadly, but there needs to be reciprocity, and there needs to be appropriate engagement without, in this case, the Chinese Government determining what is said and what is done on U.S. campuses.

The law must be followed. That is why transparency is so important.

This morning we held a hearing following an 8-month investigation into this issue. Based on our findings, let me focus on these two issues of transparency and reciprocity—transparency in how colleges and universities manage the institutes which are controlled, funded, and mostly staffed by the Chinese Government and the lack of reciprocity in how China does not permit U.S. State Department programming in China.

Our report details how China, known for its one-sided dealings in trade—not having a level playing field in trade—also does not have a level playing field with regard to these cultural changes.

Our report documents how U.S. officials had expressed concerns about China's influence through its Confucius Institutes. Recently, the FBI's Assistant Director for Counterintelligence testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that the Confucius Institutes are "not strictly a cultural institute" and that "they are ultimately beholden to the Chinese government." The State Department has labeled Confucius Institutes "China's most prominent soft power platform."

Higher education groups have also expressed concern. The American Council of Education, the National Association of Scholars, and the American Association of University Professors have all recommended that U.S. schools fundamentally change how they manage Confucius Institutes or consider shutting them down.

Other foreign governments have already acted. For example, the UK Conservative Party Commission on Human Rights called for the suspension of further agreements until it can complete a more comprehensive review of potential threats to academic freedom at the Confucius Institutes in the United Kingdom.

The Canadian Province of New Brunswick recently announced that it would cease its Confucius Institute operations, citing academic freedom concerns and that the program provides a "one-dimensional" view of China. Finally, an Australian State, New South Wales, is currently reviewing the Confucius Institute program, citing that it exposes children to propaganda.

These concerns are well-founded. Past statements by Chinese officials make clear the purpose of Confucius Institutes. For example, in 2011, a former member of the Chinese Government explained:

The Confucius Institute is an appealing brand for expanding our culture abroad. It has made an important contribution toward improving our soft power. The "Confucius" brand has a natural attractiveness. Using

the excuse of teaching Chinese language, everything looks reasonable and logical.

The Director General of Confucius Institute Headquarters has also commented on how the program controls messaging about controversial topics. She said in 2014:

Every mainland China teacher we send . . . will say Taiwan belongs to China. We should have one China. No hesitation.

So with regard to issues like Taiwan, Tibet, and Tiananmen Square, the Confucius Institutes stay away from those issues that are considered controversial.

We know that Confucius Institutes exist as one part of China's broader, long-term strategy, but China has invested heavily in them, giving about \$150 million to U.S. schools just in the last decade. China's other long-term initiatives include its Made in China 2025 plan, which is a push to lead the world in certain advanced technology manufacturing. The Thousand Talents Program is another state-run initiative designed to recruit Chinese researchers in the United States to return to China for significant financial gain, bringing with them the research knowledge gained at U.S. universities and companies. We plan on continuing to examine the U.S. Government's responses to these issues as well.

Confucius Institutes, by the way, do not stop at colleges and universities alone. China has also opened more than 500 Confucius Classrooms programs at U.S. K-12 schools. In fact, the Confucius Classroom program is a priority for the Chinese Government. A document obtained by the subcommittee during our investigation details a plan to expand Confucius Classrooms by seeking "top-down policy support from the state government, legislative and educational institutions, with particular emphasis on access to the support from school district superintendents and principals."

Over the last 8 months, we interviewed U.S. school officials, teachers, and Confucius Institute instructors. We also reviewed tens of thousands of pages of contracts, emails, financial records, and other internal documents obtained from more than 100 U.S. schools that were either active or recently closed Confucius Institutes.

Since our investigation started, more than 10 U.S. schools announced they would be closing their Confucius Institutes. We found that Chinese funding for Confucius Institutes comes with strings attached—strings that can compromise academic freedom. The Chinese Government vets and approves all Chinese directors and teachers, events, research proposals, and speakers at U.S. Confucius Institutes. Chinese teachers sign contracts pledging with the Chinese Government that they will follow Chinese law and "conscientiously safeguard China's national interests."

Some schools actually contractually agreed that both Chinese and U.S. law will apply at Confucius Institutes in

the United States on their school campuses. Think about that. American universities are agreeing to comply with Chinese law on their campuses. This application of Chinese law at these schools can result, of course, in exporting China's censorship of political debate and prevent discussion of politically sensitive topics.

As such, numerous U.S. school officials told the subcommittee that Confucius Institutes were not the place to discuss topics like the independence of Taiwan, Tibet, or the Tiananmen Square massacre. Put simply, as one U.S. school administrator told us: "You know what you're getting when something is funded by the Chinese government."

Investigators from the Government Accountability Office also spoke with U.S. officials, who acknowledge that hosting the Confucius Institute could limit events or activities critical of China, not just at the Confucius Institute but also elsewhere on campus.

In response to the growing popularity of Confucius Institutes, the United States initiated its own public diplomacy program in China through the State Department. The Chinese Government effectively shut it down. Since 2010, the State Department has provided \$5.1 million in grant funding for 29 American Cultural Centers in China. Through this program, a U.S. school would partner with a Chinese school to set up a cultural center, which would enable Chinese students to better understand our country, our culture.

The Chinese Government stifled the program from the start. Seven of the 29 American Cultural Centers never even opened. Of those that did open, they needed permission from the Chinese partner schools, sometimes including local Chinese Communist Party officials, just to hold events. Eventually, because of the obstacles, the State Department stopped funding the program altogether. There are four programs remaining. They are all going to be phased out entirely by this summer.

We heard some very interesting testimony today from the State Department—testimony that details the academic environment in China that has made it impossible for us to have the kind of freedom they enjoy over here. The State Department testimony aligns with the findings of our investigation.

For example, while the State Department conducts various public diplomacy programs in China, the Chinese Government has increasingly impeded access to some segments of Chinese society, including Chinese schools and universities. All Chinese institutions, including universities, have a foreign affairs officer or a "gatekeeper" that is an internal governmental office that manages contact between the non-Chinese entities and the institution. Any Chinese institutions that wish to interact with foreign government officials must obtain approval first from this gatekeeper.

The State Department even told us that the Fulbright Program, a prestigious and longstanding student exchange program, is impeded as Chinese authorities have prevented Chinese alumni of the Fulbright Program from forming a Fulbright Association, a standard practice in other countries. We even heard directly from an American educator who was detained by the Chinese police and questioned extensively about her involvement with a State Department grant. While the Department of State said they conveyed to the Chinese Government that it expects reciprocal access for U.S. diplomats in our programs, it is not happening. Obviously, more needs to be done.

While the State Department is mostly known for its overseas diplomatic efforts, it also has oversight responsibilities right here in the United States with regard to these Confucius Institutes. The State Department conducts field site reviews to ensure that foreign nationals who come to the United States on these Exchange Visitor Programs have visas that are appropriate and that they are here for the stated reason.

There are roughly 100 Confucius Institutes at colleges and universities in America, yet the State Department has conducted field visits only to two of them. At those two, they found serious problems. At the Confucius Institute, the State Department revoked more than 30 visas for Chinese visitors who were supposed to be working at the university that sponsored their visa but were actually teaching in the K-12 environment. They also discovered evidence of "fraudulent paperwork and coaching" that was a "deliberate attempt to deceive" investigators, according to the State Department.

The Chinese director coached the Chinese teachers to tell the State Department they were working on research programs that they really weren't working on at the university's campus.

State also told us it does not collect the visa information specifically related to the Confucius Institute, so we don't know how many Confucius Institute teachers there are or where they are. Again, they visited only 2 schools out of 100, and in those they found serious problems with regard to the State Department's responsibilities on visas.

Our investigation also identified failures at the Department of Education that have contributed to a lack of transparency and oversight at schools that take money from foreign governments. If a U.S. school receives more than \$250,000 from a single foreign source in 1 year, it is required by law to report that data to the Department of Education, which, in turn, publishes it on its website. The Department of Education, however, has not issued any guidance on foreign gift reporting for 14 years, the same year that China opened its first Confucius Institute, and our investigation was able to find

that 70 percent of the colleges and universities that should have reported receiving funds for Confucius Institutes from China did not; 70 percent are out of compliance. When a school fails to report a foreign gift, the Department of Justice can force the school to comply, but only at the request of the Secretary of Education. The Department of Education has never referred this type of case to them—never.

We received two important commitments at the hearing this morning. One is the Department of Education has committed to issuing new guidance to the more than 3,000 schools it oversees. This guidance is important to ensure that schools know that they are obligated to report receiving these foreign government funding sources. They also agreed to step up their enforcement on the law on reporting foreign government funds from Confucius Institutes.

The State Department committed this morning to do more to ensure visas are being properly used at Confucius Institutes around the country. Again, they conducted only two site reviews. They have to do more, and they said they will. We are going to follow up on that.

As with all of our investigations, we are developing legislation aimed at addressing the problems identified here today. I want to call attention, as I conclude, to a news report that came out just a couple of days ago. The Chinese Communist Party's central committee and the Cabinet published a document stating that the Confucius Institutes will remain "a key government policy." Specifically, the news report plans to "optimize" the spread of Confucius Institutes. While it is unclear what "optimize" means at this point, any legislation must try to anticipate the potential rebranding of Confucius Institutes or other efforts that may seek to avoid the transparency, disclosure, and reciprocity that is needed if these programs are to continue on our campuses.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

TRIBUTE TO BRUCE KING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I know my good friend from Georgia has to get somewhere, and I have to get somewhere. I will be very brief.

I want to take a moment to pay tribute. We have staffers here who are just unsung heroes. They work day in and day out. Because of their diligent work, the world and the country is a better place.

One of these people who works in quiet dignity and gets so much done and is so well respected is Bruce King. He has been indispensable at my office, and today, this afternoon, it is my unfortunate duty to say farewell to Bruce.

He has worked in the Senate in some capacity since 1984. He has worked for Judiciary, Senator Lautenberg, the Budget Committee, and as the senior

counsel for multiple Democratic leaders on the Federal budget, stretching from Leader Daschle to Leader Reid to me. In that short time, Bruce wasn't short of legislative achievement, from negotiating the balanced budget agreement of 1997 to blocking the privatization of Social Security in 2006, from shepherding health reform through the Senate to passing the financial rescue bill after the crisis in 2008.

One of our most distinguished Senators would be proud of that record. Their name would be in lights. Bruce did all of that and much more in his, as I said, quiet, steadfast, brilliant dignity.

I have never sat on the Budget or Appropriations Committees, so when I became leader, having his experience and wisdom was incredible. I have met no one who could take these complex issues and put them in terms that even someone like myself could understand, not being an expert on those things. He was able to understand the big picture and never get caught in the minutia, although he knew the minutia extremely well.

When you ask Bruce's opinion on a matter, he presents it so succinctly and persuasively that you know it is the right answer in a matter of minutes, until he decides to play devil's advocate against his first opinion and convinces you of the opposite because he is one of those staffers who has never had an ax to grind. He said: Let my Senators know both sides, and let them decide.

But we knew both sides so well and so lucidly because of Bruce's ability to take these issues and help us understand them.

He can juggle so many variables in his head at once. He can weigh the pros and cons. He has an instinctive knowledge of how to deal with the tradeoffs, and he can keep it all in a simple way.

He is a modest man. He has sat at the same desk in the Capitol for 14 years. Every day, he brings his lunch—peanut butter and jelly sandwiches—and he leaves the office at almost the same time every night to have dinner at home with Janis, his beloved wife.

Senators get the spotlight and the credit when our initiatives succeed, but so many initiatives would never have succeeded without Bruce King. Bruce, through the years, deserves an ocean of credit for his work. He would never claim a drop of it because he is a humble man.

For all his expertise, he is humble, kindhearted, and thoughtful. Everyone likes him. In all the years he has worked here, I never heard a single person say a single bad thing about him. That is a pretty good tribute in a place like the Senate.

Bruce's departure will be a loss to his friends and colleagues and to the Senate as a whole and, of course, to my office.

There is only one bad thing I can say about him. He switched his allegiance from the New York Mets to the Nation-

als. The good news is that he will be able to catch some more games with Janis, his son Aaron, and his daughter Liana.

Bruce, you are a blessing to our office, to the Senate, and to the country. We wish you the best.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, to the Democratic leader and Bruce, who is on the floor, congratulations on behalf of all the Republicans in the room.

Come down to Atlanta and watch the Braves play the Mets. We would be happy to have you anytime. Thank you for your time here.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. President, I will be very brief. Two things happen at this time of day every day in the Senate and only two. The first is that the last person having their say finally gets up and says it, which means that you all have to listen to me for a minute. When the last person speaks, they don't tell you anything new. They tell you what everybody else said in a different way. You get to hear a small speech about that.

The other thing that happens is that SHELDON WHITEHOUSE comes to the floor and talks about global warming. That happens every day. SHELDON hasn't been down here. I don't know if he is sick. I don't know where he is. I am going to replace SHELDON for a minute.

Every day goes by, and we ought to talk about climate change and things like that. I am going to talk about disaster relief, which ties right into climate change. I am not a global warming guy, except to say I think it is going on. It has been going on since the planet was created. It will be going on long since we are gone. How tough it is depends on our dealing with it—how we sequester carbon, how we manage carbon, and how we have businesses and industries find new ways to fuel their industries and fuel their mechanisms, and things like that.

Tell SHELDON when you see him that I came down to talk about how we do need to address these things. It is all of our responsibility. We can address it in a positive way, just like we did in the Montreal Protocol, where 25 years ago we got rid of fluorocarbons that were drilling a hole in the atmosphere and causing us to have terrible cancer of the skin.

Tell SHELDON I have listened to him. I heard some of his great speeches. Mine is not nearly as close to how good his are. I wanted to make sure a day didn't go by without our saying what SHELDON says.

I want to talk about the disaster bill that Senator LEAHY, only a few minutes ago on the floor, talked about, and I want to talk about the urgent job we need to do in the Senate.

We had terrible disasters in the South and Southeast 3 years ago. We had hurricanes, floods, and tornadoes. Billions of dollars were lost in South

Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, and other locations. We failed to meet the disaster demands that we have to help those farmers and ag producers and business and industries to get back on their feet.

We now have a dire crisis. We have an emergency in the Southeast. It is time we got the disaster bill that we have been trying to pass for a year passed. We had it as a rider twice. We had it as a rider on the bill that was going to end the shutdown. At the last minute, it got negotiated out of the picture, not because it was a bad bill but because nobody would leave it in there and it did free up some money.

We have until March 15 to get it done. If we don't, there are going to be farmers in most of the Southeast who are going out of business. Industries that this Nation depends on will be terrible. You will pay way too much for your food. I don't know about you, but if you don't have nutrition to go with the energy you need, you don't have anything.

I am here to plead with every Democrat and every Republican that when we get the bill to the floor—and it will be some time before March 15—to support the disaster relief bill for the Southeastern United States and for Puerto Rico. The Democrats wanted so badly to add Puerto Rico to it, and the President signed off on that part. So we don't have a problem with the executive branch. I ask you to support all of the other provisions in it to see that those who were so badly damaged get their relief.

Let me tell you what that relief is. I am not talking about a handout. As an example, I am talking about the pecan industry that is housed in my State of Georgia. It is a tremendous industry in Asia. It is a tremendous export in the United States, with a tremendous balance of payments which contribute to our country. Well, 70 percent was wiped out. It takes 15 to 20 years to replace a pecan orchard. They have to start growth from a seedling to be a full, maturing tree to produce the crops to get to the marketplace.

Some of our crops are annual crops. A lot of them are long-term longevity crops. It is very important that we get them back on their feet. We will reclaim our place in the marketplace, but if we don't, somebody will take it away from us. Maybe it is Egypt, maybe it is India, or maybe it is somebody else.

I am down here to say that climate does change and we can do something about it by addressing carbon. And the economy changes. We can do something about it by helping industries.

When disasters come, if they are not responded to quickly and resolutely, they end up causing big losses to everybody in business, in productivity, and in our industries.

I want to ask everybody on the floor to please join me—hopefully, before the 15th or at least by the 14th of March—

to support the disaster bill that passed. Senator SHELBY, Senator LEAHY, myself, Senator PERDUE, and Senator RUBIO, and many others worked very hard on this to bring it together to get the pieces that were missing in place.

I want to thank, particularly, Senator SHELBY and Senator LEAHY for the time they and their staff have given us in the last couple of weeks to try to recover from the vote 2 weeks ago, when we lost what we thought was a solution to this problem.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time on the floor.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I want to recognize the wisdom and insight from my friend and colleague from the great State of Georgia. We have unmet disaster needs in this country. I look forward to working with him to achieve the relief of the disaster impacts on the Southeastern United States and other States.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about climate change—to talk about something that is a pressing and real problem that affects everyone in this country, and, in fact, in our world. It is a challenge that we can't afford to ignore any longer because the health of our families, our economy, our environment, and even our national security, quite literally, depend on our ability to address it and address it promptly.

After a year of recordbreaking extreme weather in 2018—when we saw rising average temperatures fuel California's deadliest wildfire season on record, when Florida was faced with the strongest hurricane ever to reach that State's panhandle, and when farmers in Delaware and across the country faced challenges due to severe flooding and drought—it is clear that we can't afford to sit back and do nothing about climate change while the American people pay the price.

The costs of our inaction are real—real in human suffering, real in disaster recovery spending, real in lost economic opportunity, and real in the burden borne by our Armed Forces around the world.

Yes, there is a clear link between climate change and national security. The Pentagon has consistently pointed to climate change as a real national security threat that will make the military's job around the world harder. National security leaders from across administrations, both Republican and Democratic, have warned that climate change acts as a "threat multiplier," increasing global instability and weakening fragile States as climate change leads to more extreme weather events and scarcer food and water resources.

In many ways, these findings echo themes about climate change that we already know—that it is already happening, that it continues to get worse,

that it is going to cost us dearly, and that we can do something about it. It is that last point that I want to focus on. We can do something to stop the disastrous impacts of climate change, so long as we recognize it and work together in a bipartisan way to develop, take up, debate, and pass meaningful legislation that can make a difference.

Democrats have a broad range of bold and new policy proposals and of tested and fully developed policy proposals to address climate change. Many of them are bipartisan.

I wanted to come to the floor today to talk through 4 different bills that I have cosponsored—some that are relatively new and some considered across several Congresses—that are positive, constructive steps forward we can take to address climate change.

The first, and probably my oldest bill in this field, is called the MLP Parity Act—a catchy name, I know. It has five Republican colleagues who have cosponsored it now over three Congresses. This bill expands to renewable forms of energy, to carbon capture and sequestration, and to renewable and so-called clean energy a popular and long-established tax tool for financing energy projects that the oil and gas and pipeline sectors have enjoyed for decades. It would level the playing field. It would stop picking winners and losers in terms of energy tax policy. It would be, literally, an "all of the above" energy financing strategy. If enacted, it would be the first permanent change for the financing of clean energy projects in the U.S. Tax Code—potentially, worth billions of new private investment in renewable forms of energy.

It is also cosponsored by the Republican chair of the Energy Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, the Republican chair of the Banking Committee, Senator CRAPO, and three other colleagues from across the country. We have five Democrats and five Republicans. It has had a hearing in front of the Energy Committee and a hearing in front of the Finance Committee in previous Congresses. This is the sort of solid, scored bipartisan bill that would be a meaningful step forward in addressing climate change.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I have introduced the IMPACT for Energy Act to create a private foundation to support cutting-edge energy research and technology commercialization. Why would we do this? What am I talking about?

Well, a guy named Bill Gates, one of the greatest inventors and innovators in American history, wants to deploy private investments and foundation investments alongside the Department of Energy, in partnership with a lot of other individuals, to significantly accelerate the cutting-edge research being done at our National Laboratories through the Department of Energy.

This is a tool that several other Federal Agencies already have. It is a so-called private foundation that allows

them to marry up private sector dollars—foundation dollars—with Federal dollars to leverage greater impact. This private foundation can go out and raise that additional money and add it to the energy R&D already being funded by the Federal Government.

I also want to applaud the hard and bipartisan work of my colleagues, led by Senators MURKOWSKI and CANTWELL on the Energy Committee, on a comprehensive energy bill with a wide range of policy ideas that can move us forward. It has several components that I contributed and that would help to address climate change. I very much hope that in this Congress we can finally take up this bipartisan bill and see it signed into law.

Last, but in some ways most importantly, I want to mention a bill I offered at the end of the last Congress with my friend and former colleague, the Senator from Arizona, Jeff Flake. Despite our very different ideological, cultural and contextual backgrounds—we are from different States, from different faiths, and from different perspectives on the role of government and society; he is a real conservative, and I am a progressive Democratic—we still managed to come together and introduce a bill that addresses the cost of ignoring climate change and the impact it will have on the people in our home States.

We offered the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act. It is a commonsense bill to achieve significant and sustained emissions reductions and to help to mitigate the worse impacts of climate change. Our bill would accomplish this by using a free-market approach to pricing carbon pollution that would spur economic growth and put money back in the pockets of American taxpayers. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by a bipartisan coalition. I look forward to reintroducing this bill in this Congress.

The Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act should be the centerpiece of a robust, bipartisan climate agenda because it aggressively tackles emissions while optimizing economic growth and income for working families. We estimate that our bill would reduce emissions by 90 percent by 2050, while creating as many as 2 million net new jobs in the next decade.

I believe this is an efficient way to use market forces to address the very real problem of climate change while creating jobs and opportunities for American workers. Frankly, an outright ban on nonrenewable sources would be inefficient and disruptive to workers from all sectors, but, in particular, across the building trades and other vital sectors of employment. In contrast, sending a strong market signal in favor of lower carbon or carbon-neutral energy would spur investment and growth in these technologies by the private sector and lead us toward a lower carbon future through competition.

We don't need to choose between clean energy and economic growth or between combating climate change and creating jobs. These two goals are not permanently and mutually exclusive. They can go hand in hand if we craft the right policies. Still, we cannot move abruptly away from an economy that relies heavily on fossil fuels without having a real and coordinated plan for the very people—the millions of Americans—whose jobs will ultimately be impacted by that transition.

Fortunately, a gradual transition to a clean energy future can also be an effective job creator. In 2017, the renewable energy and energy efficiency sectors alone employed 2.8 million Americans. If we place a price on carbon and then let the market work, we will create jobs across a wide range of industries, occupations, and geographies.

As we work to deal with the effects of climate change by moving to a cleaner energy and infrastructure economy—an economy that is more resilient—we will need to rely on workers who are already in place in many of these industries. We will need building trades professionals to construct and maintain our new resilient and clean energy infrastructure. We will need manufacturing workers to build these more energy-efficient products. We will also need scientists and engineers to help research, develop, design, and deploy these new technologies. These workers bring real experience and skills to the table, and we must ensure that these skills translate into new, good jobs and that the workers in these new jobs are able to organize for fair competition, for fair compensation, and for fair work conditions.

We can't tackle climate change alone. The United States is the largest historic emitter of carbon dioxide, but our emissions have been declining in recent years. Meanwhile, China has whirled past us, and China and India and other countries are rapidly catching up in their carbon emissions. We need an approach that incentivizes these countries to reduce their emissions as well. The United States is a world leader in science and technology and innovation. We need to develop and advance new technologies—carbon-neutral technologies like small, modular nuclear reactors and carbon capture and sequestration—that we can export. Then we need to find ways to encourage countries like China and India to modernize and industrialize while also reducing their emissions.

There is good work taking place in this area, and there are good solutions we can act on together. We need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in a serious, thorough, deliberate, and thoughtful way. We need to be prepared to adapt to the ongoing impacts of climate change. We need to make sure American workers and families aren't left behind or are burdened by Federal climate policy.

This administration, unfortunately, strikes me as taking us backward. We

are voting on an EPA Administrator in this Chamber who is failing to take action on climate, even on action that is widely supported by industry. Our President just proposed a National Security Council initiative to counter the consensus around climate change and refute the idea that greenhouse gases are harmful to the environment. I shouldn't even need to say this, but that just isn't how science works.

That is why, here in the Senate, we need to take the opportunity to lead and to have voices from both parties in Congress and in this country who want to take bold steps to address the climate. The hard part is going to be squaring these big, bold ideas with political reality. That is hard, but there are ways we can do it. Instead of being silent, we should bring this conversation to the forefront. Instead of debating whether climate change is real, we should be passing bipartisan bills, like the ones I have mentioned today, that can meaningfully address climate change and improve our economy.

Climate change is a serious threat to our economy, to our security, and to our way of life. We need leadership from all parts of our society and government to tackle it, and we must do our part in the Senate. I look forward to having conversations across the aisle, to working together, to identifying real solutions to the challenges before us, and to creating new opportunities for America's workers.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

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.

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

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

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

MS. STABENOW. Mr. President, I have often said healthcare is not political. It is personal, and there is no part of healthcare that is more personal than the decision if, when, and under what circumstances to have a child and who decides the medical course of action in a serious medical crisis.

These decisions need to be made by women, their families, and their doctors. They should not be made by politicians who are more focused on their own political advantage rather than medical tragedies facing pregnant women at the end of pregnancy who want desperately to have a child.

Our Republican friends know very well that nobody—and I mean nobody—in this Chamber supports infanticide. No one. In fact, in 2002, Congress voted unanimously—100 Members, including myself—to reaffirm that it is illegal, period. Suggesting otherwise is insulting and, frankly, disgusting, and it is beneath the dignity of the U.S. Senate.

How dare the majority pretend to care about the health of women and

children. If the Republican majority cares about the health of moms and their babies, why are you continuing to try to take their healthcare away? The President and the Republican majority have tried again and again and again to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Let me remind you that before the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies could, and most of the time did, refuse to cover maternity care as basic healthcare for women, leaving parents with bills of tens of thousands of dollars for an uncomplicated birth.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I was proud to author the provision requiring maternity care in the Affordable Care Act. I remember the debate. I remember a very specific debate with a former colleague from Arizona, and I remember Republican efforts to strip that provision to cover maternity care from the Affordable Care Act. Fortunately, they were not successful. Now the administration is legalizing and offering junk insurance plans that treat being a woman as a preexisting condition again.

One study found that none—none—of the newly approved plans cover maternity care. Maternity care is not a frill. It is basic healthcare for women, and if we are seeing more and more of these healthcare plans being put on the market, where women assume they are going to be covered and once again will not be, that is outrageous.

