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.

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.

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 controversial 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

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 legislation 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. 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 our country. Madam Speaker, while this is not a day for our conversation, I encourage all Members to take this month to hear stories of our history so that we may honor the past, present, and future of our African American citizens.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to ask the Speaker to co-sponsor H.J. Res 1407, legislation that would allow for the designation of February as African American History Month.

I again ask that the Speaker co-sponsor this legislation.

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation.

Madam Speaker, we have made significant progress in providing healthcare to all people. However, we still have a lot of work to do.

I want to thank the Speaker for working with us to pass H.R. 1227, which provides a framework for States to set up their own State-based insurance exchanges.

This legislation will 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.

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 our country. Madam Speaker, while this is not a day for our conversation, I encourage all Members to take this month to hear stories of our history so that we may honor the past, present, and future of our African American citizens.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to ask the Speaker to co-sponsor H.J. Res 1407, legislation that would allow for the designation of February as African American History Month.

I again ask that the Speaker co-sponsor this legislation.

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation.

Madam Speaker, we have made significant progress in providing healthcare to all people. However, we still have a lot of work to do.

I want to thank the Speaker for working with us to pass H.R. 1227, which provides a framework for States to set up their own State-based insurance exchanges.

This legislation will 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.

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 our country. Madam Speaker, while this is not a day for our conversation, I encourage all Members to take this month to hear stories of our history so that we may honor the past, present, and future of our African American citizens.
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 detest.

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 unselected 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, 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 high school to join 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 opportunity, 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 AS 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. She was recently 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 school day 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 becoming friend in their 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. 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
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.

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 blocking 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 system. 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 system, that a 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 pass or fail result, the ATF cannot determine whether the sale of a firearm should be allowed to proceed. The ATF determined that if NICS issued a pass result, more than 90 percent of the cases, the NICS system provides a more effective background check.

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 is required to 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 to 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.

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 this 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 system 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.
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 two 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 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 who was 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 vote on it. 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.

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 a gun in 2016 using this loophole, and the 4,800 people who purchased guns in 2016 using this loophole. Think about who those 4,000 people, the poor souls of Emanuel AME Church, their next meeting, this gentleman, who stabbed her to death.

There could be no end to this cycle.

Clementa Pinckney, who, along with two 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.

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 wait 4 or 5 days, 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.

However, that faith was rocked in June 2015 when this lone gunman punctuated his participation in a Bible study at Emanuel AME ...
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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 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 after the background 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 more than 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, approximately 22 percent of the individuals investigated proceeded transfers——

Ms. BASS. The FBI reported that, in 2007 and 2008, in cases 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for this 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 forms 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 do not 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.

Last year, 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 background check if the Attorney General finds by a horrific act of gun violence. Their lives were taken by a horrific act of 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 urge my colleagues to vote yes on 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.

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

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

Madam Chair, I heard the arguments 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 that 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 part of this 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 did hear 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 from 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 get 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 commonsense 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. CORY BOOK 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 of the bills 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 mark-up 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 engaged with 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," "severe emotional instability," or "severe mental defects" could result in some veterans who are not now included being added to the NICS index due to 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 prohibited 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.

Mr. ROE 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 same 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 I am up at this time 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 down the Rules process. 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 for prime time for 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 on my chairman that he really had no control over. I believe, to bring something forward that is not proper.

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 gentleman from Illinois (Ms. Kelly).

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 but it was 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 the “post-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 in the Senate. 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 gentleman from Texas (Ms. Jackson Lee), a member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas Madam Chair, I thank the chairman and Mr. Clayburn, 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 he had it not signed and 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— and then的规定. 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 gentleman 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 Ms. Lofgren, 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 weapon. I thank the Majority Whip, Congressman Clayburn, 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 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 could not sell or transfer 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 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.

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 33,000 gun-related homicides in the U.S.—4,000 more than 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

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 safe storage requirements or assault weapons bans.

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

- 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 Texas, 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.

One question you have to answer—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 and respect 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 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 this 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. But I 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. Three 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.

My question—do we always have to go to the big violence, or why do we 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? If that is 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 told, this bill does give the FBI 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 go to 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 the United States: 39,000. How are we different? Are we tougher? We are not doing that. We are starting on the nonsense of the following 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 our 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 neighborhods, 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 SELLS OR TRANSfers A FIREARM TO A PERSON WHO IS NOT SUCH A LICENSEE.

Section 922 (f) 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—

(1) not fewer than 10 business days (meaning a day on which State offices are open) has elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and

(ii) 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 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 Attorney General or by first-class mail, a petition for review which—

(a) 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

(b) requests that the Attorney General or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation notify 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:

(2) 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)(B)(ii); and

(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.