Why aren't we passing a bill to guarantee that prenatal care and maternity care are covered for moms and babies as essential healthcare in every insurance plan? I assure you, this medical care is essential, and until parts of the Affordable Care Act began to be unwound by the administration, it was viewed as essential care for every woman.

How dare you pretend to care about the health of women and children while voting to dramatically slash Medicaid and healthcare for low-income working families. When you gut Medicaid, you are keeping moms and babies from getting the healthcare they need. In fact, Medicaid provided prenatal care and maternity care for 43 percent of American moms and babies born in 2016—43 percent. Why aren't we voting to strengthen Medicaid? Why aren't we voting to strengthen Medicaid healthcare for moms and babies? Why isn't that being brought to the floor?

A few years ago, the Senate Finance Committee reported out a bill that I led with Senator GRASSLEY called the Quality Care for Moms and Babies Act. This bill would create a set of maternal and infant quality care standards in the Children's Health Insurance Program and Medicaid. The goal is simple: improving maternal and infant health outcomes. Shouldn't we all want to do that?

Let me be clear. We have no uniform quality standards right now across the country for almost half of the births that occur every year. The Quality Care for Moms and Babies Act will help

make sure every mom—every mom—gets the best pregnancy care possible and every baby gets a healthy start. Why isn't that a top priority for action in the U.S. Senate, to protect the health of moms and babies?

Let's also be clear. We have a real healthcare crisis that we need to address in this country. In most of the world, fewer and fewer women are dying from child birth but not in the United States. In fact, our maternal mortality rate is climbing. More women are dying, and our infant mortality rate ranks a shameful 32 out of 35 of the world's wealthiest nations. The United States of America is 32 out of 35 countries—wealthiest countries in the world—in the number of infants that are dying in birth. That is something we need to have a sense of urgency to act on.

There are a lot of things on healthcare. There are a lot of things to improve outcomes for children and moms and give them a healthy start and a healthy life that we should be doing right now, as well as stopping the administration from undermining basic healthcare for women and children. It is time to stop the cynical political stunts and start protecting—really protecting—the health of moms and babies.

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. 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, I am glad to join Senator STABENOW, who was on the floor just now, to respond to the shameful lies and gross exaggerations that have been claimed by some on the other side of the aisle.

Earlier this week, we voted on legislation that some of my colleagues claimed was needed to outlaw infanticide—the killing of babies. How absurd. It is, and has always been, illegal to kill any human, including infants.

So what was in that legislation we voted on earlier this week? To honestly discuss the bill, we need to have a factually and medically accurate conversation about abortion.

A healthy fetus becomes potentially able to live outside the womb at about 24 weeks of pregnancy. Very few abortions occur after that—less than 1 percent—and generally are performed either because the fetus has a fatal condition or the pregnant woman's life or health is at severe risk. These are heartbreaking situations involving very wanted pregnancies—hardly the time for the heavy hand of government to reach into our wombs.

Under this bill, doctors will be required to resuscitate infants born with fatal conditions, even if the parents did not want these measures that could

prolong their infant's suffering and instead wanted to spend the limited time they had with their baby comforting their child and holding them close.

How dare anyone pretend to know what care is best for these families instead of trusting them and their doctors to decide. How dare Congress interject itself into a decision we have no business deciding for others. Yet this is exactly what this bill would have done.

I encourage my colleagues to read stories from women who have been speaking up about their experiences with abortion later in pregnancy. These stories are usually found on the internet as well as in the national press, as more women feel under attack and are coming forward to tell their stories. Perhaps, in hearing from these women, my colleagues will realize what these women need is compassion, not condemnation.

Stories like that of Dana Weinstein, who bravely told her story to CNN. Years ago, Dana and her husband learned at 31 weeks that their daughter's brain had a severe defect. Doctors told the couple their daughter would not be able to suck or swallow and would most likely suffer from uncontrollable seizures upon birth. They heard what a resuscitation order would entail. They listened to what an existence, short-lived or otherwise, would look like. They were briefed on hospice care.

After the diagnosis, the kicks in Dana's belly, which had given her so much joy, became unbearable. She feared her daughter was seizing and may be suffering. Ultimately, Dana and her husband decided to get an abortion. For this baby they loved, it felt like—in their words—"a more peaceful path for her passing."

These are the stories. Compassion and understanding are what is needed in these instances, but instead of compassion, what my colleagues have offered this week is inflammatory political rhetoric and shaming and intimidating women and their providers who care for them in an attempt to score partisan points.

President Trump—never missing an opportunity to score partisan points—weighed in on Twitter claiming that Senate Democrats "don't mind executing babies after birth."

Today former Governor Scott Walker said to a crowd at the Conservative Political Action Conference that "people are taking already-born babies from the hospital and aborting them there"—a comment that doesn't even make sense.

Republican National Committee chair, Ronna McDaniel, chimed in at the same conference, calling the choice that women like Dana make murder. These charges are false, incendiary, and this sort of language is intended to incite the Republican Party's base. It emboldens violence against abortion providers—violence which nearly doubled from 33 reported death threats or

threats of harm in 2016 to 62 in 2017, according to the National Abortion Federation.

The hard truth is, the Republican Party hurts women. One of the ways they are doing this is by working as hard as they can to set up barriers or to eliminate entirely safe and legal abortions wherever they can.

They demonize women who face the heartbreaking situation of needing an abortion later in pregnancy, oftentimes for medical reasons.

They want to cut off crucial healthcare dollars to providers who even discuss abortion with patients. This is a gag rule that this administration is seeking to impose.

They create loopholes to allow businesses to exclude coverage for contraception for workers, and to make sure that these and all of their other efforts stick, they pack the Federal courts with a line of aggressively anti-choice judges to uphold Federal Agency actions and State laws restricting abortion access.

Doing the bidding of these rightwing ideologue supporters like the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation, Donald Trump has sent us judicial nominee after nominee with records of attacking a woman's right to choose as laid out in the Supreme Court's opinion in *Roe v. Wade* and restated in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*.

These nominees come before the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, and parrot the line provided for them by the Trump administration. When asked if they will respect precedent and uphold *Roe v. Wade*, they say they will "follow the law." Then, when they get confirmed, they are in a position, with their lifetime appointments, to do exactly the opposite.

The prime and most dangerous example of this kind of bait and switch is Brett Kavanaugh—a notoriously rightwing political lawyer appointed by George W. Bush to the second highest court in the United States—the Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit.

Kavanaugh was not even on Donald Trump's original so-called short list of possible Supreme Court nominees—not the list released before the 2016 election and not the first list released thereafter. No, Kavanaugh only found a place on that list after he wrote a harsh dissent in a case involving a young refugee's right to an abortion.

A minor, then 17 years old, was being kept in the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services because she had entered the United States without documentation. Where she was held in Texas, in order to access abortion services, a minor must have parental consent or receive permission from the judge. This is called a judicial bypass—to proceed without that parental consent.

In this case, called *Garza v. Hargan*, the young woman did go through the process of going to court and receiving a judicial bypass. She had people willing and able to transport her and to

pay for the health services she needed, but the radical Trump appointee in charge, well known for his anti-abortion views, decided it would be in her best interest to find adult sponsors for her first, presumably to help her make a decision, but the Texas court had already decided she could make her own decision, and she did.

She challenged the Trump appointee and his Agency, and ultimately a majority of the DC Circuit agreed with her that she had the legal right to an abortion and the Federal Government could not delay any further.

Brett Kavanaugh, sitting on that circuit, disagreed and wrote a dissent, which must have captured the attention of those in charge of Donald Trump's Supreme Court short list because not long after his name appeared on that list.

What did he write to earn his place on the list and eventually a nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court? He wrote a dissenting opinion that falsely characterized the Garza case as one about parental consent, which we know was not so because a judicial bypass was already in place.

He wrote the dissent using the code words of the extreme anti-choice and anti-women wing of the Republican Party. He accused the majority on that court of creating "a new right for unlawful immigrant minors in U.S. government detention to obtain immediate abortion on demand." He was wrong. There was no new right being created.

He falsely claimed that by permitting the abortion "[t]he majority's decision represents a radical extension of the Supreme Court's abortion jurisprudence." He was wrong again. The majority decision was correct under *Roe v. Wade*.

He wrote it was not an undue burden for this young woman to be prevented from getting an abortion until a sponsor family could be found for her. This was not even a legal argument, but he based his dissent on it. That is the dissent that moved Brett Kavanaugh to the head of the line on the short list for a nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court, where he sits.

So when he came to the Judiciary Committee for a hearing, some Senators—myself included—were rightly skeptical that he would respect precedent if confirmed. At his hearing, Ranking Member DIANNE FEINSTEIN asked Judge Kavanaugh about *Roe v. Wade* and its status as settled precedent. He testified that *Roe* was "settled as a precedent of the Supreme Court, entitled to respect under principles of *stare decisis*."

He further went on: "Planned Parenthood v. Casey reaffirms *Roe* and did so by considering the *stare decisis* factors. So Casey now becomes a precedent on precedent."

It sure sounds like someone who will apply the precedents of *Roe* and *Casey* and others who rely on them, doesn't it? That is not so.

The very first opportunity he got, Brett Kavanaugh, as Supreme Court Justice, voted against following precedent. Not 4 months after his confirmation, Justice Kavanaugh voted in the minority in a Supreme Court case called *June Medical Services v. Gee* to allow a restrictive, anti-abortion law in Louisiana to take effect.

This law would have so restricted access to abortion that only one provider would have been left in the entire State of Louisiana of 4.7 million people. Even Chief Justice Roberts voted with the majority to block the law. That is because it was clear from recent precedent in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* that such restrictions don't meet constitutional standards.

Justice Kavanaugh's cavalier attitude to the burden that he would put on a woman's ability to exercise their constitutional right is no surprise. His callous disregard for the way unwanted pregnancies can change the lives of women and children is not unexpected, and his willingness to hew to the party line of his supporters and ignore the assurances he gave the Senate is simply par for the course with Trump judicial nominees. This is what they do. It is an abuse of power, and women across the country are paying for it.

Why do my colleagues across the aisle use this Chamber, time and again, to bring forward political shams that shame and retraumatize women who face profoundly heartbreaking situations? The will of over half of this country is 67 percent of Americans support *Roe v. Wade* and access to safe and legal abortion. Sixty-seven percent of Americans support a woman's right to choose.

How is it that Republicans continue to bring forward bill after bill and amendment after amendment that goes against a constitutionally protected right of women—of women? This is why I say Republicans hurt women.

I am proud of the vote I cast in opposition to the sham bill we voted on this week. My vote was rooted in fact and understanding about what an abortion in later pregnancy actually means. It was rooted in the understanding that when faced with these difficult situations, these decisions are best left to a woman and her doctor. These decisions should not rest with the U.S. Senate.

My vote was cast with a clear understanding that if unchecked or unchallenged, this administration and this Senate will continue to assault a woman's right to choose and chip away at it bit by bit, where it will end up being a nullity, and that is what they want.

I will continue to stand in opposition to attacks that seek to limit the personal freedom of women across the country and what would be more of a personal freedom for a woman than to exercise control over her own body?

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

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

CONFIRMATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss why I voted in opposition to the confirmation of Andrew Wheeler for the position of Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Clean air and clean water are not only vital to our public health; they are at the very heart of our economy. Nowhere is that more apparent than in my home State of Michigan, where we are blessed to be surrounded by the Great Lakes, a source of drinking water for more than 40 million people and the lifeblood of our State's multi-billion-dollar fishing, shipping, and tourism industries. That is why I spent my entire career in public service fighting to protect our environment.

In the Michigan State Senate, I worked to ban oil drilling under the Great Lakes to preserve our most precious source of drinking water. When I represented the city of Detroit in the House of Representatives, I fought to end harmful air pollution coming from piles of petcoke that left homes coated in dust while being breathed into the lungs of residents.

In my first term in Congress, I supported landmark climate change legislation that sought to drastically reduce deadly greenhouse gas emissions that are continuing to warm our planet at an unsustainable rate. In the U.S. Senate, I led the charge to protect the Great Lakes from pipeline spills and pressured industry to cut down their deadly sulfur-dioxide emissions that give Michigan communities some of the highest rates of asthma anywhere in the country.

I have championed these vital efforts because protecting our environment in Michigan is in the best interest of everyone, and I will never let up on that fight. There is so much more work to do and even more pressing challenges ahead of us. We cannot afford to turn back the clock on clean energy innovation or refuse to address climate change, and that is, unfortunately, what we can expect from the EPA now that Andrew Wheeler has been confirmed. His entire career has been devoted to undermining public health and environmental protections.

As Acting EPA Administrator, he is personally responsible for the most significant efforts to roll back our Nation's bedrock environmental laws in the Agency's history. He oversaw the proposed rollback of Clean Water Act protections that safeguard drinking water for tens of millions of people. He is leading efforts to weaken standards on the largest sources of greenhouse gases and to reduce protections against climate change. When he was a Senate staffer, he drafted the so-called "Clear

Skies Act," which was directly intended to undermine the Clean Air Act.

As a lobbyist for Murray Energy, Wheeler represented a company that didn't just knowingly violate environmental laws but consistently put its own employees' safety at risk by undermining basic protections for coal miners. He has even undermined the widely supported mercury and air toxics standards. These commonsense standards would have protected people, particularly children, from a well-known neurotoxin that impairs fetal brain development and reduces children's ability to learn.

Every single one of these actions has a direct bearing on human lives and has put people at risk. In Michigan we have witnessed firsthand the visceral and painful human costs when public leaders fail to keep our drinking water and our air quality safe. Just ask the people of Flint whom they would want to have in charge of protecting their drinking water. I can tell you it certainly is not Andrew Wheeler. The city, the State, and the EPA all contributed to the crisis that poisoned thousands of children through lead exposure, and now those children will suffer lasting consequences for the rest of their lives.

While I am proud that the Senate was able to come together to provide initial Federal funding to help Flint replace its lead pipes, the community needs continued support going forward. I am committed to doing everything in my power to ensure that the people of Flint are made whole, and that included my opposing this nomination. We cannot allow the failures of leadership that led to Flint's devastating crisis ever be repeated again.

The people of Michigan and of every State deserve to know that their air is safe to breathe and their water is safe to drink. Yet communities across my State and around the country are facing another emerging drinking water crisis. This time it is from toxic fluorinated chemicals, known as PFAS, that are currently unregulated by the EPA. Rigorous testing has found that 1 out of every 10 water systems in my State has unacceptable high rates of PFAS chemicals. Families across the State have been exposed to these dangerous chemicals that have been linked to cancer, thyroid and heart problems, and even autoimmune issues. But under Wheeler's leadership, the EPA has failed to take aggressive action to list PFAS chemicals as hazardous waste and to establish strong and enforceable limits to protect drinking water and to limit exposure to these toxic substances.

While I work to bring Senate action to this issue through legislation and hearings, the Wheeler-led EPA thinks action can wait. Michigan families certainly deserve better. My constituents are understandably concerned about their drinking water, and they are rightfully skeptical about who will be at the helm of the Agency charged with keeping water safe.

Since Wheeler has failed to exercise the leadership needed to address the environmental concerns we face on a national level, it is clear that he is completely unprepared to lead the Agency charged with tackling the global crisis of climate change. We must confront climate change. I have been advocating for action since before I ran for Congress. It is an issue impacting our economy, our health, our safety, and our national security. I am committed to continuing to work with my colleagues to find innovative and achievable solutions to address climate change, but we also need a leader at the EPA who can find commonsense ways to address this very serious threat, to protect our environment, and to ensure that our country can remain economically competitive. We need a leader who will fight to protect the people and the interests of my State. Given his abysmal record, it is clear that Andrew Wheeler isn't the right person for the job, and that is why I voted against his confirmation.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JEAN POLLARD

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as you know, I try to come down to the floor every week to talk about someone in my State who is making a big difference in Alaska, a big difference in their country, and a big difference in what I believe is the best State in this country. That is just my opinion. I am sure the Presiding Officer thinks his State is the best in the country, but that is why we are all here in the Senate.

Of course, Alaska is beautiful, particularly now as the snow is on the ground and the Sun is out. It is back out and high in the sky. It is also nearly time for the Iditarod—the last great race—something, I am sure, Senator MURKOWSKI and I will be talking about on the floor in the coming weeks. It kicks off this weekend.

We know it is a beautiful and amazing State, but what really makes Alaska such a great place are the people—the people who work tirelessly for causes they believe in.

Many people don't know this, but Alaska is also incredibly diverse. In fact, Anchorage—my hometown and the State's largest city—is home to the country's three most diverse census tracts, racially and in terms of nationalities. By the way, the fourth is Queens, NY.

I will just give you an example. Last week, we had this great event called Bridge Builders. It was in Anchorage. There were all of these different ethnic communities in Anchorage coming together. I spent a lot of time there on Saturday.

We are very proud of our diversity. We are proud that more than 100 languages are spoken in our schools. Think about that if you want to talk about diversity. We are proud of the foods and the cultural events. We are proud of the unique tapestry that makes up Alaska.

We are very proud of our history, and we are also blessed to have people who work diligently for all of us to keep history alive. I can think of no better way to cap off Black History Month than to recognize someone who, for years, has been fiercely determined to unearth a very important part of Alaska's history—actually, a very important part of America's history—one that transpired in my State but that greatly influenced our Nation during a very critical time.

I want to introduce you to Ms. Jean Pollard. She is our Alaskan of the Week. Jean has brought back the story of the African-American Army Engineers of the 93rd, 95th, and 97th regiments who were in the U.S. Army during World War II and stationed in Alaska during World War II.

More than 3,000 of these brave soldiers were integral in Alaska in building what we call the Alcan Highway—the Alaska-Canada Highway—one of the 20th century's greatest engineering feats.

Let me tell you about Ms. Pollard. Now a retired schoolteacher, she grew up in Georgia. When she was a teenager, her father, who was in the Army, got transferred to Alaska. Like all Alaskan students—like our good students, our pages in the Senate—she took a class on her State's history—Alaska history—in high school.

During the class, she learned about how the Army built the Alcan Highway in 1942 to help defend Alaska and America from invasion by Japan. A lot of people don't know this. Yes, Alaska was invaded and occupied by the Japanese military during World War II in the Aleutian Islands. I am going to talk about that a little bit more.

She learned about this in high school. It was a good story, but the most important element she was taught in high school was actually left out. The highway was only able to be finished because of the more than 3,000 African-American soldiers who built it.

So after getting a master's degree in education and a minor in history and after being a teacher for decades, Ms. Pollard only learned the entire story herself when she was sitting home one Friday night watching a PBS documentary about the building of this incredible highway.

What did she learn? Again, let's go back in time. It is March 1942, 3 months after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. As the war effort was heating up, construction began on a 1,700-mile-long vital link connecting the great State of Alaska—it wasn't a State then; it was a territory—to the lower 48 for the war effort.

Soon a massive mobilization followed—about 10,000 Army troops. Huge

trucks, civil engineers, food, tents, you name it, were deployed to start building this road.

Then, in June 1942, the Japanese invaded Attu and Kiska Islands in the Aleutian Islands chain of Alaska, adding a new sense of urgency to the completion of the road.

These soldiers worked day and night—200 bridges, 800 culverts, through some of the most rugged terrain on planet Earth, mountains, rivers, no rest, hard, backbreaking work—and they were able to complete this 1,700-mile road that still exists today—some of you may have driven it—in less than a year.

When the road was being built, the military was still segregated, and African Americans in the Army—much like in the rest of the country—were treated as second-class citizens. They were assigned to the toughest jobs on this project, using the worst equipment. In the summer, it was full of mosquitoes, black flies, mud, and swamps.

Winter comes early in Alaska. According to the historian, Lael Morgan, the winter of 1942 was considered one of the worst winters on record since 1906 in terms of how cold it was—and, trust me, it gets cold in Alaska—and how much snow there was.

The Black troops were required to build winter barracks for the White soldiers, while the African-American troops lived in tents. When the snow fell, they couldn't get supplies, and some nearly starved to death, Lael wrote. It is reported that some even succumbed to injuries due to the cold—fatalities due to the cold.

They did so much of the hard work. However, the contribution of these great African-American soldiers and heroes were completely almost scrubbed from all of the history books. Nobody that Ms. Pollard spoke to—social studies teachers or history professors—knew anything about this history.

In Ms. Pollard's words: "They stole that history." The history books wouldn't write it. It was wrong, and she knew she had to make it right so she went to work.

As a teacher herself and a lifelong learner, she knew that bringing the story to the school system was key to keeping our history alive—accurate history. Eventually, she called the historian I spoke about, Lael Morgan—a former Alaskan who was then living in Maine and happened to be featured in that documentary that Ms. Pollard watched on that Friday evening.

Lael decided to help in a big way. Incredibly, a year later, she sold her house in Maine and headed up the Alcan Highway to Alaska. Together, and with the help of a team of others Ms. Pollard recruited, they amassed enough material to give to the school system to set the history right.

Now schools across Alaska are putting this story—this real story—into their curriculum, and now she is trying to get it required as part of a course

that the university students in Alaska who are studying education have to take.

She and her team put calls out across the internet for anyone who was involved in or had a relative involved in building the highway. She was able to track down three members of the African-American Army Engineers who were still alive. She flew to interview one of the soldiers who was 100 years old. Another one, who lives in Louisiana, traveled to Alaska in 2017 for the 75th anniversary of the highway's completion.

Recently, Ms. Pollard mentioned the names of the soldiers she spoke to back then. There was a soldier from Virginia, SGT Reginald Beverly, who, unfortunately, has now passed away. The soldier in Louisiana who came to Alaska in 2017 is Private Leonard Larkins. He has 10 children. The Alaska Highway Project will be bringing him and his three sons back to Alaska on August 3 to help him celebrate his 99th birthday.

I am in the process of drafting a Senate resolution to recognize all of the members of the African-American Army Engineers who helped build the Alcan Highway, which was so critical to protecting our Nation and Alaska.

Ms. Pollard describes herself as feisty. Others might describe her as fiercely determined. When the Alaska State Legislature, at her urging, passed a resolution commemorating these African-American soldiers who built one of the greatest engineering highways in the world, she was sitting behind some of the State legislators.

She heard one whisper to another: Have you met this Jean Pollard?

The other said: Yes, she calls me several times a day about this bill.

Julie and I were just with Ms. Pollard this past weekend, as I mentioned, at the Bridge Builder event in Anchorage—my wife Julie and I. She is very passionate, very persuasive, and we are very proud of her.

Ms. Pollard and the team that created the Alaska Highway Memorial Project are on another mission to erect a memorial in a park in Anchorage. They have the design, and they certainly have the will with her driving it, and I have no doubt they will get it done to memorialize this great engineering feat by American heroes who were not treated well by their country.

Like the story of how Ms. Pollard brought important history back to our State, the story of building the Alcan and of the civil rights in the military also has an uplifting message.

On October 25, 1942, less than 8 months after they started, two soldiers, one African American and one White, shook hands after completing this highway. Six years later, President Harry S. Truman ordered the Army desegregated, 16 years before the passage of the Civil Rights Act. Many historians now cite the work and the experience on this Alcan Highway project, and the African-American sol-

diers and White soldiers working together on a really difficult challenge, as also helping make that possible—civil rights, 16 years later.

The Federal Highway Administration calls the Alcan Highway the road to civil rights. Isn't that a great depiction?

So, Ms. Pollard, thank you and your team for bringing that history back to us. I am proud to have talked a little bit about that important history for Alaska and America on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Congratulations for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 81 through 86 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Michael X. Garrett

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Timothy J. Donnellan

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Stephen J. Mallette

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Scott M. Brown
Capt. Casey J. Moton
Capt. Stephen R. Tedford
Capt. Eric H. Verhage

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Jeffrey T. Anderson
Capt. Stephen D. Barnett

Capt. Michael W. Baze
 Capt. Richard T. Brophy, Jr.
 Capt. Anthony C. Carullo
 Capt. Robert B. Chadwick, II
 Capt. Jeffrey J. Czerewko
 Capt. Michael P. Donnelly
 Capt. Christopher M. Engdahl
 Capt. Robert M. Gaucher
 Capt. Daniel P. Martin
 Capt. John V. Menoni
 Capt. Curt A. Renshaw
 Capt. Scott F. Robertson
 Capt. Milton J. Sands, III
 Capt. Paul C. Spedero, Jr.
 Capt. Christopher J. Sweeney
 Capt. Jeromy B. Williams

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. VeraLinn Jamieson

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN268 AIR FORCE nomination of Jason D. Hoskins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN269 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning NANCY E. COSTA, and ending ALEXANDER O. KIRKPATRICK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN270 AIR FORCE nomination of Saiprasad M. Zemse, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN271 AIR FORCE nominations (125) beginning JEFFREY WAYNE AKIN, and ending STEVEN S. ZASUETA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN272 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning DAVID C. SALISBURY, and ending ROBERT L. WILKIE, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN273 AIR FORCE nominations (8) beginning CRAIG K. ABEE, and ending CAROL A. YEAGER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN274 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning MICHAEL J. CHUNG, and ending BRADLEY J. PIERSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN275 AIR FORCE nomination of Robert T. Hines, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN276 AIR FORCE nominations (12) beginning MARC A. BANJAK, and ending JENNIFER C. WHITKO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN277 AIR FORCE nominations (12) beginning DENNIS M. BRITTEN, and ending KRISTEN MARIE WYRICK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN278 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning JASON G. ARNOLD, and ending CARRIE A. SCHMID, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN279 AIR FORCE nominations (12) beginning DAVID P. BAILEY, and ending AMY S. SWETS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN280 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning KIMBERLY J. KLOEBER, and ending MARSHA L. SCHUMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN281 AIR FORCE nomination of Joyce C. Beaty, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN282 AIR FORCE nominations (5) beginning TIMOTHY S. MCCARTY, and ending TERESA M. STARKS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN283 AIR FORCE nominations (5) beginning JENNIFER J. ARCHER, and ending LAWRENCE D. PEAVLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN284 AIR FORCE nominations (61) beginning ANDREW T. ALLEN, and ending ASSY YACIOUB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN285 AIR FORCE nominations (15) beginning ELHAM BARANI, and ending BRANDON H. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN286 AIR FORCE nominations (121) beginning HOMAYOUN R. AHMADIAN, and ending JOE X. ZHANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN287 AIR FORCE nominations (25) beginning FRANCIS E. BECKER, and ending BRENT J. WINWARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN289 AIR FORCE nominations (45) beginning MARGARET E. ABBOTT, and ending JEFFREY C. YEE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN290 AIR FORCE nominations (252) beginning JOSEPH L. ABRAMS, and ending ALYSSA R. ZUEHL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN342 AIR FORCE nomination of Katherine R. Morganti, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN379 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning PATRICK N. WESTMORELAND, and ending AARON J. LIPPY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

PN394 AIR FORCE nomination of Tolulope O. A. Aduroja, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN395 AIR FORCE nomination of Erick L. Jackson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

IN THE ARMY

PN291 ARMY nomination of James B. Flowers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN292 ARMY nomination of Dylan T. Randazzo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN293 ARMY nomination of Jerry D. Hallman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN294 ARMY nomination of Christopher P. Moellering, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN295 ARMY nomination of Joubert N. Paulino, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN296 ARMY nomination of Saw K. San, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN297 ARMY nominations (2) beginning REBECCA J. QUACKENBUSH, and ending DAVID A. WATKINS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN298 ARMY nomination of Stacie L. Kervin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN299 ARMY nomination of Brian R. Kossler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN300 ARMY nomination of Katherine A. O'Brien, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN301 ARMY nomination of Jessica N. Peralesludemann, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN302 ARMY nomination of Julia C. Phillips, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN303 ARMY nomination of Alain M. Alexandre, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 24, 2019.

PN304 ARMY nomination of Taliat A. Animashaun, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN307 ARMY nomination of G010349, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN308 ARMY nomination of Jordanna M. Hostler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN309 ARMY nomination of Elizabeth N. Strickland, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN310 ARMY nomination of Shawn M. T. May, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN311 ARMY nomination of Kyle A. Zahn, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN396 ARMY nomination of Joseph J. Fantony, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN397 ARMY nomination of Chariti D. Paden, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN398 ARMY nomination of Donald W. Rakes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN399 ARMY nominations (7) beginning RONNIE S. BARNES, and ending FRANCIS R. MONTGOMERY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN401 ARMY nomination of Charles A. Riley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN402 ARMY nomination of Richard S. McNutt, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN403 ARMY nomination of Lloyd V. Lozada, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

PN404 ARMY nominations (18) beginning JULIO ACOSTA, and ending APRIL L.

SAPP, which nominations were received by, the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN317 MARINE CORPS nomination of Matthew T. Coughlin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN318 MARINE CORPS nomination of Bethanne Canero, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN320 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning KEVIN T. BROWNLEE, and ending DANIEL L. YOUMANS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN321 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning KEVIN F. CHAMPAIGNE, and ending JOHN C. JOHNSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN322 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning AARON J. GRIFFUS, and ending JEREMIAH J. ZEISZLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN325 MARINE CORPS nominations (4) beginning DANIEL H. CUSINATO, and ending EDUARDO QUIROZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN329 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning ARMANDO A. FREIRE, and ending ANDREW J. SHRIVER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN330 MARINE CORPS nomination of Stephen R. Byrnes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN331 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning HERMAN E. HOLLEY, and ending BRIAN E. KELLY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN332 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning DARREN M. GALLAGHER, and ending AUSTIN E. WREN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN333 MARINE CORPS nominations (799) beginning ALEXANDER N. ABATE, and ending JOSEPH A. ZUKOWSKI, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN334 MARINE CORPS nominations (14) beginning GERMAN ALICEALAPUERTA, and ending LYDIA A. SIMONS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN335 MARINE CORPS nominations (106) beginning ERIC J. ADAMS, and ending WAYNE R. ZUBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN336 MARINE CORPS nomination of Joseph W. Crandall, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN338 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning AARON S. ELLIS, and ending CURTIS B. MILLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN339 MARINE CORPS nomination of Justin D. Mosley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN341 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning ANDRES J. AGRAMONTE, and ending ROSS A. HRYNEWYCH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN386 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning BETHANY S. PETERSON, and ending JON T. PETERSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

IN THE NAVY

PN312 NAVY nomination of Jessica M. P. Miller, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN313 NAVY nomination of Rosemary M. Hardesty, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN314 NAVY nomination of Brett T. Thomas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN385 NAVY nominations (46) beginning SCOTT A. ADAMS, and ending BRET A. YOUNT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2019.

PN405 NAVY nominations (14) beginning PETER D. ALLEN, and ending ROBERT D. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT AND TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the White House recently unveiled the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative, W-GDP, an inter-agency plan to increase women's global labor force participation and advancement in the workplace, improve access of women entrepreneurs to market opportunities, and remove barriers to economic growth for women.

I support the initiative, although not based on the erroneous claim of some in the White House that it is the first women's initiative ever launched by the United States. On the contrary, I and many other Members of Congress and previous administrations have supported such efforts for many years. However, there is still a lot of work to be done, and I hope W-GDP builds on those efforts.

Too many of this administration's actions have fallen far short of the President's rhetoric or have been the antithesis of what he promised, so while I am ready to do what is necessary to support W-GDP, I worry that this initiative may be part of the same story. From human trafficking at the southern border, to processing asylum applicants, to combating HIV/AIDS, this administration purports to be serious about addressing global problems

while implementing policies or proposing budgets that bear no resemblance to effective solutions and in many cases would make the situation worse.

For example, while the objectives of W-GDP are laudable, it is being implemented by the same White House that sought to cut the budget for the Department of State and foreign assistance programs by roughly 30 percent in fiscal years 2018 and 2019, cuts that would have decimated funding for programs that address the needs of the world's poorest people, for water and sanitation, maternal and child health, education and employment opportunities, to stave off poverty and disease that disproportionately afflict women and girls. In fact, the President's budget did not include a single dollar for W-GDP.

This administration has also waged war on reproductive health, reportedly directing the omission of reporting on reproductive rights in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Human Rights, and one of President Trump's first acts after his inauguration was to reinstate the Global Gag Rule. In fact, egged on by extremists in his administration, he expanded it to condition funding for every nongovernmental organization, NGO, implementing any health programs for the United States overseas, even if their programs have nothing to do with reproductive health. In other words, if an NGO spends millions of dollars in India to combat HIV/AIDS, but spends \$1 of its own private funds—not U.S. taxpayer funds—to provide counseling on abortion, it is ineligible for any U.S. Government funding for either purpose. Such a policy would be unlawful in our own country.

So while I support W-GDP, I caution all those who defend women's rights and support economic opportunities for women to not be distracted by one initiative this administration launched on the backs of the Congress's rejection of President Trump's budget and to call on the White House to adopt a more consistent, comprehensive approach to supporting women around the world.

With that in mind, I hope the White House will speak out forcefully and consistently about the institutionalized and systemic persecution and discrimination of women in Saudi Arabia and other countries whose autocratic and corrupt governments this White House has embraced. If the White House expects to be taken seriously about women's empowerment, it cannot remain silent about governments whose laws and policies treat women as property and that imprison women's rights activists.

This is not the only area in which the administration is purporting to support vulnerable populations while its short-sighted policies are having the opposite effect.

In a November 30, 2018, op-ed in the Washington Post, Ivanka Trump announced that the administration had

decided to limit the number of waivers for assistance for countries that are identified in the State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons Report as failing to meet minimum standards for combating human trafficking. She also noted the administration's pledge of \$45 million to a fund to end modern slavery, funds that, as is true for W-GDP, the President did not include in his budget and from an account the White House proposed to cut.

I agree with the goal of holding governments accountable for failing to meet minimum standards for preventing trafficking in persons, but informed people know that cutting funding for health, education, environmental conservation, counterterrorism, and governance programs does nothing to prevent human trafficking, while it undercuts our ability to make progress on other issues of national interest.

Yet that is exactly what the administration has done. By belatedly approaching human trafficking as if nothing else matters and limiting use of the waiver authority Congress provided, administration officials have spent months tying themselves in knots over which programs to continue and which to suspend. The result is that implementing partners are running out of money, services are not being delivered, and important programs are shutting down.

The Trump administration needs to stop governing by sound bite. If the White House is serious about addressing human trafficking and other complex challenges, it should work with Congress to secure the necessary funding and apply the law in a common sense manner that is consistent with our national interests.

EGYPT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to briefly discuss the situation in Egypt, a country where unchecked repression has come to define the government of President el-Sisi.

The 2011 Egyptian revolution brought hope of a democratic future for the country, but it has failed to materialize, subverted by aspiring autocrats. After winning historic democratic elections in 2012, the Morsi government sought to consolidate its control, issuing a declaration to provide the President with sweeping authorities and eliminating checks on Executive power. The response was another popular uprising and a military coup led by then-Defense Minister Abdel Fattah el-Sisi.

Although cheered by some who favor President el-Sisi's crackdown on the leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood and anyone suspected of being affiliated with it, his Presidency has become a model for autocratic rule. His police have arrested human rights lawyers, journalists, civil society activists, and opposition politicians. Anyone who criticizes the regime or calls for a more

democratic system is threatened, arrested, and accused of "terrorism" or some other vague crime against the state. Once detained, they have been subjected to physical and psychological abuse while they wait for months or more often years before being subjected to sham trials that make a mockery of due process.

Earlier this month, President el-Sisi's government took another step to consolidate his rule. Egypt's rubberstamp Parliament approved constitutional amendments that would enable el-Sisi to remain in power until 2034, 12 years beyond the end of his second and final term. Other amendments would enable el-Sisi to tighten his control of the judiciary, create a second Parliamentary chamber dominated by Presidential appointees, and expand the authority of the military to codify its role in civilian political life. Egypt today is a civilian government in name only. The military, led by el-Sisi, effectively wields total control.

In 2011, we all hoped the Egyptian people had a brighter, albeit challenging, political future ahead of them, but 7 years after the overthrow of Hosni Mubarak, the el-Sisi government is erasing any remaining hope for democracy in the country. The calls of those who flooded the streets under Mubarak and Morsi for greater political freedom and civil liberties, less corruption, and more accountability are treated not as visions for Egypt's future, but as threats to el-Sisi himself.

Regrettably, it seems that the only constant in U.S.-Egyptian relations over the last several decades, besides Egyptian Government repression and billions of dollars in U.S. military aid, is the reticence with which successive U.S. administrations have confronted this issue. There always seems to be an excuse for why now is not the time to insist on meaningful progress to advance democracy and human rights by our ally Egypt. If not now, when? What line would the Egyptian government have to cross for the Congress and the administration to recognize the threat that a brutal military dictatorship poses to stability in Egypt, and to our long-term interests in the region?

Every U.S. administration has engaged, in varying degrees, in quiet diplomacy to address human rights abuses and corruption overseas and issued public statements or withheld foreign aid to encourage progress. Diplomacy, if backed up with consequences, can achieve results, but successive Egyptian Governments have gambled that, at the end of the day, we will look the other way in the mistaken belief that doing so serves U.S. security interests, and by and large, that has been the case.

It is interesting to compare the Trump administration's selective condemnation of government repression in other countries, where the number of political prisoners is a fraction of those in Egypt, to President Trump's pro-

nouncement that President el-Sisi as a "great guy." What a sad commentary on what this country purports to stand for.

We must acknowledge what history has repeatedly shown, that upholding our values is the best way to protect our interests. That does not mean cutting off all aid and walking away from Egypt. That kind of reactionary approach is equally short-sighted. What it does mean is that we need a more principled, measured, and consistent policy and make clear that our aid is not a blank check—that Egypt's leaders are not above the law; that freedom of expression is universal; that due process is a right; that torture, cruel and inhuman treatment are forbidden under international law; and that governments should be accountable to their people.

At a time when President el-Sisi is seeking to manipulate the legislative process to cement his hold on power for life, senior officials at the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon need to stand up for what is first and foremost in our national interest: the principles that define us as Americans.

I hope all Senators will join me in encouraging the Trump administration to learn from the mistakes of its predecessors and realign our policy toward Egypt with our values.

OPIOID CRISIS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this morning, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services and Related Agencies held a hearing on the opioid epidemic and how States are responding to the crisis. I was pleased Beth Tanzman, the executive director of Vermont's Blueprint for Health, agreed to be a witness at today's hearing to share the innovative approaches Vermont has taken to combat opioid use disorders. Ms. Tanzman has also served as Vermont's deputy commissioner for mental health and also directed adult mental health services for Vermont's Department of Mental Health.

While certainly not spared from the opioid epidemic, Vermont is ahead of much of the country in many ways: Our State openly identified the problem, and our former Governor, Peter Shumlin, dedicated his entire State of the State address in 2014 to constructively seek ways to not just help addicts get clean, but to halt this scourge in its tracks. Public health leaders, addiction specialists, doctors, and State leaders came together and implemented a system to integrate substance abuse treatment with primary healthcare.

Ms. Tanzman's testimony focused on the system developed through this collaboration, known as the Hub and Spoke Model. The plan helps support those in recovery with nine regional

hubs, offering daily medication assisted treatment for those with complex addictions, and spokes, where patients receive follow-up care, counseling, and general wellness services. This framework has allowed Vermont to virtually eliminate wait times for treatment, which can be enormous barriers for individuals needing help.

Every State in the Nation has seen the impacts of opioid abuse. Ms. Tanzman's testimony was informative and offers an important perspective for other States struggling with treating addiction. I ask unanimous consent to that her testimony from the Appropriations Committee hearing this morning be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF VERMONT HEALTH
ACCESS, VERMONT BLUEPRINT FOR
HEALTH

TESTIMONY TO THE U.S. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION REGARDING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC—FEBRUARY 28, 2019

BETH TANZMAN, MSW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, VERMONT BLUEPRINT FOR HEALTH, DEPARTMENT OF VERMONT HEALTH ACCESS

Chairman Blunt, Ranking Member Murray, and Senator Leahy and staff thank-you for the opportunity to outline what we are learning in Vermont about addressing the opioid epidemic.

Vermont is here before you because we have successfully scaled treatment availability for Opioid Use Disorder statewide. Through our Hub and Spoke program we are currently treating over 8,000 Vermonters (1.6% of the adult population) with Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT). Vermont treats a higher percentage of people with Opioid Use Disorder than any other state in the nation.

We provide Medication Assisted Treatment in primary care offices (Spokes) and in specialty addictions treatment programs (Hubs). Through a Health Home Medicaid plan we've built a programmatic framework that links primary care (Spokes) and addictions treatment programs (Hubs). Patients can move between Hubs and Spokes based on their needs. Clinical expertise is shared across primary care and substance abuse treatment providers.

There are strong signals that the Hub and Spoke program is facilitating positive outcomes. Vermont has the lowest opioid overdose death rate in New England. Vermonters receiving Medication Assisted Treatment have lower rates of: incarceration, hospitalizations, and emergency department use than do Vermonters with Opioid Use Disorder who receive care as usual. Our system of deploying teams of nurses and counselors to primary care Spokes—2 FTE for every 100 Medicaid Members—combined with a strong back-up from Hub programs has dramatically increased the number of primary care providers offering Medication Assisted Treatment in Vermont.

What we're learning may be helpful to others and a few conclusions stand out.

Medication Assisted Treatment, the combination of medications and counseling, is the most effective treatment for opioid use disorder and as such, it should be consistently available as the standard of care for this condition.

Insurance should pay for Medication Assisted Treatment. In Vermont we developed

a Medicaid Health Home State Plan Amendment under the authority of section 2703 of the Affordable Care Act to create the Hub and Spoke Program. There are other approaches to using Medicaid that states can employ including: 1115 B Substance Use Waivers, State Plan Amendments, including MAT in managed care organization contracts, and increasing reimbursement rates for targeted services. Commercial payers should also participate: in Vermont two of our major commercial plans are piloting payments for Hub and Spoke Services.

The health system—especially primary care—has a key role in treating opioid addiction. The addictions treatment system cannot do this alone; there is simply not enough treatment capacity to meet the need brought on by this epidemic. The participation of primary care can effect greater integration of care, especially by coordinating pharmacological treatments with counseling, rehabilitation, and recovery supports.

The barriers to primary care participation in MAT (not enough provider time, patient complexity, difficulty integrating counseling supports) can be addressed by adding nursing and counseling resources to the primary care prescribing teams, as we did in Vermont.

Treatment is one element of a comprehensive response to the opioid epidemic. Other elements include prevention—reducing peoples' exposure to opioids in the first place, harm reduction such as wide availability of the overdose reversal medication Narcan to help prevent overdose deaths, and recovery supports—including vocational services to help people in recovery participate fully in our communities.

Leadership focus matters. I have had the honor of serving under two consecutive Governors, Democratic and Republican, who have both provided leadership and resources to address the opioid epidemic in Vermont.

In closing, we have made much progress in Vermont, much of it with the support of our federal partners. Yet while we have some of the best access to treatment in the nation, we have not solved this problem. Every week two Vermonters die from a drug overdose. Tragically we've also experienced high numbers of children under the age of five, who come into state custody due to this crisis. We must learn how to do better by our families and communities.

Thank you.

(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 "yes" on rollcall vote 31, the confirmation of Michael J. Desmond to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 32, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 33, the confirmation of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.●

SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the Committee on the Budget has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 116th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator SANDERS, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET U.S. SENATE RULES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. MEETINGS

(1) The committee shall hold its regular meeting on the first Thursday of each month. Additional meetings may be called by the chair as the chair deems necessary to expedite committee business.

(2) Each meeting of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a portion or portions of any such meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by record vote in open session of a majority of the members of the committee present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such portion or portions—

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(c) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(d) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement; or

(e) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(i) an act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(ii) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person.

(f) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

(3) Notice of, and the agenda for, any business meeting or markup shall be provided to each member and made available to the public at least 72 hours prior to such meeting or markup.

II. CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

(1) If the chair of the committee makes proposed legislative text of a concurrent resolution on the budget available to all committee members by 12:00 p.m., five days prior to the start of a meeting or markup to consider the resolution, during that meeting or markup:

(a) it shall not be in order to consider a first degree amendment unless the amendment has been submitted to the chief clerk

by 5:00 p.m. two days prior to the start of the meeting or markup, except that an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the chair of the committee shall not be required to be filed in advance, and

(b) it shall not be in order to consider a second degree amendment unless the amendment has been submitted to the chief clerk by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the start of the meeting or markup, and

(c) it shall not be in order to consider a side-by-side amendment unless the amendment has been submitted to the chief clerk by 5:00 p.m. on the day prior to the start of the meeting or markup, and the amendment is filed in relation to a particular first degree amendment that is considered by the committee.

(2) During consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment that would have no force or effect if adopted.

III. ORDER OF RECOGNITION

Those members who are present at the start of any meeting of the committee including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be recognized in order of seniority based on time served as a member of the committee. Any members arriving after the start of the meeting shall be recognized, in order of appearance, after the most junior member.

IV. QUORUMS AND VOTING

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this section, a quorum for the transaction of committee business shall consist of not less than one-third of the membership of the entire committee: Provided, that proxies shall not be counted in making a quorum.

(2) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting budget resolutions, legislative measures or recommendations: Provided, that proxies shall not be counted in making a quorum.

(3) For the purpose of taking sworn or unsworn testimony, a quorum of the committee shall consist of one Senator.

(4)(a) The committee may poll—

(i) internal committee matters including those concerning the committee's staff, records, and budget;

(ii) steps in an investigation, including issuance of subpoenas, applications for immunity orders, and requests for documents from agencies; and

(iii) other committee business that the committee has designated for polling at a meeting, except that the committee may not vote by poll on reporting to the Senate any measure, matter, or recommendation, and may not vote by poll on closing a meeting or hearing to the public.

(b) To conduct a poll, the chair shall circulate polling sheets to each member specifying the matter being polled and the time limit for completion of the poll. If any member requests, the matter shall be held for a meeting rather than being polled. The chief clerk shall keep a record of polls; if the committee determines by record vote in open session of a majority of the members of the committee present that the polled matter is one of those enumerated in rule I(2)(a)–(e), then the record of the poll shall be confidential. Any member may move at the committee meeting following a poll for a vote on the polled decision.

V. PROXIES

When a record vote is taken in the committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, a quorum being present, a member who is unable to attend the meeting may vote by proxy if the absent member has been informed of the matter on which the vote is being recorded and has affirmatively requested to be so recorded; except that no member may vote by proxy dur-

ing the deliberations on Budget Resolutions unless a member is experiencing a health issue and the chair and ranking member agree to allow that member to vote by proxy on amendments to a Budget Resolution.

VI. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

(1) The committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 1 week in advance of such hearing, unless the chair and ranking member determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(2) At least 24 hours prior to the scheduled start time of the hearing, a witness appearing before the committee shall file a written statement of proposed testimony with the chief clerk who is responsible for circulating the proposed testimony to all members at the same time. The requirement that a witness submit testimony 24 hours prior to a hearing may be waived by the chair and the ranking member, following their determination that there is good cause for the failure of compliance.

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(1) When the committee has ordered a measure or recommendation reported, following final action, the report thereon shall be filed in the Senate at the earliest practicable time.

(2) A member of the committee, who gives notice of an intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final committee approval of a measure or matter, shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days in which to file such views, in writing, with the chief clerk of the committee. Such views shall then be included in the committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusions shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of timely notice, the committee report may be filed and printed immediately without such views.

VIII. USE OF DISPLAY MATERIALS IN COMMITTEE

Committee members may use the electronic display system provided in the committee hearing room or physical graphic displays during any meetings or hearings of the committee. Physical graphic displays are limited to the following:

Charts, photographs, or renderings:

Size: no larger than 36 inches by 48 inches.

Where: on an easel stand next to the member's seat or at the rear of the committee room.

When: only at the time the member is speaking.

Number: no more than two may be displayed at a time.

IX. CONFIRMATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

(1) Standards. In considering a nomination, the committee shall inquire into the nominee's experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. The committee shall recommend confirmation if it finds that the nominee has the necessary integrity and is affirmatively qualified by reason of training, education, or experience to carry out the functions of the office to which he or she was nominated.

(2) Information Concerning the Nominee. Each nominee shall submit the following information to the chief clerk, who will distribute to the chairman and ranking member at the same time:

(a) A detailed biographical resume which contains information concerning education, employment, and background which generally relates to the position to which the individual is nominated, and which is to be made public;

(b) Information concerning financial and other background of the nominee which is to be made public; provided, that financial information that does not relate to the nominee's qualifications to hold the position to which the individual is nominated, tax returns or reports prepared by federal agencies that may be submitted by the nominee shall, after review by the chair, ranking member, or any other member of the committee upon request, be maintained in a manner to ensure confidentiality; and,

(c) Copies of other relevant documents and responses to questions as the committee may so request, such as responses to questions concerning the policies and programs the nominee intends to pursue upon taking office.

(3) Report on the Nominee. After a review of all information pertinent to the nomination, a confidential report on the nominee may be prepared by the committee staff for the chair, the ranking member and, upon request, for any other member of the committee. The report shall summarize the steps taken and the results of the committee inquiry, including any unresolved matters that have been raised during the course of the inquiry.

(4) Hearings. The committee shall conduct a hearing during which the nominee shall be called to testify under oath on all matters relating to his or her suitability for office, including the policies and programs which he or she would pursue while in that position. No hearing or meeting to consider the confirmation shall be held until at least 72 hours after the following events have occurred: the nominee has responded to the requirements set forth in subsection (2), and, if a report described in subsection (3) has been prepared, it has been presented to the chairman and ranking member, and is available to other members of the committee, upon request.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 25, 2019, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

116TH CONGRESS—RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AS ADOPTED

[February 28, 2019]

1. Subcommittee rules. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Quorums.

A. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one Member of the Minority is present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term "routine business" includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business of the Subcommittee other than reporting to the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs any measures, matters, or recommendations.

B. Taking testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.

C. Proxies prohibited in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chairman of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing, provided that the Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her of disapproval of the subpoena within 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays and legal holidays in which the Senate is not in session, of being notified of the subpoena. If a subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

Immediately upon authorization of the issuance of a subpoena under these rules, a written notice of intent to issue the subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs waive the 48-hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chairman authorizes subpoenas, subpoenas may be issued upon the signature of the Chairman or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 25, 2019, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent that a

copy of the Rules of Procedure of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

116TH CONGRESS—RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AS ADOPTED

[February 28, 2019]

1. No public hearing connected with an investigation may be held without the approval of either the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or a Majority of the Members of the Subcommittee. In all cases, notification to all Subcommittee Members of the intent to hold hearings must be given at least 7 days in advance to the date of the hearing. The Ranking Minority Member should be kept fully apprised of preliminary inquiries, investigations, and hearings. Preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the Subcommittee Majority staff upon the approval of the Chairman and notice of such approval to the Ranking Minority Member, Minority Staff Director, or the Minority Chief Counsel. Preliminary inquiries may be undertaken by the Minority staff upon the approval of the Ranking Minority Member and notice of such approval to the Chairman, Staff Director, or Chief Counsel. Investigations may be undertaken upon the approval of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member with notice of such approval to all Members of the Subcommittee.

No public hearing shall be held if the Minority Members of the Subcommittee unanimously object, unless the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (the "Committee") approves of such public hearing by a majority vote.

Senate Rules will govern all closed sessions convened by the Subcommittee (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(b), Standing Rules of the Senate).

2. Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by him or her, with notice to the Ranking Minority Member. A written notice of intent to issue a subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, or staff officers designated by them, by the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him or her, immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to the appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee waive the 48 hour waiting period or unless the Chairman certifies in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

3. The Chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the Subcommittee. This authority may be delegated by the Chairman to any other Member of the Subcommittee when necessary.

4. If at least three Members of the Subcommittee desire the Chairman to call a special meeting, they may file, in the office of the Subcommittee, a written request therefor, addressed to the Chairman. Immediately thereafter, the clerk of the Subcommittee shall notify the Chairman of such request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of such request, the Chairman fails to call the requested special meeting, which is to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of such request, a majority of the Sub-

committee Members may file in the office of the Subcommittee their written notice that a special Subcommittee meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the Subcommittee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of such notice, the Subcommittee clerk shall notify all Subcommittee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the Chairman is not present at any regular, additional or special meeting, the Ranking Majority Member present shall preside.