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, there is 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. 2. REQUIREMENT THAT THE NICS SYSTEM SEARCH THE NATIONAL DATA EXCHANGE DATABASE IN CONDUCTING BACKGROUND CHECKS.

Section 922(t)(1) of title 18, United States Code, 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 good. 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.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 3. REPORTS ON PETITIONS SUPPORTING FIREARMS TRANSFERS NOT IMME Diately Approved by Nics Sys tem, 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 and would do so, with these weapons anyway. Simply, this is the right to bear arms. I do not believe 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 effort 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 what we have 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 colleagues 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. 325 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 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 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, Medford, Mississipi—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 Piggy Bank Shooting, Goleta, California—January 2006: 7 Dead
13. Trolley 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. Atlantic Plastics Shooting, Henderson Kentucky—June 2008: 5 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
26. Seal Beach Shooting, Seal Beach, California—October 2011: 8 Dead
27. Oikos University, Oakland, California—April 2012: 7 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. Aurora Mall Shooting, Aurora, Colorado—January 2013: 8 Dead
34. San Bernadino Shooting, San Bernardino, California—December 2015: 14 Dead
35. San Bernardino Shooting, San Bernardino, California—December 2015: 14 Dead
36. San Bernardino Shooting, San Bernardino, California—December 2015: 14 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 Nightclub 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 those criminal investigation reviews 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 Acting CHAIR. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I am proud to cosponsor 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.

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 New York and southern New Jersey were 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.

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 Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I am proud today to join me in supporting this amendment, and I commend the sponsor for doing so.

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

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. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment was agreed to.
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. 4. 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.

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 common myth 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 have 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, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 5. 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.

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 the 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 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 license 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
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 that amount of time, it is 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. Then 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 is 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 gentleman, 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. That purpose of this amendment is to, obviously, do so, support Second Amendment rights.

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 this 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 the gentleman here and in the plain reading of this amendment does not fix it. I am glad the gentleman is trying to fix this, which 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.
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Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from "aye" to "no.

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 on the state of the House forthwith, reported the bill, as amended by 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, to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 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 gentleman opposite 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 1, line 20, strike "(bb)" and insert "(II)";

Page 2, line 9, strike "(aa)" and insert "(BB)";

Page 2, line 14, strike "(bb)" and insert "(BB)";

Page 3, line 1, strike "or" after the semi-colon;

Page 3, 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 was notified. In this sub-clause, 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 of the victim; and; and, The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman 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 recommitted. 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 remind 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 Bone, 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 Bone 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.

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?
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 reiterate that that very name—"Charleston loophole"—is a grim reminder of the underlying bill, H.R. 1112, is a critical and carefully crafted bill to address the Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.

I will repeat, the very name "Charles-

The Charleston loophole.
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 of the 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 between the two votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 100, "nay" on rollcall No. 101, "nay" on rollcall No. 102, and "yea" on rollcall No. 103.

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 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.
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, 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. 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, and 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.

**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. 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.

**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 be come the owner of a firearm. 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.

This has to be 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 those 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 told Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli, he had somebody daily intelligence briefings that went through his home. She had somebody working as her home. She had somebody who should not have been wiretapped. Of course, he didn’t just do it on his own. His source was the FBI’s counterintelligence—and also the Attorney General’s Office, which was also working with the FBI’s counterintelligence.

And he goes on to talk about that.

The name is not disclosed. He 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 abuse, and he would have 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.

I know, 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.

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 calloused, so self-absorbed, and so political that they have damaged not only the FBI but the Department of Justice, but this country.

But when you have willing allies in the alt-left media—or some call them 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. They reported that the inspector general says, “Prosecution Was Declined for Senior DOJ Official Who Sexually Assaulted a Subordinate.”

And goes on to talk about the one thing I agreed with him on, and I heard him tell people: “You, of all people, especially, knew better.”

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.

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 calloused, so self-absorbed, and so political that they have damaged not only the FBI but 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 some feeling of despair is felt by the American people. Where do we turn when the Justice Department is not honest?

While we ask you to could you 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 the Central American countries. Am I amazed that some of these media outlets can even continue to call themselves journalists.

An article from Brian Flood, January 10, 2019, points out that: ‘News outlets can readily describe 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 outlets say there are no 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 was no C-word there. ‘Crisis’ is the C-word, crisis was the C-word. 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—a crisis along the southern border were ‘shocking,’ and ABC News reported that Obama requested $3.7 billion to cope with the humanitarian crisis at the border away the alternative of 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: ‘Immigrant crisis funds. ‘Incredible sums. ‘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.

They would tell you 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 in. Naturally, you were going to see a spike.