5. For public or executive sessions, one Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony in any given case or subject matter.

One-third of the Members of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Subcommittee business other than the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony, provided that at least one member of the minority is present.

6. All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

7. If, during public or executive sessions, a witness, his or her counsel, or any spectator conducts himself or herself in such a manner as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration of such hearing, the Chairman or presiding Member of the Subcommittee present during such hearing may request the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, his or her representative, or any law enforcement official to eject said person from the hearing room.

8. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness at any public or executive hearing and to advise such witness while he or she is testifying of his or her legal rights; provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the government, or of a corporation or association, the Chairman may rule that representation by counsel from the government, corporation, or association, or by counsel representing another witness, creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness may only be represented during interrogation by Subcommittee staff or during testimony before the Subcommittee by personal counsel not from the government, corporation, or association, or by personal counsel not representing another witness. This rule shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event his or her counsel is ejected for conducting himself or herself in such a manner so as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration of the hearings; nor shall this rule be construed as authorizing counsel to coach the witness or answer for the witness. The failure of any witness to secure counsel shall not excuse such witness from complying with a subpoena or deposition notice.

9. Depositions

9.1 Notice. Notices for the taking of depositions in an investigation authorized by the Subcommittee shall be authorized and issued by the Chairman. The Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee shall be kept fully apprised of the authorization for the taking of depositions. Such notices shall specify a time and place of examination, and the name of the Subcommittee Member or Members or staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. The deposition shall be in private. The Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness's failure to appear unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a Subcommittee subpoena.

9.2 Counsel. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of

their legal rights, subject to the provisions of Rule 8.

9.3 Procedure. Witnesses shall be examined upon oath administered by an individual authorized by local law to administer oaths. Questions shall be propounded orally by Subcommittee Members or staff. Objections by the witness as to the form of questions shall be noted for the record. If a witness objects to a question and refuses to testify on the basis of relevance or privilege, the Subcommittee Members or staff may proceed with the deposition, or may, at that time or at a subsequent time, seek a ruling by telephone or otherwise on the objection from the Chairman or such Subcommittee Member as designated by him or her. If the Chairman or designated Member overrules the objection, he or she may refer the matter to the Subcommittee or he or she may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to civil or criminal enforcement unless the witness refuses to testify after he or she has been ordered and directed to answer by the Chairman or designated Member.

9.4 Filing. The Subcommittee staff shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded. If it is transcribed, the witness shall be furnished with a copy for review pursuant to the provisions of Rule 12. The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in his or her presence, the transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall then be filed with the Subcommittee clerk. Subcommittee staff may stipulate with the witness to changes in this procedure; deviations from this procedure which do not substantially impair the reliability of the record shall not relieve the witness from his or her obligation to testify truthfully.

10. Any witness desiring to read a prepared or written statement in executive or public hearings shall file a copy of such statement with the Chairman, Staff Director, or Chief Counsel 48 hours in advance of the hearings at which the statement is to be presented unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member waive this requirement. The Subcommittee shall determine whether such statement may be read or placed in the record of the hearing.

11. A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, personal safety, or physical discomfort, that during testimony, television, motion picture, and other cameras and lights, shall not be directed at him or her. Such requests shall be ruled on by the Subcommittee Members present at the hearing.

12. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings. The record of his or her own testimony, whether in public or executive session, shall be made available for inspection by witness or his or her counsel under Subcommittee supervision; a copy of any testimony given in public session or that part of the testimony given by the witness in executive session and subsequently quoted or made part of the record in a public session shall be made available to any witness at his or her expense if he or she so requests.

13. Interrogation of witnesses at Subcommittee hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the Subcommittee by Subcommittee Members and authorized Subcommittee staff personnel only.

14. Any person who is the subject of an investigation in public hearings may submit to the Chairman questions in writing for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the Subcommittee. With the consent of a majority of the Members of the Sub-

committee present and voting, these questions, or paraphrased versions of them, shall be put to the witness by the Chairman, by a Member of the Subcommittee, or by counsel of the Subcommittee.

15. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified, and who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing, or comment made by a Subcommittee Member or counsel, tends to defame him or her or otherwise adversely affect his or her reputation, may (a) request to appear personally before the Subcommittee to testify in his or her own behalf, or, in the alternative, (b) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony or other evidence or comment complained of. Such request and such statement shall be submitted to the Subcommittee for its consideration and action.

If a person requests to appear personally before the Subcommittee pursuant to alternative (a) referred to herein, said request shall be considered untimely if it is not received by the Chairman, Staff Director, or Chief Counsel in writing on or before thirty (30) days subsequent to the day on which said person's name was mentioned or he or she was otherwise specifically identified during a public hearing held before the Subcommittee, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member waive this requirement.

If a person requests to file his or her sworn statement pursuant to alternative (b) referred to herein, the Subcommittee may condition the filing of said sworn statement upon said person agreeing to appear personally before the Subcommittee and to testify concerning the matters contained in his or her sworn statement, as well as any other matters related to the subject of the investigation before the Subcommittee.

16. All testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released for public information without the approval of a majority of the Members of the Subcommittee.

17. No Subcommittee report shall be released to the public unless approved by a majority of the Subcommittee and after no less than 10 days' notice and opportunity for comment by the Members of the Subcommittee unless the need for such notice and opportunity to comment has been waived in writing by a majority of the Minority Members of the Subcommittee.

18. The Ranking Minority Member may select for appointment to the Subcommittee staff a Chief Counsel for the Minority and such other professional staff and clerical assistants as he or she deems advisable. The total compensation allocated to such Minority staff shall be not less than one-third the total amount allocated for all Subcommittee staff salaries during any given year. The Minority staff shall work under the direction and supervision of the Ranking Minority Member. The Minority Staff Director and the Minority Chief Counsel shall be kept fully informed as to preliminary inquiries, investigations, and hearings, and shall have access to all material in the files of the Subcommittee.

19. When it is determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, or by a majority of the Subcommittee, that there is reasonable cause to believe that a violation of law may have occurred, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member by letter, or the Subcommittee by resolution, are authorized to report such violation to the proper State, local and/or Federal authorities. Such letter or report may recite the basis for the determination of reasonable cause. This rule is not authority for release of documents or testimony.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 27, 2019, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

(1) SUBCOMMITTEE RULES. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(2) QUORUMS. For public or executive sessions, one Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony in any given case or subject matter. One-third of the Members of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business other than the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony, provided that one Member of the minority is present. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

(3) TAKING TESTIMONY. All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

(4) SUBCOMMITTEE SUBPEONAS. Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by him or her, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, provided that the Chairman may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chairman or a staff officer designated by him/her has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member or a staff officer designated by him/her of disapproval of the subpoena within 24 hours excluding Saturdays and Sundays, of being notified of the subpoena. If the subpoena is disapproved by the Ranking Minority Member as provided herein, the subpoena may be authorized by a vote of the Members of the Subcommittee.

A written notice of intent to issue a subpoena shall be provided to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chairman, or a staff officer designated by him or her, immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 48 hours, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from delivery to appropriate offices, unless the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member waive the 48 hour waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chairman certifies in

writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue the subpoena immediately.

BAHRAIN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, February marks the anniversary of the massive, peaceful protests against Bahrain's repressive regime in 2011. Bahraini citizens, men and women of all ages and backgrounds, demanded more accountability from their leaders and more agency in their lives.

Instead of sitting down with the protestors as leaders in Oregon or Washington, DC, often do, Bahrain's rulers unleashed the country's security forces on them. I am afraid that it has now become a rather sad tradition of mine to remind the Senate of these events, and so before February gives way to March, I just wanted to offer a few words on why this issue continues to resonate.

Bahrain held elections in November 2018, but they were hardly on the level. "The Economist" termed them "unfair." The head of Human Rights First called them "fake elections." The Project on Middle East Democracy and Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain said they were a "sham." The list goes on.

This should come as no surprise to anybody paying attention to development in Bahrain because the regime banned opposition parties from participating altogether. That is not exactly a recipe for a free, fair, or legitimate outcome.

Indeed, the regime has spent the past couple years detaining, intimidating, and silencing the political opposition.

But don't take my word for it, that's how Amnesty International characterized the situation before the November elections.

The repression extends far beyond the ballot box. Human rights advocates say the regime has arbitrarily stripped hundreds of individuals of their citizenship in the past few years.

Human Right Watch indicates that the regime closed the last remaining independent newspaper in 2017. Freedom House says the regime continues to bully journalists and to persecute those who are critical of the regime.

Bahrain is a longtime U.S. ally in a tumultuous region. My intent with these annual statements is neither to insult the Kingdom nor to demand the administration cut ties.

No, the point of these statements is to make it clear that I believe the United States should always promote basic rights and values and further, that I believe the United States must—must—hold its friends and partners to a higher moral standard.

I was concerned that the previous administration did not do more to push Bahrain's rulers on this point, but I am deeply disappointed that the Trump administration seems hell-bent on setting a new low.

The President himself has made clear that he views the world through a transactional lens and is willing to overlook rights violations in the name of arms sales or greater defense cooperation.

So it is hardly surprising to read that Trump administration officials fail to raise human rights concerns with their Bahraini counterparts.

This must change. I hope it will change. And I hope that the influx of new members of Congress following the 2018 midterm elections will cause it to change.

Today I renew my call on Bahrain's monarchy to stop brutally repressing peaceful protest, to release political prisoners like Abdulhadi al-Khawaja and Nabeel Rajab, and to offer Bahrainis a greater voice in their country's future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CHRIS CORREALE

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the service and achievements of Ms. Chris Correale, director of harbor development for the Maryland Port Administration, upon her retirement.

Chris Correale is the ultimate example of a public servant whose expertise and efforts while unknown to the majority of Maryland's residents, have been critical to Maryland's economy and environment.

An expert in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers processes, Chris has spent more than 25 years crafting and implementing innovative and collaborative Federal and State beneficial reuse projects that kept the Port of Baltimore's shipping channels open and improved the environment in the Chesapeake Bay. From dredging, construction, beach replenishment, habitat restoration, and permitting, Chris has been the visionary behind the development of projects that have significantly improved the infrastructure, environment, business climate, regional partnerships, and economic development opportunities throughout the State of Maryland.

At the Maryland Port Administration, Chris ensured the Port of Baltimore's channels are in top condition for maritime traffic serving the port. She oversaw the planning and policy of what to do with the dredged material, she secured State and Federal funding for the port, and she coordinated multi-agency management of the port's aids to navigation systems.

Prior to joining the Maryland Port Administration, Chris had a distinguished career as the chief of the operations division of the U.S. Army Corps' Baltimore District. By overseeing the Baltimore District's navigation program, Chris was instrumental in the operations, maintenance, protection, and restoration of Maryland's ports, military installations, levees, Federal

channels, island habitats, and reservoirs.

Chris's retirement is a loss for the State of Maryland. Her vision, expertise, and extraordinary social skills have enabled her to successfully navigate the Federal, State, and local forces to bring so many critical projects to fruition. She has significantly improved the infrastructure, environment, and business climate throughout the State of Maryland, and she will be missed. Therefore, it is my honor to recognize the contributions of Ms. Chris Correale to the State of Maryland and thank her for her years of valuable service.●

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK ARMSTRONG, JR.

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Patrick Armstrong, Jr., of Heart Butte, for his dedication to Glacier County.

A member of the Blackfeet Nation, Mr. Armstrong was born and raised in Browning, MT, where he attended Browning Public School Systems, K-12. He has been an educator at Browning Elementary for 5 years, where he currently teaches fourth grade. Patrick and his wife, Anna, have three children.

Mr. Armstrong has always been actively involved in sports and has been officiating for 20 years. Since then, Patrick has been heavily involved in officiating high school basketball. He was recently nominated as this year's boys basketball official of the year by the National Federation of High School Association, Montana High School Association, and the Montana Officials Association. To be nominated for this award, you must exemplify upstanding character. Mr. Armstrong is a prominent mentor in his community. He is a humble man who knows the value of a strong community.

I congratulate Patrick on his role in bringing together and growing the Browning community.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:01 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8. An act to require a background check for every firearm sale.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 8. An act to require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

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-412. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Bioengineered Food Disclosure Standard" (AMS-TM-17-0050) 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-413. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials for Fiscal Year 2020"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-414. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of additional time required to complete a report relative to the ongoing use of open burn pits and the feasibility of phasing out the use of open burn pits by using technology incinerators; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-415. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of additional time required to complete the annual report on defense manpower requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-416. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the report on activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-417. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Readiness), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-418. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-419. 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 "Establishment of TRICARE Select and Other TRICARE Reforms" (RIN0720-AB70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-420. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Libya declared in Executive Order 13566; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-421. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, eight (8) reports relative to vacancies in the

Department of Housing and Urban Development, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 22, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-422. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts" (Rel. No. 33-10604) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-423. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding (including rescissions) so designated by the Congress, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for the enclosed list of accounts; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-424. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation as an emergency requirement all funding so designated by the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019, pursuant to section 251 (b) (2) (A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, for the accounts referenced in section 7058 (d); to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-425. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 199A Determination of W-2 Wages" (Rev. Proc. 2019-11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-426. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rulings and Determination Letters" (Rev. Proc. 2019-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-427. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 199A Trade or Business Safe Harbor: Rental Real Estate" (Notice 2019-07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-428. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure Providing Safe Harbor Method of Accounting for Determining Depreciation Deductions for Certain Passenger Automobiles" (Rev. Proc. 2019-13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-429. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations Regarding the Transition Tax Under Section 965 and Related Provisions" (RIN1545-B051) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-430. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the

report of a rule entitled "Centralized Partnership Audit Regime" (RIN1545-B003 and RIN1545-B004) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-431. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Bulk Drug Substances That Can Be Used To Compound Drug Products In Accordance With Section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act" ((21 CFR Part 216) (Docket No. FDA-2016-N-3464)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-432. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Construction Contract Administration" ((RIN3090-AJ63) (48 CFR Parts 501, 511, 517, 532, 536, 543, 546, and 552)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-433. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-434. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports entitled "2018 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts" and "Judicial Business of the United States Courts", and their accompanying Uniform Resource Locators (URLs); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-435. A communication from the Chief Counsel for Regulation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Information, Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Regulations" (RIN0605-AA45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-436. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Organic Program; Amendments to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (Crops, Livestock, and Handling)" ((RIN0581-AD60) (Docket No. AMS-NOP-14-0079; NOP-14-05)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-437. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of United States Grade Standards" ((7 CFR Part 51) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0081; SC-19-326)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-438. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate" ((7 CFR Part 989) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0069; SC-18-989-1 FR)) received in the Office of the

President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-439. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Pummelos Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate" ((7 CFR Part 905) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0065; SC-18-905-4 FR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-440. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Olives Grown in California; Establish Procedures To Meet Via Electronic Communications" ((7 CFR Part 932) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0061; SC-18-932-1 FR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-441. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Specific Fee Reference" ((7 CFR Part 800) (Docket No. AMS-FGIS-18-0063)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-442. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Southeastern States; Termination of Marketing Order 953" ((7 CFR Part 953) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0037; SC-18-935-1 FR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-443. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Honey Packers and Importers Research, Promotion, Consumer Education, and Industry Information Order; Change in Membership" ((7 CFR Part 1212) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-444. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Procedures for Status Review of Detainees outside the United States"; to the Committees on Armed Services; and the Judiciary.

EC-445. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Industrial Policy (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of additional time required to complete a report relative to the relocation of steam turbine production from Nimitz-class and Ford-class aircraft carriers and Virginia-class and Columbia-class submarines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-446. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual National Defense Stockpile Operations and Planning Report"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-447. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Defense Production

Act Fund Annual Report For Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-448. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility; Mississippi: Aberdeen, City of, Monroe County" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2018-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-449. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments" (RIN1024-AE56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-450. A communication from the Staff Director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the United States Commission on Civil Rights renewing the charter of its federal advisory committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-451. 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; Alabama; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9990-31-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-452. 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; Massachusetts; Air Emissions Inventory, Emissions Statements, Source Registration, and Emergency Episode Planning Provisions" (FRL No. 9989-90-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-453. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Operating Permits Program; Kansas; Reporting Emission Data, Emission Fees and Process Information" (FRL No. 9989-43-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-454. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Health Department, Withdrawal of Section 112(l) Delegation Authority for the Chemical Accident Prevention Regulations" (FRL No. 9990-12-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-455. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emissions Monitoring Provisions in State Implementation Plans Required Under the NOX" (FRL No. 9990-33-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-456. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Massachusetts: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference" (FRL No. 9989-82-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-457. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Surface Coating of Large Appliances; Printing, Coating, and Dyeing of Fabrics and Other Textiles; and Surface Coating of Metal Furniture Residual Risk and Technology Reviews" (FRL No. 9988-80-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-458. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Review of the Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Sulfur Oxides" (FRL No. 9990-28-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-459. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019-0011 - 2019-0012); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-460. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition of Interment of Memorialization of Persons Who Have Been Convicted of Federal or State Capital Crimes or Certain Sex Offenses" (RIN2900-AQ36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-461. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Revisions to Hazardous Materials Grant Requirements (FAST Act)" (RIN2137-AF19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Neomi J. Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Drew H. Wrigley, of North Dakota, to be United States Attorney for the District of North Dakota for the term of four years.

Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for the remainder of the term expiring January 29, 2020.

Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2022.

By Mr. BURR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

William R. Evanina, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JONES):

S. 592. A bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 593. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect civil rights and otherwise prevent meaningful harm to third parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 594. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 595. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 596. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for direct payment to physician assistants under the Medicare program for certain services furnished by such physician assistants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 597. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule regarding the application of the Act to marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 598. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 599. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DAINES, Ms. SMITH, Mr.

ROUNDS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JONES, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 600. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricultural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 601. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former Members and elected officers of Congress from lobbying Congress at any time after leaving office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 602. A bill to address state-sponsored cyber activities against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 603. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to consider alternative approaches before determining that a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. LEE):

S. 604. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 605. A bill to assist States in carrying out projects to expand the child care workforce and child care facilities in the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 606. A bill to improve oversight and evaluation of the mental health and suicide prevention media outreach campaigns of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 607. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to address insufficient compensation of employees and other personnel of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 608. A bill to provide that chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code, relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements, shall not apply to enrollment agreements made between students and certain institutions of higher education, and to prohibit limitations on the ability of students to pur-

sue claims against certain institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 609. A bill to prohibit States from suspending, revoking, or denying State-issued professional licenses or issuing penalties due to student default; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 610. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 611. A bill to provide adequate funding for water and sewer infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 612. A bill to require a joint resolution of approval for the entry into effect of a civilian nuclear cooperation agreement with Saudi Arabia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH:

S. 613. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to provide chronic wasting disease support for States and coordinated response efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 614. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue a final rule relating to removing the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 615. A bill to free States to spend gas taxes on their transportation priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 616. A bill to impose user fees on manufacturers and importers of electronic nicotine delivery systems; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 618. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to voluntarily adopt advance directives guiding the medical care they receive; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 619. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to provide investment authority to support rural infrastructure development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN,

Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 620. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 621. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 622. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 623. A bill to provide guidance and priorities for Federal Government obligations in the event that the debt limit is reached and to provide a limited and temporary authority to exceed the debt limit for priority obligations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 624. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 625. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to carry out a pilot program under which the Commission shall provide funds to local educational agencies for initiatives to provide voter registration information to secondary school students in the 12th grade; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 626. A bill to repeal debt collection amendments made by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 627. A bill to promote the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence,

dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 629. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the processes and requirements of the Department of Veterans Affairs for scheduling appointments for health care and conducting consultations under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 630. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 631. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 633. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. ERNST, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations and eligible workforce training organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 635. A bill to restore statutory rights to the people of the United States from forced arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 636. A bill to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status

under such section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 637. A bill to prohibit price gouging in the sale of drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 638. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, and Mr. UDALL):

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution calling on the United States and Congress to take immediate action to address the challenge of climate change; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution to prohibit the unauthorized use of United States Armed Forces in hostilities with respect to Venezuela; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 85. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of Easterseals, a leading advocate and service provider for children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older adults, and their caregivers and families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT:

S. Res. 86. A resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 87. A resolution authorizing the printing of a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 88. A resolution designating March 1, 2019, as “Read Across America Day”; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 89. A resolution expressing the condolences of the Senate and honoring the memory of the victims of the mass shooting in Aurora, Illinois, on February 15, 2019; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 90. A resolution designating February 28, 2019, as “Rare Disease Day”; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 91. A resolution designating March 3, 2019, as “World Wildlife Day”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Con. Res. 6. A concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Con. Res. 7. A concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the 26th edition of the pocket version of the Constitution of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 72

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 72, a bill to suspend the enforcement of certain civil liabilities of Federal employees and contractors during a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 261, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes.

S. 285

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 286

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 316

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area.

S. 349

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 349, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to request nominations for, and make determinations regarding, roads to be designated under the national scenic byways program, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 385

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 385, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide increased labor law protections for agricultural workers, and for other purposes.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) 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. 507

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to clarify that a State may not use an individual's failure to vote as the basis for

initiating the procedures provided under such Act for the removal of the individual from the official list of registered voters in the State on the grounds that the individual has changed residence, and for other purposes.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 530

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 530, a bill to establish the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S.J. RES. 3

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

S. CON. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JONES):

S. 592. A bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Cybersecurity Disclosure Act along with two members of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator COLLINS, and the ranking member, Senator WARNER, in addition to Senator KENNEDY and Senator JONES, who also serve with me on the Senate Banking Committee. In response to data breaches of various companies that exposed the personal information of millions of customers, our legislation asks each publicly traded company to include—in Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, disclosures to investors—information on whether any member of the board of directors is a cybersecurity expert, and if not, why having this expertise on the board of directors is not necessary because of other cybersecurity steps taken by the publicly traded company. To be clear, the legislation does not require companies to take any actions other than to provide this disclosure to its investors.

In Deloitte's 11th Global Risk Management Survey of financial services institutions, published last month, "sixty-seven percent of respondents named cybersecurity as one of the three risks that would increase the most in importance for their business over the next two years, far more than for any other risk. Yet, only about one-half of the respondents felt their institutions were extremely or very effective in managing this risk." According to the 2018-2019 National Association of Corporate Directors Public Company Governance Survey, only 52 percent of directors "are confident that they sufficiently understand cyber risks to provide effective cyber-risk oversight," and 58 percent "believe their boards collectively know enough about cyber risk to provide effective oversight." Indeed, Yahoo, in its 2016 annual report, disclosed, "the Independent Committee found that failures in communication, management, inquiry and internal reporting contributed to the lack of proper comprehension and handling of the 2014 Security Incident. The Independent Committee also found that the Audit and Finance Committee and the full board were not adequately informed of the full severity, risks, and potential impacts of the 2014 Security Incident and related matters." The 2014 Security Incident here refers to the fact that "a copy of certain user account information for approximately 500 million user accounts was stolen from Yahoo's network in late 2014."

This is particularly troubling given that data breaches expose more and more records containing personally identifiable information. Indeed, according to the Identity Theft Resource Center, the number of these types of records exposed by data breaches in the business industry grew from 181,630,520 in 2017 to 415,233,143 in 2018 and in the medical and healthcare industry from 5,302,846 in 2017 to 9,927,798 last year. Across all industries, the number of records containing personally identifiable

information exposed by data breaches rose 126 percent, from 197,612,748 in 2017 to 446,515,334 in 2018.

Investors and customers deserve a clear understanding of whether publicly traded companies are prioritizing cybersecurity and have the capacity to protect investors and customers from cyber related attacks. Our legislation aims to provide a better understanding of these issues through improved SEC disclosure.

In testimony given to the Senate Banking Committee last June, Harvard Law Professor John Coates, who also practiced securities law as a partner at Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz, expressed support for our legislation by stating that "[the Cybersecurity Disclosure Act] is well designed. It does not attempt to second-guess SEC guidance and rules regarding disclosures generally, or even as to cyber-risk overall. The bill simply asks publicly traded companies to disclose whether a cybersecurity expert is on the board of directors, and if not, why one is not necessary. To be clear, the bill does not require every publicly traded company to have a cybersecurity expert on its board. Publicly traded companies will still decide for themselves how to tailor their resources to their cybersecurity needs and disclose what they have decided. Some companies may choose to hire outside cyber consultants. Some may choose to boost cybersecurity expertise on staff. And some may decide to have a cybersecurity expert on the board of directors. The disclosure required would typically amount to a sentence or two."

While this legislation is a matter for consideration by the Banking Committee, of which I am a member, this bill is also informed by my service on the Armed Services Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence. Through this Banking-Armed Services-Intelligence perspective, I see that our economic security is indeed a matter of our national security, and this is particularly the case as our economy becomes ever more dependent on technology and the internet.

Indeed, General Darren W. McDew, the former commander of U.S. Transportation Command, which is charged with moving our military assets to meet our national security objectives in partnership with the private sector, offered several sobering assessments during an April 10, 2018 hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee. He stated that "cyber is the number one threat to U.S. Transportation Command, but I believe it is the number one threat to the nation . . . in our headquarters, cyber is the commander's business, but not everywhere across our country is cyber a CEO's business . . . in our cyber roundtables, which is one of the things we are doing to raise our level of awareness, some of the CEO's chief security officers cannot even get to the see the board, they cannot even . . . see the CEO. So that is a problem."

In my view, this is a real problem because, if we are attacked, the first strike will likely not be a physical one against the military but a cyber strike against the infrastructure of movement, logistics, and other critical assets in the civilian space.

With growing cyber threats, we all need to be more proactive in ensuring our Nation's cybersecurity before there are additional serious breaches. This legislation seeks to take one step towards that goal by encouraging publicly traded companies to be more transparent to their investors and customers on whether and how their boards of directors and senior management are prioritizing cybersecurity.