Let’s talk about the drugs. There is a spike there. Sometimes, they are going to go live, and we handle the shipping. We know that nobody crosses our border undetected. They are in charge of the House of Representatives who want us there, and they are trying 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 come: Where did you get the money to pay to come? Oh, 1,000 here, 1,000 people 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 needed to go to get the money to work off what they owe the drug cartels.

But, Madam Speaker, you shouldn’t be surprised when you see headlines like: Meth lab in major U.S. city bust by drug cartels. 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 legally into the country, and they hand us the address of somebody supposed to be 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 the Homeland Security Department for decades 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 the 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 wayside. The drug cartels want them 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 amounts of drugs that are coming 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 by 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 to me—keeping him alive, but he is amazing. He is fighting the drug cartels down there.
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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 means a lot of Mexican drug cartel 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 have 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.

That is still going on. It was going on during President Bush’s administration, probably back to the former Bush 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 been quoted: “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 former 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 in 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, that is an urgent humanitarian situation.”

As the Director of Border Patrol told me, “It is not a humanitarian crisis anymore.”

As the Director of Border Patrol pointed out this week in testimony under oath, now the huge majority is people coming to be family units—why? Because they have heard, if they have children, 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.
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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.

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 produce it 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.

And as teachers have pointed out to me: I love my kids. I love the kids that 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 violence.

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’s 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 not recognize the mistaken impression that there are 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 that good 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 most 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 ELLIjah 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. That is the committee that 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.

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 me to 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, just 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 it is I can do to make sure the people I represent have the maximum of representation they can. I am sure 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 do something for 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 our District, 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; they are higher. And it 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 had fought and won the Civil War, where those in my party the Democrats had fought on the side of slavery.

Republican fought on the side of freedom, and when it saw it had a capitol, that it did not wish to lose to 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-govern-ment 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 Rep-representatives in 1948, and I have en- dorsed the enactment of home rule legis-lation during both my terms as Presi-dent."

This was bipartisan, finally. And Re-publicans, that party, that post-war party that fought on the side of slavery, serves 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 hodgepodge 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. laws, bills that together bring about statehood, burdened 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 consecutively every day. 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, what do we do? 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: it is not used by the Congress, but it is 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 Congress, borders the city and 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 should pursue. 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, which 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.
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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 to 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 to the District of Columbia and say: Please call out the National Guard. But no. The District has its own National Guard. We have no say.

That is, essentially, what we are asking for. So that, too, is part of my Free and Equal D.C. series.

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 we 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.
RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Hon. NANCY PELOSI, Presiding 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 Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereafter referred to as the “Committee”), to the extent applicable.

(a) The Rules of the House of Representa-
tives, as amended from time to time, and to the extent applicable, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the extent applicable.

(b) A motion to recess and a motion to disperse 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, the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman or other member of the Committee deems necessary 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.

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 to determine the time at which a hearing shall begin, or to adjourn a hearing, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the taking ofaction; (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 Committee or subcommittee unless the Chairman of the Committee shall determine that at least one quorum of the House of Representatives remains present at the time the Committee or subcommittee meets.

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 will be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, would 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 Chairman or majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person; and

(c) The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, in open session only if the Chairman or majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person.

5. CONVENING HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

(a) Hearings

(1) Notice. Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of the hearing to be held 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. The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the relevant Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing before the commencement of the Committee or subcommittee, and in the case of the full Committee, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. No change shall be made to the hearing title after consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member and notice to previously announced witnesses.

(2) When proceedings resume on a postponed hearing, the Chairman, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection,

(b) Markups and Other Meetings to Transact Business

Meetings. The Chairman of the full Committee may or shall convene, as the relevant Chairman considers necessary, meetings of the Committee or a subcommittee for the purpose of receiving testimony on a hearing, 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 the 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 the markup or meeting. The Chairman may advance the 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 the Chairman’s or subcommittee chairman’s consideration unless such consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee, or by the Chairman of the full Committee, or by motion. However, in the case of a hearing or markup meeting, in which the witness represents more than one party, the witness shall, if requested by the Chairman, be permitted to question witnesses for a specific period of not longer than 30 minutes.

(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 or of the subcommittee thereof, to question a witness for a specified period of not longer than 30 minutes. On such occasions, the number of Minority Members so questioning the witness is limited. In no event 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) 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 the date that appears on the notice of the hearing. If a witness is scheduled before 10 a.m. on a business day, the witness shall file the testimony no later than 12 p.m. on the business day following the business day of the hearing. If a witness is scheduled after 10 a.m., the witness shall file the testimony no later than 3 p.m. on the business day following the business day of the hearing. If the hearing is closed to the public, the Committee may waive the filing requirement.

(2) Witness Preparation and Waiver. The requirements of paragraph (1) may be waived if the Chairman of the full Committee, or of the subcommittee, or any Member of the Committee designated by the relevant Chairman, or any Member of the Committee or a subcommittee, or any Member of the Committee (a) the witness is a minor, or (b) the witness is a minor who is likely to present testimony other than that appearing on the notice of the hearing. For purposes of this subsection, testimony includes the written statement of a witness, as well as any video, audio, photographic, written, or other supporting materials that the witness intends to present or display before the Committee. Such testimony should be provided in an electronic form not later than one day after the request of the Chairman.

(3) Remote Witness Participation. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may permit a witness to testify via telephone, videoconference, or any other medium at the witness’s request. The witness shall provide to the Committee a copy of the witness’s statement, including any supplementary materials that the witness intends to present during the hearing.

(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 HANDLING 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 a written request for 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 such 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 before its printing. Any 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 Committee and any witness participating in any proceeding, 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 at the written request of any Member of the Committee.

The Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make its publications available in electronic form, including official prints of hearings and markup 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 full 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 Committee or subcommittee hearing 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 after the 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 Member sponsoring each such amendment.

(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, each Committee hearing shall be considered completed, and any committee bill shall be considered extraneous material.

(b) 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 travel reports, is submitted to the Chairman, Members and employees of the Committee shall provide a report to the Chairman listing all official expenses (including per diem and other official functions in which the individual participated, by country and date. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Chairman may require such report of a member of the Committee who may be required to attend 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 action recommended by the Committee is 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 sentiment of the 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 Committee or a subcommittee, and on extraordinary circumstances will be determined by the Committee or a relevant subcommittee has ordered reported such bill or resolution.

The full Committee or a subcommittee shall not consider a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that contains exclusively findings and policy declarations or expressions of sentiment of the 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.

13. STAFF SERVICES

The Committee staff shall be selected and organized so that it can provide a comprehensive range of professional services in support of the full 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 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 serve under the general 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 fixed, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the majority of the minority party Members of the Committee. The Chair must ensure that 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, CSE, and Global War on Terror; Challenged 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; arms control and disarmament; the International Development Finance Corporation, the United States Agency for International Development; activities and policies of the State, Commerce, and Defense Departments and other international agencies related to the Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act, including export and licensing policies for munitions items and technology and dual-use equipment; and the Arms Export Control Act.

Subject to clause 9 of rule X of the House of Representatives, 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 serve under the general 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 fixed, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the majority of the minority party Members of the Committee. The Chair must ensure that 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.
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 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 regional 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:

1. 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, including the American Red Cross; and the Peace Corps. In addition, legislation 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.

2. The Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and Nonproliferation:

(a) Such other matters as the Chairman of the full Committee may determine.

(b) In addition to its regional jurisdiction, oversight of: nonproliferation matters involving nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction.

3. The Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy and the Environment:

(a) 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; vulnerabilities to uninterrupted and affordable energy; environmental conservation and wildlife protection.

(b) The Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Egypt:

(a) 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:

1. With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, legislative jurisdiction over investigations of all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

2. The Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security and Trade:

(a) International energy trends; energy security, responses to regional jurisdiction, oversight of: international energy crises and challenges; 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 international non-proliferation and non-terrorism; and preventing violence by state or non-state actors.

(b) With the concurrence of the Chairman of the full Committee, regional legislative jurisdiction over export promotions and measures related to the International Development Finance Corporation and the Trade and Development Agency.

15. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) General. The Committee 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, other appropriate Members, and with a view toward minimizing scheduling conflicts. Subcommittee meetings shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with hearings of the 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 notice to the relevant subcommittee.

16. REFESSION OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

In accordance with rule 14 of the Committee and with the concurrence of the majority party, the Chairman of the full Committee shall have authority to refer any legislation to a subcommittee of the Committee.

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 Rules 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 Rules of the House.

All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the Members serving as Chairman of the subcommittees.

Conference subcommittee records shall be coordinated with the records of the full Committee. Subcommittee records shall be kept distinct from the property of the House.

19. MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman shall call a meeting of the subcommittee chairman on a regular basis not less frequently than once a month. Such a meeting shall be held on official 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 and other Members of Congress authorized to receive classified information by clause 13 of rule XXXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Egypt shall be considered authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee shall be the only Member of the Committee authorized to access classified information.

(d) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to access classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(f) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(g) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(h) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(i) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(j) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(k) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(l) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(m) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(n) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(o) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(p) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(q) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(r) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(s) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(t) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(u) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(v) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(w) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(x) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(y) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

(z) The Chairman of the Committee shall be authorized to have access to classified information in the possession of the Committee.