I thank the bill's supporters, including the North American Securities Administrators Association, the Council of Institutional Investors, the National Association of State Treasurers, the California Public Employees' Retirement System, the Bipartisan Policy Center, MIT Professor Simon Johnson, Columbia Law Professor Jack Coffee, Harvard Law Professor John Coates, K&L Gates LLP, and the Consumer Federation of America, and I urge my colleagues to join Senator COLLINS, Senator WARNER, Senator KENNEDY, Senator JONES, and me in supporting this legislation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. LEE):

S. 604. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 604

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 "Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON STATE WITHHOLDING AND TAXATION OF EMPLOYEE INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No part of the wages or other remuneration earned by an employee who performs employment duties in more than one State shall be subject to income tax in any State other than—

(1) the State of the employee's residence; and

(2) the State within which the employee is present and performing employment duties for more than 30 days during the calendar year in which the wages or other remuneration is earned.

(b) **WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.**—Wages or other remuneration earned in any calendar year shall not be subject to State income tax withholding and reporting requirements unless the employee is subject to income tax in such State under subsection (a). Income tax withholding and reporting requirements under subsection (a)(2) shall apply to wages or other remuneration earned as of the commencement date of employment duties in the State during the calendar year.

(c) **OPERATING RULES.**—For purposes of determining penalties related to an employer's State income tax withholding and reporting requirements—

(1) an employer may rely on an employee's annual determination of the time expected to be spent by such employee in the States in which the employee will perform duties absent—

(A) the employer's actual knowledge of fraud by the employee in making the determination; or

(B) collusion between the employer and the employee to evade tax;

(2) except as provided in paragraph (3), if records are maintained by an employer in the regular course of business that record the location of an employee, such records shall not preclude an employer's ability to rely on an employee's determination under paragraph (1); and

(3) notwithstanding paragraph (2), if an employer, at its sole discretion, maintains a time and attendance system that tracks where the employee performs duties on a daily basis, data from the time and attendance system shall be used instead of the employee's determination under paragraph (1).

(d) **DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.**—For purposes of this Act:

(1) **DAY.**—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an employee is considered present and performing employment duties within a State for a day if the employee performs more of the employee's employment duties within such State than in any other State during a day.

(B) If an employee performs employment duties in a resident State and in only one nonresident State during one day, such employee shall be considered to have performed more of the employee's employment duties in the nonresident State than in the resident State for such day.

(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the portion of the day during which the employee is in transit shall not be considered in determining the location of an employee's performance of employment duties.

(2) **EMPLOYEE.**—The term "employee" has the same meaning given to it by the State in which the employment duties are performed, except that the term "employee" shall not include a professional athlete, professional entertainer, qualified production employee, or certain public figures.

(3) **PROFESSIONAL ATHLETE.**—The term "professional athlete" means a person who performs services in a professional athletic event, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional athlete.

(4) **PROFESSIONAL ENTERTAINER.**—The term "professional entertainer" means a person of prominence who performs services in the professional performing arts for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis,

provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional entertainer.

(5) **QUALIFIED PRODUCTION EMPLOYEE.**—The term "qualified production employee" means a person who performs production services of any nature directly in connection with a State qualified, certified or approved film, television or other commercial video production for wages or other remuneration, provided that the wages or other remuneration paid to such person are qualified production costs or expenditures under such State's qualified, certified or approved film incentive program, and that such wages or other remuneration must be subject to withholding under such film incentive program as a condition to treating such wages or other remuneration as a qualified production cost or expenditure.

(6) **CERTAIN PUBLIC FIGURES.**—The term "certain public figures" means persons of prominence who perform services for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for services provided at a discrete event, in the nature of a speech, public appearance, or similar event.

(7) **EMPLOYER.**—The term "employer" has the meaning given such term in section 3401(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3401(d)), unless such term is defined by the State in which the employee's employment duties are performed, in which case the State's definition shall prevail.

(8) **STATE.**—The term "State" means any of the several States.

(9) **TIME AND ATTENDANCE SYSTEM.**—The term "time and attendance system" means a system in which—

(A) the employee is required on a contemporaneous basis to record his work location for every day worked outside of the State in which the employee's employment duties are primarily performed; and

(B) the system is designed to allow the employer to allocate the employee's wages for income tax purposes among all States in which the employee performs employment duties for such employer.

(10) **WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.**—The term "wages or other remuneration" may be limited by the State in which the employment duties are performed.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act shall take effect on January 1 of the second calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—This Act shall not apply to any tax obligation that accrues before the effective date of this Act.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 608. A bill to provide that chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code, relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements, shall not apply to enrollment agreements made between students and certain institutions of higher education, and to prohibit limitations on the ability of students to pursue claims against certain institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 608

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 "Court Legal Access and Student Support (CLASS) Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. INAPPLICABILITY OF CHAPTER 1 OF TITLE 9, UNITED STATES CODE, TO ENROLLMENT AGREEMENTS MADE BETWEEN STUDENTS AND CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code (relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements) shall not apply to an enrollment agreement made between a student and an institution of higher education.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON LIMITATIONS ON ABILITY OF STUDENTS TO PURSUE CLAIMS AGAINST CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(30) The institution will not require any student to agree to, and will not enforce, any limitation or restriction (including a limitation or restriction on any available choice of applicable law, a jury trial, or venue) on the ability of a student to pursue a claim, individually or with others, against an institution in court."

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before the Presidents Day recess, I announced that I would introduce legislation if the tax extenders weren't included in the legislation that we passed at that time that would keep government open.

Today I am following through on that promise with a bill that I am introducing with Finance Committee ranking member Senator WYDEN of Oregon.

It is fitting that I am taking this step in the same month as Groundhog Day, as the subject of my remarks is something that Congress has had to deal with too many times already.

Next to me is a depiction from the movie "Groundhog Day," which is about a man named Phil who must relive the same day over and over until he gets everything right. While we still need to break the cycle of repetitive short-term extensions, the right thing to do right now is to extend these already-expired provisions for 2018 and 2019.

As I have said before, the tax extenders are a collection of temporary tax

incentives that have required extension on a very regular basis in order to keep them available to the taxpayers. Currently, there are 26 provisions. At one time there were as many as 50-some. We have done away with some of them and made some of those laws permanent, but these 26 provisions expired at the end of 2017. They need to be extended, as well as three others that expired at the end of last year.

Today we are in the middle of filing season for 2018 tax returns, and taxpayers affected by these expired provisions need a resolution so that they can file. I want to stress that I want to find a long-term resolution so that we don't have to have temporary tax policy, but it is critical we make it clear to the taxpayers that these provisions are available for the 2018 filing season and extending them for this year will give us room to take a needed long-term view of this temporary tax policy.

Many of the tax extenders are intended to be incentives, and to be successful, then, these incentives need to be in effect before decisions can be made. That is why we should provide extensions for at least 2 years, to maximize that incentive effect. But it is also important that we extend these provisions for 2018, even though the year has obviously already ended. We have developed a very bad policy and a very bad habit of extending these tax provisions year after year, and people and businesses have come to expect that the extension will happen.

As a result, decisions were made by various businesses in 2018 based upon the expectation of extension, and that is a reasonable expectation because we have done it over decades. In other words, people did what we wanted them to do in their business decisions when these provisions were created. We should not retroactively punish these businesspeople for Congress's inaction.

Today, a diverse group of organizations, including the National Biodiesel Board, the American Trucking Associations, and the National Corn Growers Association, among others, sent a letter to congressional leaders requesting that the expired provisions be extended through 2019 as quickly as possible. I want to quote a few sentences from that letter:

Providing taxpayers with a predictable planning outlook as it pertains to tax rules is conducive to increased private sector investment and economic activity. Accordingly, we respectfully ask that you act to retroactively extend these expired tax provisions through 2019 on the first appropriate legislative vehicle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the U.S. House,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
U.S. House Republican Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
U.S. Senate Democratic Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD NEAL,
Chairman, U.S. House Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Ranking Republican Member, U.S. House Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Democratic Member, U.S. Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, REPUBLICAN LEADER MCCARTHY, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER, CHAIRMAN NEAL, RANKING MEMBER BRADY, CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY AND RANKING MEMBER WYDEN: The following organizations, representing diverse business, energy, transportation, real estate and agriculture sectors, are writing to you regarding the pressing need to address the expired tax provisions ("tax extenders"). We respectfully ask that at a minimum, the House and Senate retroactively extend these provisions through 2019 promptly in order to minimize potentially severe disruptions to the recently opened tax filing season.

These temporary tax provisions have remained lapsed since the end of 2017. This has created confusion for the numerous industry sectors that utilize these tax incentives and has threatened thousands of jobs in the U.S. economy. The continued uncertainty with regard to eventual congressional action on tax extenders is undermining the effectiveness of these incentives and stands as a needless barrier to additional job creation and economic growth in the private sector.

Providing taxpayers with a predictable planning outlook as it pertains to tax rules is conducive to increased private sector investment and economic activity. Accordingly, we respectfully ask that you act to retroactively extend these expired tax provisions through 2019 on the first appropriate legislative vehicle.

We sincerely appreciate your attention to this matter, and stand ready to work with you to achieve this important objective.

Sincerely,
Advanced Biofuels Association; Advanced Biofuels Business Council; Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA); Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute; Algae Biomass Organization; Alliantgroup; American Biogas Council; American Council of Engineering Companies; American Council On Renewable Energy (ACORE); American Horse Council; American Public Gas Association; American Public Transportation Association; American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association; American Soybean Association; American Trucking Associations; American Veterinary Medical Association; Association of American Railroads; Biomass Power Association; Biotechnology Innovation Organization; Business Council for Sustainable Energy; CCIM Institute; Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions; Coalition for Energy Efficient Jobs & Investment; Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas (RNG Coalition);

February 28, 2019.

Community Transportation Association of America; Copper Development Association; Directors Guild of America; E2 (Environmental Entrepreneurs); Education Theatre Association EDTA; Electric Drive Transportation Association; Energy Recovery Council; Fuel Cell and Hydrogen Energy Association; Growth Energy; and Hearth, Patio & Barbecue Association.

Independent Electrical Contractors; Independent Film and Television Alliance; Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association; Institute of Real Estate Management®; NAESCO (National Association of Energy Service Companies); National Association of Home Builders; NAHB; National Association of REALTORS®; National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO); National Association of Truckstop Operators; National Biodiesel Board; National Corn Growers Association; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Employment Opportunity Network (NEON); National Hydro-power Association; National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association; National Propane Gas Association; National Railroad Construction and Maintenance Association; National Real Estate Investors Association; National Renderers Association; National Thoroughbred Racing Association; NEFI; NGV America; Pellet Fuels Institute; Renewable Fuels Association; South West Transit Association; The American Society of Cost Segregation Professionals; The Railway Engineering-Maintenance Suppliers Association (REMSA); The Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors National Association (SMACNA); Tile Roofing Industry Alliance; U.S. Canola Association.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, another very important point I want to make has to do with the question about whether an extender package should be offset or not. Around here, the word "offset" means if you have tax provisions that might lose revenue, then do you have other revenue coming in to take its place? The House has decided that is what you should do—pay as you go, or PAYGO, as they might call it. It is a rule of the House.

I have a long record of promoting budget responsibility, and I am as concerned about the deficit and debt as anyone. However, we also have bipartisan precedent for treating the extension of temporary tax policy, like these extenders, just as we treat the extension of annual spending policy. In neither case do we need offset for such extensions. In other words, it is all right to spend more money or continue to spend the same amount of money after a program has expired, and you don't have to offset it when you have tax law that has been on the books for a couple of decades, and it is sunset. Why should you have to sunset that? There are a few people around here who think it is all right to spend money without offsets, but it is wrong to do tax policy unless you have offsets.

There are a few specific items in this legislation that I want to take time to mention. Significant work has already been done to provide long-term solutions on two extenders—the short line railroad tax credit and the biodiesel tax credit.

The bill I am introducing extends those credits at their current levels for 2018 and 2019. I want my colleagues to

know that I still remain committed to enacting the compromises that several of our colleagues and I worked with the stakeholders to achieve.

The bill also includes an extension of a proposal adopted last Congress that would extend the 7.5-percent floor for itemized deductions of medical expenses. Without this provision, the floor on deductions will be 10 percent for 2019. This means that without this provision, individuals with chronic illnesses and high medical expenses would have to pay more for healthcare before that excess can be deducted in the expenses on their 2019 tax returns.

This proposal is a very important priority for one of our best colleagues, Senator COLLINS. She deserves a lot of credit for getting what has turned into a bipartisan proposal to help many Americans facing catastrophic medical expenses.

Finally, the legislation includes provisions to assist Americans who have been affected by natural disasters in 2018. This package includes proposals that we have adopted in prior years to help Americans recover from natural disasters across our country. For example, the package would allow increased access to retirement funds and relax restrictions around charitable giving. I am sure everyone here would like to help people affected by these natural disasters as soon as we are able to.

I don't want my comments today to imply that each tax extender should be permanently extended, but the right thing to do now is to provide extensions for at least 2018 and 2019. In the long term, Congress needs to decide if these provisions should be allowed to expire or if they should be phased out or if they should be made permanent as current tax policy or modified in some way beyond expiring, phasing out, or being made permanent.

Those decisions need to be made after we resolve the short-term crisis caused by the current lapse. These provisions have support of Members on both sides of the aisle. For people who think that things around here get done only with Republicans fighting Democrats or vice versa, these provisions have wide bipartisan support.

There is a solid foundation for a long-term package consisting of many of these provisions in one form or another. We need to get past today so that we can chart the course for a reliable future for the tax extenders and give business some certainty.

Just as Phil wants to stop living the same day over and over again, I think all of us want to break the cycle of short-term extensions of, in many cases, very popular tax policy. The legislation I introduce today with the ranking member, Senator WYDEN of Oregon, is a critical first step toward helping taxpayers complete their 2018 returns and helping us begin work on a long-term solution to temporary tax policy.

I have asked our majority leader to rule XIV this bill onto the calendar,

and I urge the House to send us a tax bill to address the extenders without further delay.

Just this morning, I had discussions with Iowa Congressmen of both political parties about this issue to contact the leadership of the House and the leadership of the Ways and Means Committee on the importance of moving legislation since the Constitution doesn't allow the Senate to move tax legislation in the first place.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 638. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, during the debate on the nomination of Andrew Wheeler to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency I came to the floor to express concerns on a number of issues, including EPA's regulation of per- and poly-fluorinated alkyl substances—PFAS.

PFAS are a class of man-made chemicals developed in the 1940s. PFAS can be found across industries in many products, including food packaging, nonstick pans, clothing, furniture, and firefighting foam used by the military. These chemicals have a long and tragic history—suffice it to say that their widespread use resulted too many Americans without access to safe drinking water.

This very issue is a matter of some controversy as EPA has failed to provide meaningful and swift action on these chemicals under this administration. That is why I am here today to introduce a bipartisan bill to designate PFAS chemicals as hazardous substances under the Federal superfund law. The Carper-Capito-Peters-Tillis-Stabenow-Rubio-Merkley-Gardner-Reed-Murkowski-Shaheen-Burr-Bennet-Manchin bill will force EPA to begin the rulemaking process to protecting Americans from overexposure to these harmful chemicals and hold polluters accountable. It is very similar to legislation that has already been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL.

In his confirmation hearing, Andrew Wheeler said, and I quote:

It is these Americans that President Trump and his Administration are focused on, Americans without access to safe drinking water or Americans living on or near

hazardous sites, often unaware of the health risks they and their families face. Many of these sites have languished for years, even decades. How can these Americans prosper if they cannot live, learn, or work in healthy environments? The answer is simple. They cannot. President Trump understands this and that is why he is focused on putting Americans first.

One would think those words might mean that there could be some common ground at least on addressing PFAS. After all, who wouldn't agree that we should be acting with urgency to address contamination from these hazardous chemicals?

According to one 2017 study, drinking water supplies for 6 million U.S. residents have exceeded the EPA's lifetime health advisory for these chemicals.

Another 2018 study performed by the Environmental Working Group reports that up to 110 million Americans could have PFAS-contaminated water.

In 2016, the Department of Defense announced that it was assessing the risk of groundwater contamination from firefighting foam at dozens of fire and crash testing sites across the country. It is likely that they are all contaminated.

Just last year, the town of Blades in my home State of Delaware alerted its 1,250 residents, as well as businesses and schools that use public water, to stop using public water for drinking or cooking because PFAS chemicals were present at nearly twice the Federal health advisory level. Reportedly, 36 of 67 sampled groundwater wells on Dover Air Force Base showed dangerously high levels of PFOA and PFOS. And it is not just Delaware—contamination is widespread, in red States and blue States, in small water systems and large ones, on military sites and in residential areas, from Maine to Alaska.

It is essential that we legislate to require EPA to designate PFOA and PFOS as "hazardous substances," which means that polluters could be held responsible for cleaning it up under the superfund law. In its recently released PFAS Action Plan, EPA has said again that it would issue this proposal in the future but did not indicate how long it will take to complete. Unfortunately, it has no sense of urgency to address these emerging contaminants and to protect American's from harmful levels of contamination.

EPA had an opportunity to take action to address PFAS chemicals in a real and comprehensive way; however, time and again, it has failed to move in an expeditious and meaningful way. That is why this bill is so important. Designating these chemicals as hazardous substances will, at a minimum, start the process to getting these contaminated sites cleaned up. This not the silver bullet to the broader contamination problems, but it is a start.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BENNET,

Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KING, and Mr. UDALL):

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution calling on the United States and Congress to take immediate action to address the challenge of climate change; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am joined this morning by a group of my Democratic colleagues to talk about the greatest threat facing our country and our planet—climate change. Despite the gravity and scale of the problem, at no time in the past 5 years have Republicans brought even a single bill to the floor to meaningfully address climate change. They brought CRAs to the floor to repeal critical environmental protections that limited the emission of greenhouse gases like methane. They brought legislation to open up more Federal lands to oil drilling, but they haven't brought forward a single meaningful bill to address climate change.

Ironically, the first bill Leader MCCONNELL would bring to the floor on climate change is a bill that he and his party intend to vote against. What a ridiculous sham; what a pathetic political stunt. It would be a stunt on its own from a leader who just a month ago claimed he didn't bring sham bills to the floor, but it is an even greater stunt because they have nothing positive to say about dealing with this climate crisis.

So today, Democrats will be introducing a resolution to steer the direction of this conversation about climate change back in the right direction—all 47 Democrats, every single one.

We are introducing a resolution that affirms three simple things: First, climate change is real; second, climate change is changed by human activity; and third, Congress must act immediately to address this problem. These are three simple things—three things that the vast majority of the American people agree with. Two are plain facts, and the third is just a statement that Congress should take action in light of those two facts.

Our resolution does not prescribe what action we should take. It doesn't say that someone has to be for this solution or that solution. It simply states that climate change is happening, and we ought to do something about it. It is like saying that opioid

abuse is a problem, and we should do something. Surely every Senator agrees with that.

In an ideal world, every single Republican Senator would sign on to our climate change resolution because there should be nothing controversial about it at all. But because one political party in America largely denies the science or, as I am sure my colleague from Rhode Island will address, is so in the pocket of Big Oil that it refuses to admit the severity of it, I suspect many of our Republican colleagues will not sign on, and what a shame—that a shame—that would be. At least the American people will know which of their Senators denies the overwhelming consensus of the scientific community.

So if and when Leader MCCONNELL moves to proceed to the Green New Deal, Democrats will demand a vote on our resolution, and we will see if Leader MCCONNELL is so eager to take that vote.

Again, I have asked him every day; I asked him earlier this morning: Leader MCCONNELL, do you believe climate change is real? Leader MCCONNELL, do you believe it is caused by human activity? And, Leader MCCONNELL, do you believe Congress has to act to deal with climate change? We have simply heard silence from the leader and from just about every other Republican so far.

So we are going to push this resolution, and we hope the American people will let their Senators who are not on this resolution know that they should be on it. It is the first step to moving something in a positive direction because we intend to go on offense on climate.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you for the recognition, Madam President.

Today I rise to call on this body to defend the Constitution, to protect the separation of powers, and to safeguard Congress's role as a coequal branch of government.

Today I am introducing a bipartisan resolution with my Senate colleagues to terminate the President's declaration of a national emergency to build his border wall.

My partners in this effort include Senator COLLINS, who is with me today. She will be here momentarily. Also partners are Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator SHAHEEN.

I just want to say to Senator COLLINS that I commend her on her principled stance and on standing up for the Constitution.

The vote we will take on this resolution is historic. This is no longer about the President's wall. This is not about party. This is not about protecting the very heart of our American system.

This is about protecting the very heart of our American system of governance.

Congress—and only Congress—holds the power of the purse. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution clearly states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law." The Constitution is absolutely clear.

Congress's power to make spending decisions is very clear. There is no ambiguity. Deciding how to spend public funds is among our most fundamental powers and responsibilities under the Constitution. The Founders gave this power to the legislative body, not the executive, to ensure there is a broad support for how public funds are spent.

Consequential and far-reaching decisions about spending taxpayer money are not left to one person, not even the President.

This body has rejected the President's request to give him \$5.7 billion for his wall along the southern border with Mexico. On February 14, not 2 weeks ago, we passed the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2019 by a vote of 83 to 16. That compromise bill did not include the \$5.7 billion the President wanted to build his wall.

Whether you believe Congress should fund the President's wall is not at issue. This is a question about the strength of the rule of law in this country and about the separation of powers, which forms the foundation of our American government.

The President's declaration of a national emergency is an end-run around Congress's power to appropriate—plain and simple. To quote Senator COLLINS, the President is "usurping congressional authority."

We are the representatives of the people. The people do not want to spend \$5.7 billion on the President's wall, and we must protect their will.

Let's be clear. This emergency declaration has serious implications for States all across the country. To build this wall, the White House will raid \$3.6 billion from the Department of Defense's military construction budget and \$2.5 billion from that Department's drug interdiction program, but the White House apparently failed to realize there are only about \$80 million in the drug interdiction account. So we should be prepared for a raid on other accounts or taking even more from military construction funding.

These are military construction funds that Congress already has appropriated for specific projects necessary to support the national security priorities of the United States. I am privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committee. I understand the hard and careful work that goes into these funding decisions.

From my home State of New Mexico, Congress allocated some \$85 million to construct a formal training unit at Holloman Air Force Base in the southern part of New Mexico for unmanned aerial vehicles. This investment in technology tracks terrorists

and protects our national security. We allocated \$40 million to the White Sands Missile Range to build an information systems facility badly needed for next-generation research and development activities at the range. Both of these projects were vetted over several years and deemed important to our national security.

New Mexico is not alone. Many States' military bases and regional economies will be impacted. Colorado, for example, is at risk of losing almost \$100 million for construction projects at Fort Carson near Colorado Springs. Ohio risks \$61 million for the first installment for building at the National Air and Space Intelligence Center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Military construction projects totaling \$210 million are at risk in Florida, \$520 million in Texas, \$81 million in Utah, and the list goes on and on. Projects in every corner of the country will be impacted.

According to the 1976 Senate report from the National Emergencies Act, the President's emergency power may "be utilized only when actual emergencies exist." As a border Senator, I am here to tell you that there is no actual national security emergency at our southern border necessitating a massive wall along the southern border, as this body has already determined. This is a matter where the President and Congress have disagreed and the President is trying to overrule Congress by fiat.

A bipartisan group of 58 former national security officials are sounding the alarm. They write: "Under no plausible assessment of the evidence is there a national emergency today that entitles the president to tap into funds appropriated for other purposes to build a wall at the southern border."

The evidence speaks for itself. The number of border apprehensions has decreased dramatically. Since the early 2000s, southern border apprehensions have dropped 81 percent. The number of apprehensions at the end of fiscal year 2017 was the lowest it has been since 1971—a 46-year low. We have the lowest number of undocumented immigrants in our country that we have had in over a decade.

The Pew Research Center estimated recently that the total number of undocumented immigrants residing in the United States is far less than since 2004. That is a 14-year low. And more people emigrate to Mexico from the United States than immigrate from Mexico to here. That is right. We have a negative net migration rate with Mexico.

I am one of the four States that border Mexico—one of the four States that will be the most directly affected by a wall. I know for an absolute fact that there is no national security emergency along my State's border with Mexico. It is quite the opposite.

New Mexico's border communities are thriving. International commerce is thriving. Our multicultural commu-

nities are thriving. Crime rates are low.

A wall like the President wants would be disastrous for a State like New Mexico. It will seize away private property and carve up family ranches, farms, and homesteads. It will harm the beautiful but fragile environment there on the border.

Again, whether you support the President's wall is not at issue on this vote. As Senator TILLIS put it in an op-ed in the Washington Post, "I support President Trump's vision on border security. But I would vote against the emergency."

Another Senate Republican Senator recently said, "Congress has been ceding far too much power to the executive branch for decades. We should use this moment as an opportunity to start taking power back."

Over 20 former Republican Senators and Representatives were compelled to pen a letter opposing the emergency declaration. They state: "It has always been a Republican fundamental principle that no matter how strong our policy preferences, no matter how deep our loyalties to presidents and party leaders, in order to remain a constitutional republic we must act within the borders of the Constitution."

The time to act is now. Litigation has been filed, but Congress should resolve the issue of our own constitutional authority and not wait for the courts.

Let me repeat. The vote we will take will be historic. It is imperative that all of us—Republican and Democrat—protect and defend our Constitution and that we protect and defend the checks and balances that unequivocally place the power of the purse with Congress and that we affirm our powers—powers that are separate from the President's.

Our oath is to uphold the Constitution, and the Constitution is clear. The Constitution does not empower the President to raid money by decree just because Congress has already said no.

I will vote to terminate the President's declaration of the national emergency to build his wall, and I will urge everyone in this Chamber to protect our constitutional prerogative and to do so as well.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the resolution that I am joining Senator UDALL in introducing. It would reverse the President's ill-advised decision to declare a national emergency and commandeer funding provided for other purposes by Congress and instead redirect it to construct a wall on our southern border.

I thank Senator UDALL for his leadership and also recognize the support we have received from our cosponsors, Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator SHAHEEN.

Let me be clear. The question before us is not whether to support or oppose the wall. It is not whether to support or oppose President Trump. Rather, it is this: Do we want the executive

branch now or in the future to hold a power that the Founders deliberately entrusted to Congress?

It has been said that Congress's most precious power is the power of the purse set out in plain language in article I, section 9 of our Constitution. It reads as follows: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law."

Alexander Hamilton, in Federalist 72, made clear the Founders' view that only the legislative branch commands this power, not the judiciary and not the executive. James Madison, in Federalist 58, called the power of the purse "the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the [. . .] representatives of the people."

Congress's power was jealously guarded in the early days of our Republic. No less an authority on our constitutional framework than Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story, in his famous "Commentaries," explained that "[i]f it were otherwise, the executive would possess an unbounded power over the public purse of the nation, and might apply all its monied resources at his pleasure."

Throughout our history, the courts have consistently held that "only Congress is empowered by the Constitution to adopt laws directing monies to be spent from the U.S. treasury."

I strongly support protecting the institutional prerogatives of the U.S. Senate and the system of checks and balances that is central to the structure of our government.

I support funding for better border security, including physical barriers where they make sense. I understand the President is disappointed that the funding he requested did not pass, but the failure of Congress to pass funding in the amount the President prefers cannot become an excuse for the President to usurp the powers of the legislative branch.

This is not the first time I have made this argument against Executive overreach. In 2015, I authored the Immigration Rule of Law Act, legislation that would have provided a statutory basis for the Dreamer population, while rolling back President Obama's 2014 Executive orders expanding that program.

As I explained at the time, even though I supported comprehensive immigration reform and was disappointed that it had not passed, I rejected the notion that its failure could serve as the justification for President Obama to implement by Executive fiat that which Congress had refused to pass, regardless of the wisdom of Congress's decision.

I would now like to turn to a discussion of the National Emergencies Act. This act was passed in 1976 to standardize the process by which the President can invoke national emergency powers and Congress can terminate the declaration through a joint resolution such as the one we are introducing today.

The act is procedural in nature. It lays out the process the President must follow to declare a national emergency but does not provide the President with any additional powers. Instead, it requires the President to specify where, in existing law, he has been granted the authority for the powers he intends to exercise.

By itself, the National Emergencies Act does not give the President the power to repurpose billions of dollars to build a wall. The President must look elsewhere for that authority.

In his declaration, the President cites the authority provided by title 10, section 2808 of the U.S. Code, which relates to "Construction authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency." But that authorization applies only to "military construction projects" that are "necessary to support [the] use of the armed forces." I do not believe this provision can be fairly read to bootstrap the presence of troops along the southern border into the authority to build a wall as a military construction project.

The question isn't whether the President can act in an emergency but whether he can do so in a manner that would undermine the congressional power of the purse.

Here, I think we need a better understanding of what should qualify as an emergency. One place we could turn is to a five-part test originally developed by the Office of Management and Budget in 1991, under former President George Herbert Walker Bush, to determine whether requested funding merited an "emergency spending" designation under our budget rules.

Under that test, a spending request was designated as an "emergency" only if all five of the following conditions were met:

First, expenditures had to be necessary; second, the need had to be sudden, coming into being quickly, not building up over time; third, the need had to be urgent; fourth, the need had to be unforeseen; and fifth, the need could not be permanent.

I raise this test only by way of analogy, but it is fair to say that whether or not you agree with the President that more should be done to secure the southern border—and I do agree with the President's goal—his decision to fund a border wall through a national emergency declaration would not pass this five-part test.

The President's declaration also has practical implications for the military construction appropriations process, as my colleague has pointed out.

Last year, in testimony before the Appropriations Committee, the Department of Defense said that the President's budget request for military construction funding was crucial to support our national defense, including construction projects to improve military readiness and increase the lethality of the force. This includes missile defense, improved facilities in Europe to deter Russian aggression,

and infrastructure to operationalize the F-35 stealth fighter.

This also included several important efforts at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Maine that are vital to the Navy conducting timely maintenance and refueling of our Nation's submarines. Shifting funding away from these vital projects is shortsighted and could have very real national security implications.

We must defend Congress's institutional powers, as the Founders hoped we would, even when doing so is inconvenient or goes against the outcome we might prefer.

The gridlock we have experienced on difficult issues like border security and immigration reform is not simply a failure to get our work done but a reflection of the fact that we have yet to reach a consensus.

The President's emergency declaration is ill-advised precisely because it attempts to shortcut the process of checks and balances by usurping Congress's authority. This resolution blocks that overreach, and I hope, regardless of our colleague's position on the construction of the border wall, that we will join together to assert Congress's constitutional authority in the appropriations process.

I urge our colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. UDALL. Would the Senator yield?

Ms. COLLINS. I would be happy to.

Mr. UDALL. I just want to say, because we have both been here for a bit talking on the floor about this, I want to thank Senator COLLINS for standing up for principle. I want to thank her for standing up for our Constitution. It is a real honor to join her in this resolution of disapproval.

I also, as she just did, thank the two other Senators who are joining us, Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator SHAHEEN. I thank the Senator very much.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I would thank the Senator for his gracious comments. As always, it has been a great pleasure to work with him, and I know he cares deeply about the constitutional principle that brings us to the floor today. Let us defend the Constitution.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 85—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF EASTERSEALS, A LEADING ADVOCATE AND SERVICE PROVIDER FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES, INCLUDING VETERANS AND OLDER ADULTS, AND THEIR CAREGIVERS AND FAMILIES

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 85

Whereas, on April 22, 1919, an organization now known as Easterseals was formed to

highlight and address the health care and service needs of children with disabilities;

Whereas, in 1945, Easterseals expanded its mission by opening its programs and services to returning veterans of World War II and other adults with disabilities;

Whereas, since its inception, Easterseals has strongly advocated for essential services and support for individuals with disabilities and diverse needs, including by authoring a "Bill of Rights" for children with disabilities in 1931 that led to government-funded disability services and by increasing public awareness and support through national campaigns, including its successful "seals" campaign;

Whereas Easterseals has grown from humble beginnings in Elyria, Ohio, to become a national network of leading nonprofit organizations in States across the country that deliver high-quality, local services and support to help children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older adults, live independently, achieve milestones, and fully participate in their communities, and to help caregivers and families of children and adults with disabilities;

Whereas Easterseals partners with the Federal Government, State and local governments, corporations, foundations, and other entities to provide or connect individuals with disabilities and their families with early childhood education and intervention services, employment assistance and placement services, transportation solutions, mental health services, respite services, camping and recreation activities, and caregiving and aging support; and

Whereas Easterseals continues the mission and commitment to service envisioned by its founder, Edgar Allen, a parent, businessman, and Rotarian, who concluded, "Your life and mine shall be valued not by what we take, but by what we give." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates April 22, 2019, as the 100th anniversary of the founding of Easterseals; and

(2) recognizes Easterseals for—

(A) its impact during the past 100 years in the lives of millions of people in the United States; and

(B) its commitment to expanding possibilities for children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older adults, to ensure that all individuals can live, learn, work, and play in their communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 86—PROVIDING FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. BLUNT submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:.

S. RES. 86

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Blunt, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Wicker, Ms. Klobuchar, and Mr. Udall.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Blunt, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Ms. Klobuchar, and Mr. Leahy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 87—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A COLLECTION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 87

Resolved, That a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate, together with related materials, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed 250 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 88—DESIGNATING MARCH 1, 2019, AS “READ ACROSS AMERICA DAY”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 88

Whereas reading is—

- (1) a basic requirement for quality education and professional success; and
- (2) a source of pleasure throughout life;

Whereas the people of the United States must be able to read if the United States is to remain competitive in the global economy;

Whereas Congress has placed great emphasis on reading intervention and providing additional resources for reading assistance, including through—

- (1) the programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); and
- (2) annual appropriations for library and literacy programs; and

Whereas more than 50 national organizations concerned about reading and education have joined with the National Education Association to designate March 2, the anniversary of the birth of Theodor Geisel (commonly known as “Dr. Seuss”), as a day to celebrate reading; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) designates March 1, 2019, as “Read Across America Day”;;

- (2) honors—

(A) all authors for their success in encouraging children to discover the joy of reading; and

(B) the 22nd anniversary of Read Across America Day; and

- (3) encourages—

(A) parents, educators, and communities to read with children for at least 30 minutes on Read Across America Day and, in honor of the commitment of the Senate to building a country of readers, to promote—

- (i) a love of reading; and
- (ii) opportunities for all children to see themselves reflected in literature; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe Read Across America Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 89—EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE SENATE AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE MASS SHOOTING IN AURORA, ILLINOIS, ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following

resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 89

Whereas, on February 15, 2019, a gunman opened fire at his coworkers in the Henry Pratt Company warehouse in Aurora, Illinois;

Whereas 5 innocent people were tragically killed in this mass shooting, and others, including officers of the Aurora Police Department, were wounded;

Whereas the innocent employees who lost their lives that day were—

(1) Russell Beyer, age 47, of Yorkville, Illinois, a 25-year company employee, proud union man and shop chairman, a loving father of 2 children and a beloved son and brother, and a “fun, loving gentle giant of a guy,” who “would truly give you the shirt off his back”;;

(2) Vicente Juarez, age 54, of Oswego, Illinois, a 15-year company employee and union man, a loving husband and father of 3 children and grandfather of 8, who had a passion for working on his 1969 Chevy Impala;

(3) Clayton “Clay” Parks, age 32, of Elgin, Illinois, a 2014 graduate of the College of Business at Northern Illinois University, a loving husband and father to his 9-month-old son, a leader and mentor, and an avid Chicago sports fan with a contagious smile and laugh, whose greatest joy was his family;

(4) Josh Pinkard, age 37, of Oswego, Illinois, a plant manager for the company since 2018, and a loving husband and father of 3 children, whose heartbreaking final message to his wife was, “I love you, I’ve been shot at work”; and

(5) Trevor Wehner, age 21, of Sheridan, Illinois, a senior at Northern Illinois University who was killed on the first day of an internship, a loving son, brother, and boyfriend, and a high school and college baseball player active in his community who “never met a stranger” and “made friends with everyone young and old”;;

Whereas officers from the Aurora Police Department swiftly arrived at the shooting scene within 4 minutes of the first 911 call;

Whereas the officers who arrived were fired upon by the gunman almost immediately, 5 officers were wounded, and more officers rushed in to take their place;

Whereas Aurora Police Chief Kristen Ziman said that—

(1) “Every time an officer was shot, another went in. No one retreated. They forged ahead with shields and weapons as true warriors do and no one backed down until the threat was eliminated.”; and

(2) “The officers who were shot that day put their own lives at risk to save others. They are what it means to be a warrior. Those who were in the gunfight and those who stood ready to battle are just as worthy of the term hero.”;;

Whereas the 6 officers wounded or injured were—

(1) Officer Diego Avila, who has served since 2016;

(2) Officer John Cebulski, who has served since 1988;

(3) Officer Marco Gomez, who has served since 2005;

(4) Officer Adam Miller, who has served since 2015;

(5) Officer Reynaldo Rivera, who has served since 1995; and

(6) Officer James Zegar, who has served since 1993;

Whereas the Aurora Fire Department and a broad array of municipal, county, State, and Federal law enforcement and medical support agencies also responded to the emergency promptly and assisted capably in the initial crisis and the subsequent investigation;

Whereas the people of Illinois and the United States are thankful to law enforcement officers, firefighters, 911 emergency dispatchers, and emergency medical teams for their heroic response to the shooting;

Whereas the Aurora shooting that took the lives of 2 members of the Northern Illinois University community took place one day after the February 14th anniversary of the 2008 mass shooting at Northern Illinois University that killed 5 students and wounded 17 others;

Whereas communities across Illinois, including the city of Chicago, and across the United States have suffered from the epidemic of gun violence in the United States;

Whereas the people of Aurora, Illinois, have now joined the ever-growing list of communities that have suffered from a mass shooting; and

Whereas the Aurora community has come together in support of the families and loved ones of the victims and those injured by this mass shooting and, will, in the words of Aurora Mayor Richard Irvin, “emerge as a stronger city”; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its sincere condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those who were killed in the tragic shooting on February 15, 2019, in Aurora, Illinois; Russell Beyer, Vicente Juarez, Clayton Parks, Josh Pinkard, and Trevor Wehner;

(2) extends its support and prayers to those who were wounded or injured and wishes them a speedy recovery;

(3) commends the law enforcement officers, emergency responders, and medical personnel who responded to the shooting with professionalism, dedication, and bravery;

(4) expresses its support for the Aurora community in this difficult time; and

(5) stands in solidarity with the victims of senseless gun violence in communities across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 90—DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 28, 2019, AS “RARE DISEASE DAY”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 90

Whereas a rare disease or disorder is one that affects a small number of patients, which, in the United States, is considered to be a population of fewer than 200,000 individuals;

Whereas, as of the date of the adoption of this resolution, more than 7,000 rare diseases affect as many as 30,000,000 people in the United States and their families;

Whereas children with rare diseases account for a significant portion of the population affected by rare diseases in the United States;

Whereas many rare diseases are serious and life-threatening and lack effective treatments;

Whereas, as a result of the Orphan Drug Act (Public Law 97-414; 96 Stat. 2049), there have been important advances made in the research of, and treatment for, rare diseases;

Whereas the Food and Drug Administration has made great strides in gathering patient perspectives to inform the drug review process as part of the Patient-Focused Drug Development program, an initiative that was reaffirmed under the FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-52; 131 Stat. 1005);

Whereas, although more than 750 orphan indications for drugs and biological products

have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of rare diseases, millions of people in the United States have a rare disease for which there is no approved treatment;

Whereas lack of access to effective treatments and difficulty in obtaining reimbursement for life-altering, and even life-saving, treatments remain significant challenges for people with rare diseases and their families;

Whereas rare diseases and conditions include McArdle disease, Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, acoustic neuroma, Paget disease, Landau-Kleffner syndrome, necrotizing fasciitis, mucopolysaccharidosis type I, Rasmussen encephalitis, Sanfilippo syndrome, Prader-Willi syndrome, Wagner syndrome, Barth syndrome, and many rare cancers;

Whereas people with rare diseases experience challenges that include—

(1) difficulty in obtaining accurate diagnoses;

(2) limited treatment options; and

(3) difficulty finding physicians or treatment centers with expertise in the rare disease affecting the individual;

Whereas the 115th/ Congress passed a 10-year extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program under title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.), ensuring health insurance coverage for many children with rare diseases;

Whereas both the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health have established special offices to support and facilitate rare disease research and treatments;

Whereas the National Organization for Rare Disorders (referred to in this preamble as "NORD"), a nonprofit organization established in 1983 to provide services to, and advocate on behalf of, patients with rare diseases, remains a critical public voice for people with rare diseases;

Whereas 2019 marks the 36th/ anniversary of the enactment of the Orphan Drug Act (Public Law 97-414; 96 Stat. 2049) and the establishment of NORD;

Whereas NORD sponsors Rare Disease Day in the United States and partners with many other major rare disease organizations to increase public awareness of rare diseases;

Whereas Rare Disease Day is observed each year on the last day of February;

Whereas Rare Disease Day is a global event that—

(1) was first observed in the United States on February 28, 2009; and

(2) was observed in more than 90 countries in 2018; and

Whereas Rare Disease Day is expected to be observed globally for years to come, providing hope and information for rare disease patients around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 28, 2019, as "Rare Disease Day";

(2) recognizes the importance of improving awareness and encouraging accurate and early diagnosis of rare diseases and disorders; and

(3) supports a national and global commitment to improving access to, and developing new treatments, diagnostics, and cures for, rare diseases and disorders.

SENATE RESOLUTION 91—DESIGNATING MARCH 3, 2019, AS "WORLD WILDLIFE DAY"

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 91

Whereas wildlife has provided numerous economic, environmental, social, and cultural benefits during the course of human history and wildlife conservation will secure those gifts for future generations;

Whereas plant and animal species play an important role in the stability of diverse ecosystems around the world and the conservation of that biodiversity is critical to maintain the delicate balance of nature and keep complex ecosystems thriving;

Whereas millions of individuals in the United States strongly support the conservation of wildlife, both domestically and abroad, and wish to ensure the survival of species in the wild;

Whereas the trafficking of wildlife, including timber and fish, comprises the fourth largest global illegal trade after narcotics, the counterfeiting of products and currency, and human trafficking and has become a major transnational organized crime with an estimated worth of as much as \$23,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas increased demand in Asia for high-value illegal wildlife products, particularly elephant ivory and rhinoceros horns, has triggered substantial and rapid increases in poaching of those species;

Whereas the trafficking of wildlife is a primary threat to many wildlife species, including elephants, rhinoceroses, tigers, pangolins, and sharks;

Whereas many different kinds of criminals, including some terrorist entities and rogue security personnel, often in collusion with corrupt government officials, are involved in wildlife poaching and the movement of ivory and rhinoceros horns across Africa;

Whereas wildlife poaching presents significant security and stability challenges for military and police forces in African nations that are often threatened by heavily armed poachers and the criminal, extremist allies of those poachers;

Whereas wildlife poaching negatively impacts local communities that rely on natural resources for economic development, including through tourism;

Whereas assisting institutions in developing nations, including by providing material, training, legal, and diplomatic support, can reduce illegal wildlife trade;

Whereas wildlife provides a multitude of benefits to all nations and wildlife crime has wide-ranging economic, environmental, and social impacts;

Whereas the African Elephant Status Report 2016 issued by the International Union for Conservation of Nature revealed that the elephant population of Africa has recently seen a dramatic decline, mainly due to poaching, and the continental population is now thought to be approximately 415,000;

Whereas, from 2007 to 2012, the number of elephants killed in Kenya increased by more than 800 percent, from 47 to 387 elephants killed;

Whereas, between 2002 and 2013, as a result of poaching, about 65 percent of the forest elephant population in Central Africa was killed and forest elephants lost 30 percent of the geographical range of forest elephants, placing forest elephants on track for extinction in the next decade;

Whereas fewer than 50,000 wild Asian elephants remain and poaching of these populations is on the rise, with an average of 1 elephant poached every week in Burma, driven by demand for elephant skin products;

Whereas the number of rhinoceroses killed by poachers in South Africa—

(1) dramatically increased from 13 in 2007 to 1,215 in 2014, an increase of more than 9,000 percent; and

(2) was 769 in 2018;

Whereas—

(1) the 3 species of Asian rhinoceroses also remain under constant threat of poaching; and

(2) the total populations of Javan and Sumatran rhinoceros number fewer than 100 individuals in the wild;

Whereas fewer than 4,000 tigers remain in the wild throughout Asia;

Whereas pangolins are often referred to as the most trafficked mammal in the world;

Whereas all 8 pangolin species spanning Africa and Asia are faced with extinction because pangolin scales are sought after in the practice of traditional Chinese medicine and pangolin meat is considered a delicacy;

Whereas the oceans—

(1) cover $\frac{3}{4}$ of the surface of the Earth;

(2) contain 97 percent of the water on the Earth;

(3) represent 99 percent of the living space on the earth by volume; and

(4) contain nearly 200,000 identified animal species;

Whereas the global market value of marine and coastal resources and industries is estimated to be approximately \$3,000,000,000,000 per year, representing about 5 percent of global gross domestic product;

Whereas more than 3,000,000,000 people depend on marine and coastal biodiversity for their livelihoods;

Whereas an estimated 8,000,000 metric tons of plastic enter the ocean every year, harming a wide range of wildlife species;

Whereas illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (referred to in this preamble as "IUU fishing") represents a multibillion dollar criminal industry that—

(1) undercuts the economic livelihoods of legitimate fishermen;

(2) weakens marine animal populations;

(3) poses a threat to international security; and

(4) threatens food security for communities around the world;

Whereas overfishing—

(1) contributes to the rapid depletion of many species of fish; and

(2) hinders efforts to save and restore global fisheries and the jobs relating to those fisheries;

Whereas approximately 100,000,000 sharks are killed annually, often targeted solely for their fins, and unsustainable trade is the primary cause of serious population decline in several shark species, including scalloped hammerhead sharks, great hammerhead sharks, and oceanic whitetip sharks;

Whereas the vaquita porpoise of Mexico, with fewer than 14 individual porpoises remaining, is being driven to extinction;

Whereas penal and financial deterrents can—

(1) improve the ability of governments to reduce poaching, trafficking, and IUU fishing; and

(2) enhance the capabilities of those governments to manage their resources;

Whereas the United States is developing and implementing measures to address the criminal, financial, security, and environmental aspects of wildlife trafficking;

Whereas Congress has allocated specific resources to combat wildlife trafficking and IUU fishing and address additional threats to wildlife;

Whereas Congress passed the Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016 (16 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.) to strengthen the response of the United States to the global wildlife trafficking crisis;

Whereas Congress passed the Save Our Seas Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-265; 132 Stat. 3742)—

(1) to address land- and sea-based sources of marine debris; and

(2) to promote international action to reduce the incidence of marine debris;

Whereas, in December 2013, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed March 3 as World Wildlife Day to celebrate and raise awareness of the wild fauna and flora around the world;

Whereas March 3, 2019, represents the sixth annual celebration of World Wildlife Day;

Whereas, in 2019, the theme of World Wildlife Day is “Life below water: for people and planet”; and

Whereas, in 2019, World Wildlife Day commemorations will—

(1) raise awareness about the breathtaking diversity of marine life;

(2) highlight the crucial importance of marine species to human development; and

(3) encourage future generations to continue efforts to protect marine ecosystems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 3, 2019, as “World Wildlife Day”;

(2) supports raising awareness of the benefits that wildlife provides to people and the threats facing wildlife around the world;

(3) supports escalating the fight against wildlife crime, including wildlife trafficking and illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing;

(4) applauds the domestic and international efforts to escalate the fight against wildlife crime;

(5) commends the efforts of the United States to mobilize the entire Federal Government in a coordinated, efficient, and effective manner for dramatic progress in the fight against wildlife crime; and

(6) encourages continued cooperation between the United States, international partners, local communities, nonprofit organizations, private industry, and other partner organizations in an effort to conserve and celebrate wildlife, preserving this precious resource for future generations.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A COMMEMORATIVE DOCUMENT IN MEMORY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, GEORGE HERBERT WALKER BUSH

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 6

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. COMMEMORATIVE DOCUMENT AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush, shall be printed as a House document, with illustrations and suitable binding, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) CONTENTS.—The document shall consist of the eulogies and encomiums for George Herbert Walker Bush, as expressed in the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with the texts of each of the following:

(1) The state funeral ceremony at the United States Capitol Rotunda.

(2) The national funeral service held at the Washington National Cathedral, Washington, District of Columbia.

(3) The memorial service held at St. Martin's Episcopal Church, Houston, Texas.

(4) The interment ceremony at the George Herbert Walker Bush Presidential Library Center, College Station, Texas.

SEC. 2. PRINTING OF DOCUMENT.

In addition to the usual number of copies printed, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 32,500 copies of the commemorative document, of which 22,150 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 10,350 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; or

(2) such number of copies of the commemorative document that does not exceed a production and printing cost of \$1,000,000, with distribution of the copies to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1).

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE 26TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. POCKET VERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 26th edition of the pocket version of the Constitution of the United States shall be printed as a Senate document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 480,500 copies of the document, of which 255,500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 200,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 25,000 copies shall be for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$226,250, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

(c) DISTRIBUTION.—The copies of the document printed for the use of the House of Representatives and the Senate under subsection (a) shall be distributed in accordance with—

(1) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the House of Representatives; and

(2) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 7 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: 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.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 28, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “China's impact on United States education system.”

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Drew Story, a science fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 116th Congress.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at

the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the first time en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 617) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for their second reading, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LINDSBORG, KANSAS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 43.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 43) honoring the 150th anniversary of the establishment of Lindsborg, Kansas.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 43) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 5, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 86, S. Res. 87, S. Res. 88, S. Res. 89, and S. Res. 90.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles, where applicable, be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions (S. Res. 86 and S. Res. 87) were agreed to.

(The resolutions are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The resolutions (S. Res. 88, S. Res. 89, and S. Res. 90) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A COMMEMORATIVE DOCUMENT IN MEMORY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, GEORGE HERBERT WALKER BUSH

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE 26TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of S. Con. Res. 6 and S. Con. Res. 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolutions by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) authorizing the printing of a commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush.

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) authorizing the printing of the 26th edition of the pocket version of the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolutions be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate en bloc.

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

The concurrent resolutions (S. Con. Res. 6 and S. Con. Res. 7) were agreed to en bloc.

(The concurrent resolutions are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PESTICIDE REGISTRATION IMPROVEMENT EXTENSION ACT OF 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chair lay before the body a message to accompany S. 483.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 483) entitled "An act to enact into law a bill by reference", do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 483.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 483?