{February 28, 2019 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE H2305}
(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 a 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 or by any Member designated by the Chairman.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to classified Committee documents. 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 fully satisfied the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as passed by the House).

(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 or by any Member designated by the Chairman.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to classified Committee documents. 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 fully satisfied the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as passed by the House.

(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 or by any Member designated by the Chairman.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to classified Committee documents. 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 fully satisfied the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as passed by the House. (Technicality)

(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 or by any Member designated by the Chairman.

(b) Designated Persons. Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to classified Committee documents. 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 fully satisfied the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as passed by the House.
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 conferees, the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the majority or minority member, shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member.

21. 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 within 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 shall submit an oversight plan (including any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a member of the Committee) to the Committee on Oversight and Reform and the Committee on House Administration not later than 60 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. 2—REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) 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.

(b) A regularly scheduled meeting shall be held at a time determined by the Chairperson of the Committee as the Chairperson considers necessary, or at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee. The determination of the meeting shall promptly be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) 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.

(d) The Chairperson, in the case of meetings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting to be conducted on any measure or matter. Meetings shall not commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the Fourth of July falls on such a day) on which members have notice thereof. If the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the majority member, determines that there is no need 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.

(e) The Chairperson, in the case of meetings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make available on the Committee’s website not later than 24 hours before the time of such meeting information concerning the time, place, and subject matter of the meeting. The information shall include the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

RULE NO. 5—PROXIES

(a) A record vote shall be held if requested by any member of the Committee.

(b) The record vote in the case of meetings of the Committee shall be conducted on any measure or matter. Meetings shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any record vote, and shall present the matter to the Committee on written request at any time.

(c) The Chairperson shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any record vote, and shall present the matter to the Committee on written request at any time.

(d) The Chairperson shall make available on the Committee’s website not later than 24 hours before the time of such meeting information concerning the time, place, and subject matter of the meeting. The information shall include the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

(e) The Chairperson shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any record vote, and shall present the matter to the Committee on written request at any time.
(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 (subject to subparagraph (h)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the Rules of the House as the Committee, when 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 to conduct its investigations and to make its findings 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 of the Committee

(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, of the Committee. 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 issuance of the subpoena. If 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 purpose of determining whether a majority of the members of the Committee is actually present, or of determining a quorum, the attendance of any member of the Committee shall be determined in the same manner as if the Committee were in session, and any member designated by the Chairperson, may administer oaths to any witness.

RULE NO. 8—AMENDMENTS

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the Committee must be made available in written form when requested, or in any other form, as the Committee, in its discretion, may determine. The amendment shall be in writing and submitted to the Clerk of the House for printing in the Congressional Record. The Committee shall make available to each witness a summary of the amendment as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

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 not sufficient time 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 of such notice. The Committee, at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing, shall, by a written statement of the Chairperson or by the ranking minority member, determine that the Chairperson, with the concurrence of the majority party members on the Committee, shall constitute a quorum. The Committee shall constitute a quorum. For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) Unless otherwise ordered by the Committee, each witness shall be notified, in writing, of his or her right to be accompanied by counsel for the purpose of cross-examining the witnesses before the Committee, of the rules of the Committee, and of the rights of the parties as provided by the Rules of the House of Representatives. Any witness shall be provided a copy of the rules of the Committee and a copy of the rules of the House of Representatives. Any witness may obtain a transcript copy of any testimony taken at any hearing, and all testimony given by the Committee shall be available in written form when requested.

(c) Any witness who has been called to testify or whose testimony has been requested by the Committee shall be afforded an opportunity to present such evidence or testimony as he or she deems necessary. The Committee shall have the right to require the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, documents and other materials as it deems necessary to conduct its investigations and to make its findings in electronic form. The Chairperson, or any member designated by the Committee, may administer oaths to any witness.

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) With respect to each record vote on a measure or matter, the Clerk of the House shall record accompanying or supplemental comments, written testimony, or any other material submitted by any Member or by any other person.

(b) The report of the Committee shall include all supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views of the majority of the Committee present voting for and against the measure or matter.

(c) The report of the Committee shall include the names of those members voting for and against 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.

(d)(1) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of any testimony taken at any hearing, and all testimony given by the Committee shall be available in written form when requested.

(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) report and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.
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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 such matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on 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.
(5) In the case of any special order or motion 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, to a majority member of the Committee to act as floor manager of a bill or resolution during its consideration 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.
RULEx11—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.
RULEx12—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 having an agency, bureau, or commission designation.
(b) The Committee shall, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction, make appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or procedures and take such actions as may be consistent with the above.
(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 the (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the 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 from the appropriation or reappropriation, and in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during the fiscal year.
(d) Wherever 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, or to reconcile the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.
RULEx13—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 the legislative news media, 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 television, audio or broadcast system is 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.
RULEx14—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 of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairperson.
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.), pursuant to a 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 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. 112(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 122(a)(1)); 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 22-619, “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.