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that 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.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, March 4; 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 Rushing nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, March 4.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

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.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:17 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 4, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28, 2019:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ANDREW WHEELER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

JOHN L. RYDER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2021.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL X. GARRETT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. DONNELLAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEPHEN J. MALLETT

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SCOTT M. BROWN
CAPT. CASEY J. MOTON
CAPT. STEPHEN R. TEDFORD
CAPT. ERIC H. VERHAGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JEFFREY T. ANDERSON
CAPT. STEPHEN D. BARNETT
CAPT. MICHAEL W. BAZE
CAPT. RICHARD T. BROPHY, JR.
CAPT. ANTHONY C. CARULLO
CAPT. ROBERT B. CHADWICK II
CAPT. JEFFREY J. CZEREWKO
CAPT. MICHAEL P. DONNELLY
CAPT. CHRISTOPHER M. ENDGAHL
CAPT. ROBERT M. GAUCHER
CAPT. DANIEL P. MARTIN
CAPT. JOHN V. MENONI
CAPT. CURT A. RENSHAW
CAPT. SCOTT F. ROBERTSON
CAPT. MILTON J. SANDS III
CAPT. PAUL C. SPEDERO, JR.
CAPT. CHRISTOPHER J. SWEENEY
CAPT. JEROMY B. WILLIAMS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. VERALINN JAMIESON

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JASON D. HOSKINS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NANCY E. COSTA AND ENDING WITH ALEXANDER O. KIRKPATRICK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SAIPRASAD M. ZEMSE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY WAYNE AKIN AND ENDING WITH STEVEN S. ZAFUETA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID C. SALISBURY AND ENDING WITH ROBERT L. WILKIE, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG K. ABBE AND ENDING WITH CAROL A. YEAGER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. CHUNG AND ENDING WITH BRADLEY J. PIERSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ROBERT T. HINES, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC A. BANJAK AND ENDING WITH JENNIFER C. WHITKO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENNIS M. BRITTEN AND ENDING WITH KRISTEN MARIE WYRICK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON G. ARNOLD AND ENDING WITH CARRIE A. SCHMID, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID P. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH AMY S. SWETS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KIMBERLY J. KLOEBER AND ENDING WITH MARSHA L. SCHUMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOYCE C. BEATY, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY S. MCCARTY AND ENDING WITH TERESA M. STARKS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER J. ARCHER AND ENDING WITH LAWRENCE D. PEAVLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW T. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH ASSY YACOB, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELHAM BARANI AND ENDING WITH BRANDON H. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HOMAYOUN R. AHMADIAN AND ENDING WITH JOE X. ZHANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANCIS E. BECKER AND ENDING WITH BRENT J. WINWARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARGARET E. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY C. YEE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH L. ABRAMS AND ENDING WITH ALYSSA R. ZUEHL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF KATHERINE R. MORGANTI, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK N. WESTMORELAND AND ENDING WITH AARON J. LIPPY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF TOLUPOLE O. A. ADUROJA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ERICK L. JACKSON, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMES B. FLOWERS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DYLAN T. RANDAZZO, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JERRY D. HALLMAN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER P. MOELLERING, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOUBERT N. PAULINO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SAW K. SAN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBECCA J. QUACKENBUSH AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. WATKINS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STACIE L. KERVIN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN R. KOSSLER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KATHERINE A. O'BRIEN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JESSICA N. PERALESLUDEMANN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JULIA C. PHILLIPS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ALAIN M. ALEXANDRE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TALIA T. ANIMASHAUN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF G010349, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JORDANNA M. HOSTLER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH N. STRICKLAND, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHAWN M. T. MAY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KYLE A. ZAHN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH J. FANTONY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHARITI D. PADEN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DONALD W. RAKES, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RONNIE S. BARNES AND ENDING WITH FRANCIS R. MONTGOMERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE

AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 12, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHARLES A. RILEY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICHARD S. MCNUTT, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LLOYD V. LOZADA, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIO ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH APRIL L. SAPP, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 12, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MATTHEW T. COUGHLIN, TO BE COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF BETHANNE CANERO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN T. BROWNEE AND ENDING WITH DANIEL L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN F. CHAMPAIGNE AND ENDING WITH JOHN C. JOHNSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON J. GRIFFUS AND ENDING WITH JEREMIAH J. ZEISLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL H. CUSINATO AND ENDING WITH EDUARDO QUIROZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARMANDO A. FREIRE AND ENDING WITH ANDREW J. SHRIVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF STEPHEN R. BYRNES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HERMAN E. HOLLEY AND ENDING WITH BRIAN E. KELLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARREN M. GALLAGHER AND ENDING WITH AUSTIN E. WREN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALEXANDER N. ABATE AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH A. ZUKOWSKI, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GERMAN ALICELAPUERTA AND ENDING WITH LYDIA A. SIMONS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC J. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH WAYNE R. ZUBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JOSEPH W. CRANDALL, TO BE COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON S. ELLIS AND ENDING WITH CURTIS B. MILLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JUSTIN D. MOSLEY, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDRES J. AGRAMONTE AND ENDING WITH ROSS A. HRYNEWYCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BETHANY S. PETERSON AND ENDING WITH JON T. PETERSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2019.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JESSICA M. P. MILLER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROSEMARY M. HARDESTY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRETT T. THOMAS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT A. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH BRET A. YOUNT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PETER D. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH ROBERT WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 12, 2019.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING DAVE SNUGGS OF GREAT FALLS

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dave Snuggs of Great Falls who founded and leads My Neighbor in Need, a nonprofit organization that helps provide resources to people in need.

With the help of computer programmer Tom Penwell, Dave created myneighborinneed.org, a platform for people to anonymously request help. The organization evaluates a request and lists it on their website where members of the community can volunteer to meet the need.

My Neighbor in Need relies on the generosity of neighbors to fulfill essential needs, including winter clothes, beds, furniture, car and home repairs, help with utility bills, and transit passes or bicycles for people to get to and from work. The organization, which celebrates its seventh anniversary on March 20, has helped fulfill nearly 13,000 individual requests for help.

My Neighbor in Need has grown from a one-man operation to a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization operating in Montana and nine cities in Wisconsin.

In 2013, Dave launched a similar concept to meet the needs of Montana students. My Student in Need now operates in over 160 schools throughout Montana and has helped fulfill over 2,800 requests from teachers on behalf of their students.

"I always have believed that people genuinely want to help their neighbors if they were made aware of their needs," Dave said. "My Neighbor in Need and My Student in Need truly represent the good in the communities we serve."

Madam Speaker, for his dedication to our communities and his innovative approach to helping those in need, I recognize Dave Snuggs for his spirit of Montana.

REMEMBERING THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the Khojaly Massacre, and to honor the victims of this horrendous act.

The appalling massacre perpetrated on the innocent people of Khojaly in February 1992 is no less shocking 27 years later. One of the worst atrocities ever committed in the South Caucasus, justice has still not been delivered and 150 civilians are still missing.

As we demand respect for human rights and democratic accountability within the inter-

national community, it is important that we continue to remember what happened in Khojaly and bring those responsible to account.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 2019

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I'm very proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, the most significant gun violence legislation to be considered in the House in over a decade. H.R. 8 strengthens our current laws on background checks by closing loopholes and ensuring that dangerous people do not have the opportunity to purchase a weapon. This legislation is critical and long overdue because 40 percent of gun sales are made with no background check at all.

Over 70 percent of Americans, including a majority of gun owners, support universal background checks. Why? Because they help keep guns out of the hands of criminals. The current system has already stopped three million gun sales to convicted felons and others who are prohibited by law from owning a firearm. These checks do nothing to infringe upon the right of law-abiding citizens to keep and use firearms for recreation, subsistence, or even self-defense, and importantly, the vast majority of background checks are completed within minutes.

When the Supreme Court first recognized an individual's right to carry a gun in the 2008 case *District of Columbia v. Heller*, it also acknowledged that the Second Amendment does not prevent Congress from imposing reasonable restrictions on gun sales. The right of responsible citizens to keep and bear arms must be carefully weighed against the right of all Americans to live in a safe society, and I believe H.R. 8 strikes the right balance between protecting the latter without infringing upon the former.

For too long, unreasonable forces have prevented serious consideration of virtually any gun legislation, no matter how commonsense it is. Ninety-six Americans are killed by a gun every day, and we owe it to them, their families, and the people of Newtown, Orlando, Las Vegas, Parkland, and so many other communities to take meaningful action. Too many innocent lives have been taken and the American people deserve so much better.

I wish to thank the thousands of devoted activists, including Moms Demand Action, for raising their voices across my Congressional District and across our country to end gun violence in our nation.

RECOGNIZING MRS. WILLIE C. WOODSON ON THE CELEBRATION OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, February 24, the People's Missionary Baptist Church in Dallas, Texas will celebrate Mrs. Willie C. Woodson on the occasion of her 100th birthday.

Mrs. Woodson was born in Burneysville, Oklahoma, on February 19, 1919—the third of fourteen children. She and her older brother, Thomas, were often tasked with caring for their younger siblings on top of school work. Shortly after starting the ninth grade at a local high school in Ardmore, Oklahoma, Mrs. Woodson's family came under hard times that left her without money to pay for books or school lunches. She was left with no choice but to forego her remaining years in school and focus on her family, her community, and her faith.

Upon her move to Dallas, Mrs. Woodson joined the People's Missionary Baptist Church and has been a devout member ever since. As one of the eldest active members of the church and a known mentor to all, she is commonly referred to as 'Mother Woodson' by family and friends alike. No matter how busy she is, she always makes the time to attend church every Sunday morning. She especially loves to attend the service on the first Sunday of the month because she enjoys sitting with the church's Mothers Board in their assigned row, dressed in white.

Mrs. Woodson refuses to let the limitations of old age stop her from a full schedule of activities. She has many hobbies that fill her free time, including reading, watching wrestling and cheering on the local Dallas sports teams. She also still prepares all of her meals and cleans the house on her own.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend Mrs. Willie C. Woodson for a life dedicated to her family, friends and church and want to wish her the happiest of birthdays. Congratulations are in order for her and her family as they celebrate this extraordinary milestone.

HONORING KEVIN CORBETT

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Kevin Corbett of Bristol, Virginia, who passed away on February 15, 2019, at the age of 63. Kevin was filled with devotion to the people of the City of Bristol.

In Kevin's younger years, he served his country by enlisting in the United States Army. As an Armor Crewman, he eventually rose to

• 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.

Staff Sergeant. He continued his service in Bristol by joining its Police Department in 1982. When he retired in 2006, he was a Detective Lieutenant in the Criminal Investigation Division.

Outside of his career, he remained a beloved and active presence in the Bristol community. I knew him for his work on the Ninth District Republican Committee, where he was the Bristol Unit Chairman and represented the district on the State Central Committee. As a member of St. Anne Catholic Church, he was devoted to his God and his parish.

Kevin will be long remembered by many for his kindnesses. Befitting a man who followed a career path of service, he was always willing to help others. His survivors include his two children, Allison and Shawn, five grandchildren, and his sister, Jackie Collins. I offer my condolences to them on the loss of this fine man.

RECOGNIZING TWO MAINE CONSTITUENTS, DR. MICHAEL TAYLOR AND WENDY TAYLOR

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize two of my Maine constituents, Dr. Michael Taylor and Wendy Taylor, whose shared vision, determination, and commitment have changed and saved lives in Northern Haiti and engaged countless Mainers in support of better health and better lives.

Over seventy years ago, the founding documents of the World Health Association proclaimed that "The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition."

Michael and Wendy Taylor have long believed in this right, and they recognized the extraordinary need in Haiti. In establishing Konbit Sante in 2001, they committed to supporting the development of an improved health care system to meet the needs of the Cap Haitien community. Their vision was to ensure maximum local direction and partnerships within the existing system rather than the creation of a parallel system. And they knew that it was important to not just improve access to health care, but to improve the quality of that care.

The beauty of this effort has been in the Konbit—which, in Haitian Creole, loosely translates to working together for a common goal. Rather than providing short-term expertise, Konbit Sante's focus has been on strengthening infrastructure, enhancing training, and ensuring necessary resources. Right from the start, the Taylors recognized that real, sustainable improvements in an under-resourced health system required taking the long view. This has not been fast nor always easy, but this capacity building model—trusting and supporting Haitians to serve Haitians—has yielded extraordinary results.

Michael and Wendy have had successful careers, raised children, enjoyed art and music, nurtured deep and enduring friendships, and travelled the world—always coming back to coastal Maine. Along the way they

have invested their time, talents, and resources in doing good, making lasting contributions for the betterment of humankind and inspiring so many others to join them.

Dr. Taylor is receiving the 2019 Presidential Citation today from the American Academy of Dermatologists in recognition of his extraordinary contributions to the people of Haiti. His wife and Konbit Sante cofounder, Wendy, will be at his side. I want to congratulate them both, as they make me proud to represent the good people of Maine.

TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after failing to get federal funding for his ineffective and overpriced border wall, President Trump has declared a national emergency at our southern border to try and sidestep Congress's constitutional authority so he can fulfill a campaign promise.

After the President shut down the government for 35 days, my colleagues and I came to an agreement that wisely invested in effective solutions to secure the border. Some of these solutions included infrastructure improvements at ports of entry, the hiring of additional immigration judges and technology enhancements to detect border crossings. Clearly, with this national emergency declaration, the president and his administration would rather stick to a slogan than actually secure the border.

The emergency declaration signed by the president would rob taxpayer money from high priority military construction projects, including projects in the state of Texas, and instead redirects that funding towards his pet project. This egregious misuse of taxpayer funds leaves our country less safe by denying military personnel the essential training, readiness and quality of life necessary for them to do their job.

This unlawful action by the President cannot be tolerated. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this joint resolution of disapproval so that we can do our solemn duty and uphold the Constitution.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I missed votes on Monday, February 25. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Roll Call Vote Number 88 (Passage of H.R. 539, the Innovators to Entrepreneurs Act): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 89 (Passage of H.R. 328, the Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act): YES.

HONORING THE CITY OF AURORA AFRICAN AMERICAN ADVISORY BOARD ANNUAL HERITAGE DINNER AND OFFICER SKYY CALICE AS THE 2019 AFRICAN-AMERICAN LEADER OF THE YEAR

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Officer Skyy Calice as the recipient of the City of Aurora's African American Heritage Advisory Board's 2019 African-American Leader of the Year award.

Officer Calice with the Aurora Police Department has been a true star in our community. As a Community Oriented Policing Officer, she has used her perspective and experience to launch numerous initiatives to make a difference. She established the Girls Run the World mentoring program to help guide young ladies in our local high schools to reach their full potential. Programs like this have been crucial to so many of our community members and future leaders.

I would like to thank Officer Calice for her honorable commitment to her community. I would also like to express my support for the City of Aurora's African American Advisory Board Annual Heritage Dinner. The commitment of dedicated public servants like Officer Calice is an inspiration to all of us.

IN MEMORY OF LOU WACKER

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of Lou Wacker, who died on February 15, 2019, at the age of 84. Mr. Wacker was the celebrated football coach for 23 seasons at my alma mater, Emory & Henry College, where he compiled an impressive record and shaped the lives of many young men. The Richmond Times-Dispatch quoted him as saying on his retirement, "To say that Emory & Henry College and the football program have been a big part of my life for 23 years would be an understatement; it has been my life."

Coach Wacker was a native of Richmond and excelled at football during his time at the University of Richmond. Before his tenure at Emory & Henry, he was a defensive coordinator at Hampden-Sydney College. His arrival at Emory & Henry in 1982 started an incredible run for the Wasps. By the time he retired in 2004, his teams had compiled a 164–76 record, including seventeen consecutive winning seasons, a 37-game winning streak from 1991 to 1998, and eleven Old Dominion Athletic Conference Championships.

After retiring, Coach Wacker stayed close to Emory. For his great success, he received many honors, including induction into the Emory & Henry College Hall of Fame and the Virginia Sports Hall of Fame. The home grandstand at Emory & Henry's football stadium also bears his name. The many players and assistants he mentored over the years will remember him for his skill as a coach and for the impact he had on them.

Coach Wacker's survivors include his children Bruce, Kristen, and Louis, and his grandchildren Anna Whitehead, Adele Kraus, and Robin Kraus. I offer my condolences to them on their loss.

SITES RESERVOIR PROJECT ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the "Sites Reservoir Project Act," which would provide federal support for the 1.8 million acre-feet Sites Reservoir and related water infrastructure in Colusa and Glenn Counties.

Specifically, the "Sites Reservoir Project Act" would direct the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the feasibility study for the project and, if deemed feasible, authorize federal funding and technical support for its construction. The reservoir would be owned and operated by the Sites Joint Powers Authority, a regional consortium of local water agencies and counties formed in 2010.

Our state must make forward-looking investments to capture and store water during wet years for use during drought. The Sites Reservoir is one such critical infrastructure project needed to meet California's future water needs, given climate change. The project is essential to integrated water management in the Sacramento Valley and would maximize storage of excess Sacramento River flows during winter storms for use later in the year. The Sites Reservoir Project would increase storage capacity north of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, improving resiliency in our statewide water system, and helping to advance California's renewable energy goals with the pumped-storage component planned for phase II of the project.

To date, more than \$1.2 billion in public funding has been committed to the Sites Reservoir Project, including \$816 million from California's State Water Bond (2014 Proposition 1) and federal funding from the Bureau of Reclamation for the feasibility study and related work. In November 2018, the U.S. Department of Agriculture committed \$449 million in low-interest financing from the Rural Development Program, recognizing the project's importance to California's farming communities.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and northern California neighbor Congressman DOUG LAMALFA (R-CA) for his support as the bill's original cosponsor and for sponsoring similar legislation in previous Congresses.

I look forward to working with all members of the California delegation to advance this bipartisan bill and see this critical reservoir project completed.

JEREMIAH G. HAMILTON

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, I rise today to commemorate the life of Jeremiah G. Hamilton,

the first black millionaire in the United States, whose story has been absent from the history books. I have the honor of representing the district in which Mr. Hamilton lived and worked.

Born in the West Indies in 1807, Mr. Hamilton made his way to New York in 1828 and began amassing his fortune by selling stocks to both black and white entrepreneurs. He was touted as being astute in successfully predicting the markets and became a prominent financier and businessman on Wall Street in the pre-Civil War era.

Mr. Hamilton defied many conventions of his time as he rose to the top of the business world. He owned stock of railroad companies on whose trains he was not legally allowed to ride. He married a white woman named Eliza Morris and had a close relationship with his friend Benjamin Day, who was the publisher of the Sun Newspaper. He took on titans of industry, including battling Cornelius Vanderbilt over control of the Accessory Transit Company until he got a settlement. In fact, in Vanderbilt's obituary it is stated, "There was only one man who ever fought the Commodore to the end, and that was Jeremiah Hamilton . . . the Commodore respected him."

However, Mr. Hamilton faced the horrors of the rampant racism and violence against African-Americans in the mid-19th century. In the 1830s, insurance companies blackballed him and refused to underwrite his business ventures. During the draft riots in 1863, white men unsuccessfully sought to lynch Mr. Hamilton in his own home.

Jeremiah G. Hamilton died in 1875, leaving behind an estate of \$2 million, which would be around \$45 million today.

It is vital that the history of America reflects the lives of all Americans, and I am proud to help share some of the lost history from the 10th Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing not only the life of Jeremiah G. Hamilton but the dedicated work of both the Committee to Commemorate Jeremiah G. Hamilton and historian Shane White to create a permanent place in history for the first African-American millionaire.

The Committee to Commemorate Jeremiah G. Hamilton was established in February 2018 by community activists, including Dr. Sam D. Albert, Hon. Louise Dankberg, Hon. Alan J. Gerson, Gail Green, Barbara Guinan, Greg Lambert, Esq., Christine Merritt, Hon. Daisy Paez, Mark P. Thompson, Leona Zeplin and the Committee's Co-Chairs Dolores Leito and Hon. Michelle D. Winfield.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF BETTIE MAE FIKES

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Ms. Bettie Mae Fikes, the "Voice of Selma."

At the age of 16, Ms. Fikes was one of the singers of the Civil Rights Movement and a member of the Students Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was the only national civil rights organization led by young

people during the Movement. Ms. Fikes bravely led marches with songs, registered voters, boycotted buses, sat in at lunch-counters and led walkouts at R.B. Hudson High School to support the desegregation of the school.

From an early age, Ms. Fikes began singing with her parents, both of whom were from families of gospel singers and preachers. Ms. Fikes was exposed to classic hymns and songs and was encouraged to use her voice to sing with her parents. At the tender age of four, Ms. Fikes had her first big performance: her first church solo. With that success, she began to travel throughout the country with her parents' groups, the SB Gospel Singers and the Pilgrim Four. However, when Ms. Fikes's mother passed away when she was 10 years old, she moved around from Michigan, California, and finally to Selma, Alabama.

Ms. Fikes continued to be involved in singing in the church when she moved to Selma. She used every opportunity she could to let her voice be heard. It is no surprise, given her background that she proved to be an emerging music leader when she joined SNCC at age 16. The more she became involved with SNCC, the more it became apparent that she would go to jail.

The foot soldiers of the Civil Rights Movement prepared themselves for the eventuality that they would be arrested. If an officer announced that they were under arrest, they knew to fall to their knees and to force the officers to carry them to the bus. However, when the time came, Ms. Fikes and her friend Evelyn Manns realized the police were using cattle prods on the young men and women. Hoping to avoid this pain, both women stood up and loaded the bus to go to jail.

Ms. Fikes bounced between the county and city jail, Camp Selma and Camp Camden. She was brought before Judge Reynolds where she was repeatedly asked who organized the march. Judge Reynolds and others hoped that the students would implicate Martin Luther King, Jr. in hopes of building a case against Dr. King for contributing to the delinquency of minors. Instead, Ms. Fikes loudly declared: "Jesus lead me, and my mama feed me." This frustrated the judge and led to Ms. Fikes being jailed for nearly three weeks.

Instead of being defeated, Ms. Fikes used this time to organize other young people who were also sent to jail.

"I had been there so long I felt like a trustee there," she once said. With this new Trustee status and the assistance of Reverend F.D. Reese of Ebenezer Missionary Baptist Church in Selma, Ms. Fikes was able to help others.

Ms. Fikes also bore witness to Bloody Sunday. That morning Ms. Fikes was a messenger, carrying messages from Brown Chapel AME to the head of the line at the base of the Edmund Pettus Bridge. She described the experience later, saying, "You know how it feels just before a storm—there was nobody walking on the streets . . . it was such a stillness that you can't explain."

As tensions rose, Ms. Fikes continued delivering messages back and forth, when, finally, a half block from the church, she heard the rumbling of Bloody Sunday: "Out of this stillness, this earthquake [sound], the ground it just shifted . . . and when I looked up . . . people were running everywhere." Despite the hate and the violence, Ms. Fikes saw the true spirit of the foot soldiers of Selma.

After her time in Selma, Ms. Fikes went on to become a very successful singer who has

graced the stages of Carnegie Hall and the Library of Congress, as well as the 2004 Democratic National Convention where she was introduced by Maya Angelou. She has had the opportunity to perform with Joe Turner, Lightnin' Hopkins, Albert King, James Brown, Bob Dylan, and Mavis Staples, among others. She continues to travel throughout the United States and Canada to speak about diversity and civil rights, because although we have come a long way, there is always work to be done to advance justice and equality.

On a personal note, I grew up in Selma hearing the voice of Bettie Mae Fikes. Her beautiful voice was the soundtrack of the historic march from Selma to Montgomery. I am so grateful that she faithfully returns on the pilgrimage to Selma each year with Congressman JOHN LEWIS and the Faith and Politics Institute to commemorate Bloody Sunday. Her beautiful music continues to move us all as we rededicate ourselves to the ideals of equality and justice for all. I know that I would not be Alabama's first black Congresswoman today had it not been for the bravery and sacrifice of freedom fighters like Bettie Mae Fikes.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the 7th Congressional District and the State of Alabama, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the activism and lasting contributions of Ms. Bettie Mae Fikes. Through song, her melodious voice was an inspiration for the Civil Rights Movement that changed a nation. Her work as an educator, her incredible voice and her story will be remembered in Alabama for many years to come.

TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

SPEECH OF

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2019

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise this House for its swift passage of H.J. Res 46, a bipartisan bill to terminate President Trump's declaration of a Fake National Emergency.

The President's declaration is not only an unconstitutional attempt to circumvent Congress and the will of the people. It also shows an unprecedented disregard for precedent, as well as the values and institutions enshrined in our Constitution.

To pay for his wall, President Trump will not get the funds from Mexico as he promised but from our troops, robbing \$3.5 billion from the Department of Defense, funds which were passed to improve military family housing, training facilities, security of overseas bases, and much more.

Just in Ohio, over \$90 million in military construction investment is being placed at risk, including \$61,000,000 for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base's Intelligence Production Complex and \$7,400,000 for Camp Ravenna's Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range.

Mr. Speaker, this declaration was not founded in the security of our nation, but in delivering on an ill-advised campaign promise. We cannot allow the President to ask those who have sacrificed already to sacrifice even

more—especially for an expensive border wall few think will even work. Now, it's on the Senate to take up and pass this resolution without delay.

RECOGNIZING MRS. INEZ DOROTHY YOUNG GIBSON ON THE CELE- BRATION OF HER 100TH BIRTH- DAY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am excited to recognize Inez Dorothy Young Gibson, a revered member of the Dallas, Texas, community, who will celebrate her 100th birthday on this upcoming March 26th.

Mrs. Gibson was raised in Rockwall, Texas, home of the Caddo Indians. Heavy racial and residential segregation in the area prompted a move to Dallas, Texas in 1936, for Mrs. Gibson and her family. She attended Burnett High School, an all-African-American school in Terrell, Texas, and graduated with honors.

Mrs. Gibson later became a Vocational Nurse at the Methodist Hospital of Dallas, where she served for an impressive 23 years. She has also been heavily involved in community engagement and social activism throughout her life, specifically work to improve the South Dallas/Fair Park area. Mrs. Gibson has donated countless hours of her time to volunteer with the Warren Avenue Christian Church and Dallas ISD's Reading is Fundamental Program, among others.

Mrs. Gibson married T.D. Gibson, Sr. on August 19, 1943, and had four children: Marilyn, T.D. Jr., Michael, and Charmin. She is now the affectionate matriarch of 11 grandchildren and 17 great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I wish to commend Mrs. Inez Dorothy Young Gibson for a life dedicated to her family, friends and the Dallas community, and want to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. Congratulations are in order as she celebrates this extraordinary milestone.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SECURING DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SE- CURITY FIREARMS ACT

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, regrettably, there have been too many instances in which Department of Homeland Security officers have misplaced or lost their Department-issued firearms due to a failure to properly secure such sensitive assets.

In October 2017, the DHS Office of Inspector General found that 2,142 sensitive assets—including 228 firearms and 1,889 badges—were misplaced between fiscal years 2014 and 2016. Most of these losses were due to DHS personnel who did not properly safeguard such sensitive assets. The Office of Inspector General identified the lack of a Department-wide firearm policy as a major reason why sensitive assets were not secured.

Therefore, I am introducing the Securing Department of Homeland Security Firearms

Act, which improves the accountability of DHS-issued firearms and other sensitive assets. Specifically, the bill directs DHS to develop and distribute a Department-wide directive for achieving adequate security over firearms and other sensitive assets. That directive must include reporting and recordkeeping requirements for lost assets. Additionally, the bill requires that DHS provide officers with training and guidance on how to follow safeguarding requirements and how to properly report the loss or theft of a firearm.

Due to its mission, DHS has a variety of highly sensitive equipment. Failure to safeguard those assets can have grave consequences for public safety and homeland security. This measure will foster greater accountability and security within DHS.

HONORING LIEUTENANT ERIC JI- MENEZ, U.S. NAVY, ON EIGHT YEARS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERV- ICE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, today I offer my heartfelt congratulations to Lieutenant Eric Jimenez, a resident of Tulsa, Oklahoma, on eight years of dedicated active duty service to our Country in the United States Navy.