251. 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.

252. 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.

253. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-637, “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.

254. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-638, “Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation [Docket No.: 181219859] 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 22-639, “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.

256. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-640, “Students in the Care of D.C. Children, Inc. Scholarship Program Certification 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, “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.

258. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-642, “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.

259. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-643, “Agriculture and Rural Development Premium 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.

260. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-644, “Footnotes, 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.

261. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-645, “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.

262. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-646, “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.

263. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-647, “Agriculture and Rural Development Premium Prevention 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.

264. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-648, “Public Restroom Facilities In- stalled 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.

265. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-649, “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.

266. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-650, “Students in the Care of D.C. Children, Inc. Scholarship Program Certification 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 22-651, “ 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.

268. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-652, “Farm Bill 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 22-653, “Mental Health Education 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 22-654, “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.

271. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-655, “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.
801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

295. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2019-19) 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.

296. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Private Activity Bonds (TD 9845) (RIN: 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.

297. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Private Activity Bonds (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.

298. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Individual Student_loan Responsibility Audit 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.

299. 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 pass-through entities in a transaction (Rev. Proc. 2019-10) 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.

300. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Maximum Values for 2018 for Use With Vehicle Cents-Per-Mile and Fleet Aver- age Valuations Rules (Notice 2019-06) 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.

301. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Section 162(a) Safe harbors for certain passthrough entities in a transaction (Rev. Proc. 2019-7) 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. KOHANNA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ROCO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHRACK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. VANNEMERSH, Mr. MOORE, Mr. OMAR, Ms. WATERSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEE of California, Mr. ROUZA, Ms. PINHRE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GABBAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BUSSOS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. KILDNER, Ms. DEAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SHAN PATEL, Ms. PATHEL, Ms. BROWN of New York, Mr. NELSON, Ms. SHELBY, Ms. VELEZquez, Ms. MENG, Ms. BARRAGAN, 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 Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be determined by the Speaker, in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEEXES, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ABRAHAMS, Mr. ROSAID, Ms. MCBATH, Mr. MCCULLOM, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MICHELINI, Mr. LEE of California, Mr. McKEE, Mr. ROYBAL of California, Mr. LEE of California, Mr. ROYBAL of California, Mr. BARRAGAN, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 1418. A bill to require 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. PELLMUTTER):

H.R. 1419. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish a public health insurance option on the public and private markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESCHOO (for herself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. WILLCH, and Mr. PONKOU):

H.R. 1420. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and education; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESCHOO (for herself, Mr. COOPE, 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.
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. WILSON, Ms. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Ms. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. VIDSON of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs permits the display of Fallen Soldier Displays in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. WEHR 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 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. SKIBS, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mr. BRENDA F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. ESPEY of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCCOVEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEY of California, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. HARRISON 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. BAHRAGAAN, 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 homeland security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. WATERS (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. LA MALFA, Ms. FOX of North Carolina, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GARCIA of Puerto Rico, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BIRD, 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. BURKHOLDER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CHAROT, Mr. BARR, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. DUNCAN):
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. WATERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SALALAH, and Mr. RUSH): H.R. 1449. 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. LIÉ of California (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KHANNA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TAURO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PELLMUTTER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTÉZ, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRSISLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SRINIVASAN, Mr. BHOST, Mr. McCAIN, and Ms. SPEIER): H.R. 1445. A bill to prohibit 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. LIÉ of California (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KHANNA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TAURO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PELLMUTTER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTÉZ, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRSISLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SRINIVASAN, Mr. BHOST, Mr. McCAIN, and Ms. SPEIER): H.R. 1445. A bill to prohibit 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 Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Fish and Wildlife Service to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public education activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. McCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. LOCKWOOD, Mr. NEGESE, Mr. MCDOUGAL, and Ms. SPEIER): H.R. 1450. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect religious interests against meaningfully harmful to third parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG: 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 Mr. GIROD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MILLER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. STEFANIK, Ms. JAYAPAL, 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 uncured timber; to the Ways and Means Committee.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. MURPHY): H.R. 1453. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. McGOVERN, and Ms. HAALAND): H.R. 1450. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect religious interests against meaningfully harmful to third parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH: 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. SEAN Patrick MALONEY of New York: H.R. 1457. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Fish and Wildlife Service to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public education activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. McCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. LOCKWOOD, Mr. NEGESE, Mr. MCDOUGAL, and Ms. SPEIER): H.R. 1450. A bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect religious interests against meaningfully harmful to third parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG: 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.
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 community and economic contractual activities 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 Committee 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 abeyance when a Government shutdown is in effect, and to agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2020 by April 15, 2019, to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of the House 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, 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. Baragoon, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Clarke of Massachusetts, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Correa, Mr. Cummings, Mr. DeFazio, Ms. DelBene, Ms. Dingell, Mr. Espalllier, Ms. Frankel, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Hastings, Ms. Jackson Lee, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Kaptur, Mr. Ruiz, Ms. Kilmer, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Lee of California, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Ms. Matsui, Ms. McCollum, Ms. McNerney, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Moore, Ms. Napolitano, Ms. Norton, Ms. Omar, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Sahln, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Serrano, Ms. Speizer, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Takano, Ms. Titus, Ms. Torres of California, Ms. Velázquez, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Ms. Watson Coleman, Ms. Waterhouse, and Mr. Whittaker):

H.R. 1468. A bill to promote the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, to provide 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, to provide the Attorney General with the authority to impose civil money penalties for violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on 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. Gorar, and Mr. Gaetz):

H.R. 1469. A bill to amend title IV-A of the Social Security Act to target funds to truly needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Serrano (for himself, Mr. Hastings, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Lee of California, Mr. Ruiz, 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 and loans to 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. Young):

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. Mr. Colvin's 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 allow for the importation of affordable and safe insulin for patients in emergency situations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. Wasserman Schultz (for herself, Mr. Dritsakis, 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 certification 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 tax credits for 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 authorize the Department of Energy to enter into 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 participate on Labor Day, March 1, 2019, as Read Across America Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
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:

Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

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 Ms. ESCH:

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 Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1422. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 18, Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 1423. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1425. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. CRAIG:

H.R. 1425. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1426. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1428. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1429. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WAYFARER:

H.R. 1430. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KIYOSHI:

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 I, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1433. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1435. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 1434. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 1436. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 1437. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 1438. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States; 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 I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

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. FOSTER (for himself and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 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 Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 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 Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. KIM, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. KRATING):

H.R. 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, Mr. PEDO of California, Mr. TEO LIU of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SABLIN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUAREZ, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MEeks, and Mr. MCDAMAS):

H.R. 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. BRAT):

H.R. 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 Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1423. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

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.”
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 Mr. 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:
Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:
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. CHENEFY:
H.R. 1445.
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. 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:

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, or in any Department or Officer of them, or in any Office or Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BEYER:
H.R. 1453.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The 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 Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:
H.R. 1454.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—‘‘To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations’’

By Ms. DINGELL:
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 Ms. LEE of California:
H.R. 1457.
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. 1458.
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. SHERMAN:
H.R. 1459.
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. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 1460.
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. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 1461.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:
H.R. 1462.
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. OMAR:
H.R. 1463.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 1464.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H.R. 1465.
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. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 1466.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:
H.R. 1467.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:
H.R. 1468.
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. SERRANO:
H.R. 1469.
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. KENNEDY:
H.R. 1470.
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. 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.

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 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for executing 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. 1478.

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

Article I, 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, 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 I, 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, in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1480.

H.R. 270: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1054: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 1708: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1022: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1008: Mr. REYER.

H.R. 1201: Mr. BOSHER of West Virginia.

H.R. 1377: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 1077: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1331: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1332: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1572: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. King of New York.

H.R. 1370: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 1497: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CINDEROS, Mr. KENNEDY of Mississippi, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUFFERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WITTEN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1411: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 427: Mr. BOSHER of Texas.

H.R. 1066: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1124: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1225: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SARLAN, 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. MCNERNY.

H.R. 1306: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1322: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1327: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1331: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1332: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1572: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. King of New York.

H.R. 1370: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 1497: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CINDEROS, Mr. KENNEDY of Mississippi, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUFFERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WITTEN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1411: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 427: Mr. BOSHER of Texas.

H.R. 1066: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1124: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1225: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SARLAN, 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. MCNERNY.

H.R. 1306: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1322: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1327: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1331: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1332: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1572: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. King of New York.

H.R. 1370: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 1497: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CINDEROS, Mr. KENNEDY of Mississippi, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUFFERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WITTEN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1411: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 427: Mr. BOSHER of Texas.

H.R. 1066: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1124: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1225: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SARLAN, 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. MCNERNY.

H.R. 1306: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1322: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1327: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1331: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1332: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1572: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. King of New York.

H.R. 1370: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Cisneros.

H.R. 1497: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CINDEROS, Mr. KENNEDY of Mississippi, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUFFERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WITTEN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1411: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 427: Mr. BOSHER of Texas.