Lt. Jimenez currently serves as an Operations Research Analyst in the Naval Service Warfare Center in Bethesda, Maryland. He entered the USN in 2011, and served in numerous assignments and deployments throughout his distinguished career.

Lt. Jimenez has shown not only outstanding leadership, but uncommon technical skill. As a Reactor Control Officer on the USS *Santa Fe*, he managed a team of nine nuclear trained electronics technicians charged with maintaining nuclear reactor protection systems. He further trained an underperforming division by implementing a rigorous training and monitoring program resulting in a two-letter grade improvement in all categories of the Operational Reactor Safeguards Examination (ORSE). As an Electrical Division Officer, Lt. Jimenez maintained a 100 percent electrical safety training performance and executed the ship's electrical safety program using the most up-to-date instructions and notices. As Assistant Weapons Officer, Lt. Jimenez led his team through several weapons exercises, earning the 2015 Commanders Submarines Squadron SEVEN Battle Efficiency and the Submarine Squadron Seven Weapons Excellence White "W" award.

Since November of 2016, Lt. Jimenez has led four studies, valued at \$3 million dollars, in the development, analysis, and interpretation of results of Defense Planning Scenarios designed to inform and influence Navy senior executive leadership. He further served as a co-chair on Technical Evaluation Boards, over-viewing contract proposals worth an estimated \$1.5 million.

On behalf of Oklahoma's First Congressional District, I commend and congratulate my constituent, Lieutenant Eric Jimenez, on his devoted service to the United States of

America. May we learn from this young man the virtues of self-sacrifice and fidelity to our beloved Nation.

HONORING DR. ADOLPHUS
HAILSTORK

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. TONKA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the work of Dr. Adolphus Hailstork.

Dr. Hailstork is a leading composer and professor who has dedicated his life to the study, composition, and continuation of musical excellence. He has written numerous works for chorus, chamber ensembles, piano, organ, band and orchestra, which are performed and celebrated around the world.

Born in Rochester, NY, but raised in Albany, Dr. Hailstork's remarkable musical career can be traced back to his membership in the historic Cathedral of All Saints Choir of Men and Boys, the oldest continually performing ensemble of its kind in the United States. His membership in the Choir was the catalyst to more than seventy years of creative expression and musical prowess.

Since his time with the Choir, he has pursued a career in music with relentless dedication. During his years at Albany High School, he began composing music regularly. He received degrees from Howard University and the Manhattan School of Music and studied in France with famed composer and teacher Nadia Boulanger before receiving his doctorate from Michigan State University in 1971.

What makes Dr. Hailstork truly admirable is not only his aptitude in making music, but his desire and skill in teaching it, passing on his substantial knowledge to future musicians. He has served as professor at Youngstown State University in Ohio and at Norfolk State University in Virginia. Currently, he works as a professor of music and Composer-in-Residence at Old Dominion University in Norfolk.

One of the most incredible aspects of music is its ability to connect individuals of all ages and backgrounds. Dr. Hailstork's work exemplifies this idea. He has studied, composed and taught a vast range of musical styles and genres, focusing on classical compositions with a blend of African American and European traditions. His masterful compositions have been performed by the New York Philharmonic, Chicago Symphony, Los Angeles Philharmonic and numerous other prestigious orchestras.

This year marks the 60th anniversary of Dr. Hailstork's graduation from Albany High School. Since his time in New York's Capital Region, he has left an imprint on the districts culture and society that will not soon fade.

On behalf of the United States Congress, it is my great honor and privilege to recognize Dr. Hailstork's accomplishments. I offer my gratitude for his immeasurable dedication and wish him continued success in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE RAINWATER
FAMILY AND THEIR CONTRIBU-
TIONS TO THE CITY OF
CARROLLTON, TEXAS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate trailblazers for equality like the Rainwater Family of Carrollton, Texas during this Black History Month. Over the last 100 years, each generation of the Rainwater family has persistently worked to grow Carrollton, Texas, into a diverse, inclusive, and loving community.

Born on February 3, 1912, Annie Heads Rainwater was the sixth child of Walter and Nancy Heads. In 1932, Annie married Charlie "Wash" Rainwater, son of George W. Rainwater and Delia Bush. Annie and Charlie had eight children, two of which passed away as infants. Annie and Charlie lived on the family farm belonging to Annie's grandparents—located in present day Carrollton, Texas. Annie was a homemaker and Charlie managed the family farm. Together, they attended church and spent time instilling Christian values of charity, hard work, and friendship in their children.

In 1962, Dallas' school district desegregation plan was slowly being put into place. In Carrollton, a then-rural school district to the northwest, Annie Heads Rainwater's six children had no neighborhood high school. Under segregation laws and as was customary, black students were not allowed to attend the all-white Carrollton High School just minutes away from the Rainwater family farm. Black students were bused 20 miles to all-black Booker T. Washington High School in Dallas, and later, 30 miles north to Denton's all-black Fred Moore High.

To Mrs. Rainwater, the school system had failed her family. As a recent widow, Mrs. Rainwater filed civil action in U.S. District Court against Carrollton's school district, demanding desegregation. Her younger daughters, Nancy and Betty, were named as plaintiffs in the case. Later that year, Judge Sarah T. Hughes ordered Carrollton to integrate its high school. In fall 1963, Mrs. Rainwater watched as Nancy and other teenagers became the first black students to attend all-white R.L. Turner High School in Carrollton, Texas. Annie Heads Rainwater lived until 1992. In 1994, the Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD recognized Annie for her bold perseverance against many odds by dedicating Annie Heads Rainwater Elementary in her honor.

Today, Annie Heads Rainwater's son, Rev. Willie Rainwater, continues to carry the torch for justice and freedom through his work at Christ Community Connection. Willie and his wife, Juanita, work diligently to provide scholarships to underprivileged students in Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD. Additionally, Willie and Juanita started the Martin Luther King, Jr. parade that celebrated its 25th anniversary last month.

Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring the Rainwater Family for their significant contributions to the Carrollton, Texas community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, on roll call votes 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, and 95, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA," "YEA," "YEA," "YEA," "YEA," and "YEA" respectively.

PASSING OF MRS. FANNIE MAE EVANS CORBETT AND IN RECOGNITION OF HER MANY CONTRIBUTIONS TO EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of a great woman and legend within the Wilson, North Carolina community, Mrs. Fannie Mae Evans Corbett. Mrs. Corbett passed away on Tuesday, February 19, 2019. She was 86 years old.

Born in Pitt County, North Carolina on May 23, 1932, Mrs. Corbett was the fourth of five children born to Bessie Evans and Sylvester Powell. Mrs. Corbett learned the meaning of hard work at a young age, spending much of her developmental years working in the cotton and tobacco fields. In 1955, Mrs. Corbett moved to Wilson, North Carolina, where she married and raised her family. After becoming a single mother of four children, Mrs. Corbett set out to improve her economic outlook by returning to school to earn her high school diploma and an associate's degree from Wilson Community Technical Institute.

Mrs. Corbett's influence in Wilson was transformational. In 1968, Mrs. Corbett became one of the key founders of the Wilson Community Improvement Association (WCIA). Mrs. Corbett led WCIA's growth from a local grassroots organization to a proactive movement that was a model for community development corporations across the country. Mrs. Corbett's indelible contributions to Wilson include coordinating voter registration drives across East Wilson and engaging the youth in educational and recreational programs. In 1973, under Mrs. Corbett's leadership, WCIA established the Wilson Senior Citizen Center, which was the first nutritional feeding program in Wilson County.

While championing the value of homeownership, Mrs. Corbett advocated for programs that would make owning a home an attainable goal even to those with modest means. In 1991, WCIA received a \$1.2 million grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to build 68 homes for low- and moderate-income people. Over 200 families applied for residency in the subdivision, Adventura East. After purchasing more land, WCIA completed an additional 30 units. Today, the Adventura East I & II subdivision is home to 148 families. In 1993, with WCIA's affordable housing momentum building, the organization acquired Sunset Terrace, a 104-unit housing complex. Two years later, WCIA

successfully purchased and restored Beacon Pointe Apartments in Wilson. In 1997, WCIA restored and renovated Mercy Hospital, which was built in 1913 as one of three African American hospitals in North Carolina.

Mrs. Corbett's service to her community has received national and international recognition and awards, including the prestigious Nancy Susan Reynolds award, the Citizen Award for Outstanding Service to Citizens of Wilson, and the Pioneering Award for Exemplary Service in Community Economic Development. Mrs. Corbett has also been featured in several publications and books, including "To Right These Wrongs" and "Greater Freedom."

Mrs. Corbett leaves to cherish her memory, four children, Barbara Claudette Blackston of Wilson, North Carolina; Christopher Evans of Apex, North Carolina; Donald Ray Evans of Portsmouth, Virginia; and Alvin Quintin Corbett of Eastampton, New Jersey; and a host of relatives, friends, and loved ones.

Madam Speaker, as a devoted mother, friend, and public servant, Mrs. Fannie Mae Evans Corbett's passing will surely be felt by all whose lives she touched. She will forever be missed, but never forgotten in the City of Wilson and across the State of North Carolina.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I had a family health emergency that required my personal attention at home and returned to Florida on February 28, 2019. This family health emergency resulted in me missing votes on H.R. 1112—Enhanced Background Checks Act. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on the Schneider, Jackson Lee Amendment, YES on the Van Drew Cunningham Amendment, NO on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1112, and YES on final passage of H.R. 1112.

RECOGNIZING THE MEMORIAL TO THE 1913 ITALIAN HALL DISASTER

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the dedication of the memorial to the Italian Hall disaster of 1913. Through their work to make this monument a reality, the village of Calumet and the Italian Hall Memorial Park Committee have ensured that the disaster and its victims are forever remembered by the people of Michigan.

For over 100 years, the area now known as Calumet was the heart of Copper Country, attracting thousands of Americans and immigrants from around the world, and producing more mineral wealth than the California Gold Rush. In response to long work days, low wages, and harsh work conditions, the Keweenaw chapters of the Western Federation of Miners voted to strike on July 23, 1913. The strike would last nine months—and though unsuccessful in achieving its goals in the short term, it marked a turning point for

Copper Country and the rights of the miners that called it home.

On Christmas Eve, 1913, hundreds of striking miners and their families gathered to celebrate the holiday on the second floor of Calumet's Italian Hall. However, a panic broke out after someone falsely shouted "fire" in the crowded hall. In the ensuing rush to escape the building, seventy-three people, including fifty-nine children, were killed. One hundred and six years later, the village of Calumet dedicated a new four-ton granite monument inscribed with the names of those lost in the Italian Hall disaster. The site of the Hall now serves as a place for quiet reflection and remembrance of tragedy as well as the history of the Upper Peninsula.

Madam Speaker, the Italian Hall disaster remains fixed in the memories of Michiganders more than one hundred years later. On behalf of my constituents, I would like to thank the Italian Hall Memorial Park Committee and the village of Calumet for their work to ensure that the tragedy and the lives lost there are never forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, on roll call vote 96, 97, 98, and 99, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "NAY," "YEA," "NAY," and "YEA."

OBSERVING THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise in observance of the victims of the Khojaly Massacre, a barbarous atrocity committed against innocent Azerbaijani civilians. Tuesday, February 26, marked the 27th anniversary of this bloody episode.

The story is all too tragic. Khojaly, in the region of Nagorno-Karabakh, was surrounded by Armenian and Soviet troops in the fall of 1991. After bombarding the city these troops attacked on the night of February 25 and 26, killing 600 innocent Azerbaijanis, including elderly people, women, and children. Hundreds more were left severely disabled from the attacks. Over fifty people were killed with wanton brutality, many children lost parents, and eight whole families were wiped out.

Human Rights Watch described these attacks as a "massacre" and in a 1992 report stated that the attacks by Armenian and Soviet forces, "deliberately disregarded [the] customary law restraint on attacks." This massacre remains the darkest chapter in the Azerbaijan-Armenian conflict.

Unfortunately, the dispute over Nagorno Karabakh is still ongoing, despite the United States and the international community not recognizing the independent rule of the region

and supporting a negotiated settlement. I call on all parties involved to find a peaceful resolution to this decades old conflict.

I encourage my colleagues to join with me and the Azerbaijani people as they remember this tragedy.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE KEVIN P. McMAHON

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise with great sadness to honor the life of Connecticut Superior Court Judge Kevin P. McMahon of Niantic, Connecticut who died too young at the age of 68 on February 18, 2019.

Madam Speaker, when news of Kevin's passing became known all across the state, there was an enormous outflowing of tributes and praise for the man described as "The People's Judge" for his amazing service in the criminal courts for over twenty-five years. He presided over big cases and small cases with great skill, displaying a warm and caring personality that balanced courtesy and adherence to the law with compassion for all who appeared before him. He had a sharp, delightful sense of humor and the court staff in every region he sat were professionally loyal to him because he treated them all with kindness and respect. He believed strongly in sharing his knowledge with his colleagues on the bench. He was an instructor at the Connecticut Judges' Institute and fellow judges often sought his advice on cases. Kevin was the president, and lone member, of the Black Point Judges Association, a position he was honored to hold. His knowledge of the law, his sense of humor, and, most importantly, his sense of fairness governed his decisions and made him a great judge.

Kevin was the past president of the New London/Washington County Providence College Alumni Club. He mentored students from Providence College, many of whom shadowed him during his time on the bench. The college honored him by presenting him with the Faithful Friar Award, and he was a season ticket holder for Providence College Basketball for many years.

Kevin spent summers at Black Point Beach at his family's summer home. Eventually, Patti and he became year-round residents. He was a member of the Black Point Association for many years. Kevin loved being a part of the beach community and over the years skillfully captained an array of powerboats. He was an avid reader and a serious student of history. Kevin was a sports enthusiast, as a loyal fan of the New York Giants, the Boston Red Sox, Boston Celtics and had great admiration for Tom Brady.

Kevin was also a devoted husband to the love of his life Patti McMahon and they had many happy years together at Black Point Beach which they made their permanent home. Patti is a highly skilled paralegal who worked for one of the premier law firms in Hartford—Riscassi and Davis—and their shared experience in the legal profession made them the perfect couple.

Mr. Speaker, I had known Kevin for many years when we were interns at the Hartford

Superior Criminal Court back in the 1970s. I knew from the first day we met that he was a special person whose sharp mind, quick wit, and infectious sense of humor stood out immediately. He was born to be a judge and it was wonderful to watch someone find the perfect spot on the bench to express his talents to the fullest.

Mr. Speaker we live in a time when cheap politics and cynical journalism constantly seek to delegitimize the importance of a strong, respected, independent judiciary. Kevin McMahon's life and record are the best rebuttal to this corrosive, dangerous trend. All who came in contact with him could believe in the honesty and goodness of our judicial system by observing the grace and integrity of his service. His example will be one for the ages.

Colleagues, please join me in expressing the condolences of the chamber for his friends and family—particularly his beloved wife Patti.

TRIBUTE TO HARVEY SCALES

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my deepest condolences to Mrs. Rochella Scales and her family on the loss of Milwaukee's "Godfather of Soul", Harvey Scales. Harvey was born in Osceola, Arkansas, on September 27, 1941, and passed away on February 11, 2019. He was a loving husband, father, grandfather, brother, relative and friend to many here in Milwaukee and around the world.

Harvey's family moved to Milwaukee when he was a young child where his father found work at American Motors. He attended both Roosevelt Junior High and North Division High Schools. For over 60 years, Harvey Scales has entertained us all beginning as a teen with doo wop bands in the 50's with such renowned Milwaukee contemporaries as the late Al Jarreau until he ultimately formed the band, Harvey Scales and the Seven Sounds in 1961. Harvey Scales and the Seven Sounds' first gig was at the Wisconsin State Fair. Har-

vey was able to perform in places in Milwaukee and Wisconsin where African Americans were not allowed and sought to break barriers through his music by playing at venues that drew an integrated crowd.

He was signed at various record labels over the years including the legendary soul labels of Chess and Stax. Harvey was signed by Casablanca Records after co-writing the platinum-selling song "Disco Lady" in 1976 for Johnny Taylor. In fact, it would be the biggest hit of Taylor's career, and the first song certified as platinum by the Recording Industry Association of America. Casablanca Records released Harvey's albums "Confidential Affair" in 1978 and "Hot Foot: A Funque Dizco Opera" in 1979.

Harvey proved himself to be more than an entertainer; he was also a person who endeavored to unite everyone through the love of music. He was both a social and a fun person to be around; he had friends throughout the industry including MC Hammer and the late Aretha Franklin to name but a few. Harvey continued to perform well into his 70s; in fact, one of his last shows was at Summerfest in 2017. The songs he wrote would be later sampled and recorded by a new generation of musicians including the Beastie Boys and Pete Rock.

Harvey leaves family and friends to cherish his memory including his wife Rochella Scales; Children: Tonya Stoudermire, David Vela, Daniel Vela, Dorothea Felder, Theresa Sheppard, Rodney Sheppard, Cornell Scales, Eric Scales, Harvey Scales, Jr., Jewel Henry, Kim Brown, Michael Brown, Rochelle Brown, Michelle Brown, and Bobby Brown; 40 grandchildren and a host of other relatives.

Harvey Scales, my friend and fellow Blue Devil will be greatly missed because of the positive impact he left on the lives of so many. While his death leaves a huge void, he will be remembered for his lifetime as a music artist who continues to inspire future generations. The legacy of his music continues with his son, Harvey Scales, Jr., rapper JR Scalez who collaborated with his father, as well as, the many musicians who continue to both perform and record his music.

Madam Speaker, Harvey Scales has positively impacted the 4th Congressional District,

the State of Wisconsin and the world. As family and friends gather to remember and celebrate the life of this loving and remarkable man; I applaud him and his legacy.

CONDOLENCES IN LOVING MEMORY OF CHARLES NUNZIO DELPIZZO

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, Charles Nunzio DelPizzo was one whose life and service enriched us and whose passing continues to leave a void in the community. He is sorely missed.

Mr. DelPizzo's service in the United States Army demonstrated his devotion to our nation. We will be forever indebted to him and all the brave men and women who have put their lives on the line for our beloved country. It gives me great pleasure to give him one final salute.

Mr. DelPizzo modeled a life of love, sustaining a 63-year marriage to Palma Antonia Santoro DelPizzo.

The pleasure of having known Charles DelPizzo is carried in the hearts and minds of his family and friends. Mr. DelPizzo's memory is forever cherished by his daughter Paula; Son-in-law Andrew; Grandchildren Angela, Melissa, and Andrew; great grandchildren Anthony, Talia, and Larissa; and all who knew and loved him.

I hope Paula continues to take comfort in the memories she has made with her beloved father. A person that departs from this earth never truly leaves, for they are still alive in our hearts and minds; through us, they live on. May she continue to find solace in the memory of Charles DelPizzo's love and the celebration of his life.

On behalf of the constituents of Ohio's Eleventh Congressional District, I extend sincere condolences. May God bless and keep the family.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1555–S1607

Measures Introduced: Forty-seven bills and twelve resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 592–638, S.J. Res. 9–11, S. Res. 85–91, and S. Con. Res. 6–7.

Pages S1593–S1605

Measures Passed:

Lindsborg, Kansas 150th Anniversary: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 43, honoring the 150th anniversary of the establishment of Lindsborg, Kansas, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1606**

Joint Committees on Printing and the Library: Senate agreed to S. Res. 86, providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library. **Page S1606**

Printing of Committee Rules: Senate agreed to S. Res. 87, authorizing the printing of a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate. **Page S1606**

Read Across America Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 88, designating March 1, 2019, as “Read Across America Day”. **Page S1606**

Honoring the Memory of the Victims of the Aurora, Illinois Mass Shooting: Senate agreed to S. Res. 89, expressing the condolences of the Senate and honoring the memory of the victims of the mass shooting in Aurora, Illinois, on February 15, 2019. **Page S1606**

Rare Disease Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 90, designating February 28, 2019, as “Rare Disease Day”. **Page S1606**

George Herbert Walker Bush Commemorative Document: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 6, authorizing the printing of a commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush. **Page S1605**

Pocket Version of the Constitution of the United States: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 7, authorizing the printing of the 26th edition of the pocket version of the Constitution of the United States.

Page S1605

House Messages:

Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 483, to enact into law a bill by reference. **Page S1606**

Rushing Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Allison Jones Rushing, of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit. **Page S1570**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, February 28, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 4, 2019. **Page S1570**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1570**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, March 4, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during the session of Thursday, February 28, 2019 ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 4, 2019. **Page S1570**

Readler Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit. **Pages S1570–71**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition

of the nomination of Allison Jones Rushing, of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit. **Page S1571**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1570**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1570**

Murphy Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit. **Page S1571**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit. **Page S1571**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1571**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1571**

Fleming Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development. **Page S1571**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit. **Page S1571**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1571**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1571**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 33), Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. **Pages S1555-68**

John L. Ryder, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2021. **Pages S1568-69**

- 3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
- 1 Army nomination in the rank of general.
- 22 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S1582-83, S1606-07**

Messages from the House: **Page S1590**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1590, S1605-06**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1591-92**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S1592-93**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S1595**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1595-S1605**

Additional Statements: **Page S1590**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1605**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1605**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—33) **Page S1568**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:17 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 4, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1606.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

AGRICULTURE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine implementing the Agriculture Improvement Act, after receiving testimony from Sonny Perdue, Secretary of Agriculture.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC IN AMERICA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine addressing the opioid epidemic in America, focusing on prevention, treatment, and recovery at the state and local level, after receiving testimony from Mark Stringer, Missouri Department of Mental Health Director, Jefferson City; Beth Tanzman, Department of Vermont Health Access Blueprint for Health Executive Director, Waterbury; Karen Cropsey, University of Alabama, Birmingham; Charissa Fotinos, Health Care Authority, Olympia, Washington; James Berry, West Virginia University, Morgantown; and Daisy Pierce, Navigating Recovery, Laconia, New Hampshire.

NUCLEAR POLICY AND POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine nuclear policy and posture, after receiving testimony from Madelyn R. Creedon, former Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration; Franklin C. Miller, former Special Assistant to the President of the

United States, and former Senior Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control, National Security Council Staff; and General C. Robert Kehler, USAF (Ret.), former Commander, United States Strategic Command, Department of Defense.

CAPITAL FORMATION AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine legislative proposals on capital formation and corporate governance, after receiving testimony from Catherine Mott, BlueTree Capital, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Thomas Quaadman, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Center for Capital Markets Competitiveness, Staten Island, New York; and Heather Slavkin Corzo, AFL-CIO, Bethesda, Maryland.

GLOBAL ENERGY MARKETS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine prospects for global energy markets, focusing on the role of the United States and perspectives from the International Energy Agency, after receiving testimony from Fatih Birol, International Energy Agency, Paris, France.

CHINA'S IMPACT ON U.S. EDUCATION SYSTEM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded a hearing to examine China's impact on the United States education system, including observations on Confucius Institutes in the United States and U.S. universities in China, after receiving testi-

mony from Jason Bair, Acting Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office; Walter Douglas, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and Jennifer Zimdahl Galt, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, both of the Department of State; and General Mitchell M. Zais, USA (Ret.), Deputy Secretary of Education.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Neomi J. Rao, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, 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.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of William R. Evanina, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 64 public bills, H.R. 1417–1480; and 12 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 23; and H. Res. 157–167, were introduced. **Pages H2311–15**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H2317**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Judy Chu (CA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2275**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H2275, H2293**

Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019: The House passed H.R. 1112, to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a

Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee, by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 198 nays, Roll No. 103.

Pages H2277–93

Rejected the Lesko 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 194 yeas to 232 yeas, Roll No. 102. **Pages H2291–93**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–6 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. **Page H2284**

Agreed to:

Levin (MI) amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–14) that requires GAO to submit

a report to the Committee on the Judiciary, US Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives analyzing the extent to which the new Section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, added by the bill prevents firearms from being transferred to prohibited persons; **Page H2287**

Schneider amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–14) that requires the FBI to report on the number of petitions it was not able to make a determination on within the 10-day period (by a recorded vote of 282 ayes to 144 noes, Roll No. 100);

Pages H2285–87, H2289–90

Van Drew amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–14) that allows an FFL who has contacted NICS, and who was not notified that the transfer is legally permissible within 3 business days of the initial date of contact, to rely on information provided by NICS respecting a transfer for 25 days after the transfer becomes legally permissible (by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 101); and

Pages H2288–89, H2290–91

Porter amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–14) that requires a report analyzing the impact of this Act on the safety of victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking. **Pages H2287–88**

Withdrawn:

Rice (SC) amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–14) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have granted NICS examiners access to the National Data Exchange (N-DEx) when reviewing firearm transfers. **Pages H2284–85**

H. Res. 145, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 8) and (H.R. 1112) was agreed to Tuesday, February 26th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, March 4th and further, when it adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, March 5th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H2310**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two recorded votes and two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2289–90, H2290–91, H2292–93, and H2293. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FEMALE VETERANS ACCESS TO VA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Female Veterans Access to VA”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WE’LL ALWAYS HAVE PARIS: FILLING THE LEADERSHIP VOID CAUSED BY FEDERAL INACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “We’ll Always Have Paris: Filling the Leadership Void Caused by Federal Inaction on Climate Change”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE NATIONAL EMERGENCIES ACT OF 1976

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties hearing entitled “The National Emergencies Act of 1976”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EFFECTS OF VACANCIES AT THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Effects of Vacancies at the Merit Systems Protection Board”. Testimony was heard from Valerie Brannon, Legislative Attorney, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Mark Robbins, Acting Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Foreign Relations: to receive a closed briefing on the status of the global Magnitsky investigation related to the Khashoggi murder, 5 p.m., SVC–217.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, March 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Allison Jones Rushing, of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11:30 a.m., Monday, March 4

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11:30 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E232
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E231
 Chabot, Steve, Ohio, E232
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E230
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E232
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E227
 Foster, Bill, Ill., E228

Frankel, Lois, Fla., E231, E232
 Fudge, Marcia L., Ohio, E233
 Garamendi, John, Calif., E229
 Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E227
 Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E227, E228
 Hern, Kevin, Okla., E230
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E227, E228, E230
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E230
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E231

Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E233
 Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E229
 Pingree, Chellie, Me., E228
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E227
 Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E229
 Soto, Darren, Fla., E232
 Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E228
 Tonko, Paul, N.Y., E231



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.