H.R. 1066: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1124: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1225: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SARLAN, 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. MCNERNY.

H.R. 1306: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1322: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARR, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1327: Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1331: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1332: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1572: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. King of New York.
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**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed 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 for petty policy disagreements 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**

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’
Recently 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 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 by the time they reach age 65. 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 the 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 would be unlawful for a private employer to offer healthcare to their employees. Here is what it reads: “It shall be unlawful for a private employer to offer health insurance (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. The landslide 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 take-over going to cost? Well, under even conservative estimates, this proposal—with all the revenue shortfalls 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: money that 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 number 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 is just a simple fact that financing the American people, cuts to services, rationing of healthcare, broken promises, and debt. That is where it is going to come from.

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 record-breaking 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 necessarily treatment from a specialist was 22 weeks—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 wait times that patients have to contend with, it is outright denials of care. In the first quarter of last year alone, Britain’s National Health Service abruptly canceled 25,000 surgeries—canceled them. Imagine 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—$2 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.

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 decelerization, 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 comprehensible 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, and irreversible 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 the table.

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 in the moment, our outreach to 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 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 check 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 simply updates the Brady law. 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 entrepreneurs have the consensus.

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 2006. The 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’ banks, more job openings and opportunities for American workers, more Americans feeling hopeful about their future.

Republican economic policies are making life better for American families, Mr. President, and 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 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 the entire 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 mandates that?”

The Senator from Vermont’s response: “No.”

Another Democratic candidate for President, the junior Senator from New York, was recently asked: Should everyone have healthcare, 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 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, undercuts, 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 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
CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now I want to address two more issues related to this topic.

First, I want to report 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 the Senate Democratic Caucus 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 this 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 in climate change and it is 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 want to 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 Democrat and Republican who are trying to dress up this climate change perestroika as the Green New Deal is planning to create a panel of cherry-picked scientists to “counter” the scientific consensus. I mentioned these reports earlier this morning.

It was not always this way. Here is a clue—his words, not mine. That was in 2009, which said catastrophic and irreversible consequences for humanity and our planet—his words, not mine. That was 1986, that was 2007, and this was 2009.

What tells you a lot also is this 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 about the Republican Party that they can’t even hire a scientist 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 groups organized 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 want to put in charge of the Environmental Protection Agency.

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 irreputable. 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, and it is pending before 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 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, they have been able to spend unlimited money in politics and run away from them—the American people will see right through the ploy.

I don’t know what has happened to the Republican Party that they can’t even hire a scientist to represent the people of America leading the Environmental Protection Agency. They found out how to spend unlimited money in politics. They found out how 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, they have been able to spend unlimited money in politics and run away from them—the American people will see right through the ploy.

I don’t know what has happened to the Republican Party that they can’t even hire a scientist to represent the people of America leading the Environmental Protection Agency.

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 irreputable. 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, and it is pending before 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 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, they have been able to spend unlimited money in politics and run away from them—the American people will see right through the ploy.

I don’t know what has happened to the Republican Party that they can’t even hire a scientist 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 groups organized 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 want to put in charge of the Environmental Protection Agency.

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 irreputable. 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, and it is pending before 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 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, they have been able to spend unlimited money in politics and run away from them—the American people will see right through the ploy.

I don’t know what has happened to the Republican Party that they can’t even hire a scientist to represent the people of America leading the Environmental Protection Agency.
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, 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 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.

American Petroleum Institute received 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, there is little Caseus 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 for.

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 latest data on climate pull out of the Paris climate accord was perhaps the most consequential representation of his inward-looking, isolationist view for America. It was a disastrous abdication of our Nation’s leadership role on the international stage. In short, he is not a man who can 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 the country and 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 Donald Trump and the House 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 fact that 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 tied to 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 dangerous. The chaotic, more unpredictable, and more dangerous future will be cheaper, bigger, and scarier than the one we are so desperately trying to avoid.

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 those 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-per-cent powered by clean energy because of the technologies invented in this country and because of the technologies that are being deployed with American labor. We need to invest in literally 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. MARKET. 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 well-being over the coming decades.”

These are earth-shattering-scientist 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 dangerous.” 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; the damage of trillions of dollars in 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—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 this.

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 change worse. They have approved 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 because it is dangerous. 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 change 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 and 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 plans for how to achieve that. It is the Republicans who are 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 tackle 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 ignore. But this is not what we have 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 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 happening 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. How about this? This will completely change the amount of carbon dioxide from the electricity generation. How about this? 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, and 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 fuel efficiency standards, if you don’t like making cars go 50 miles per gallon, if you don’t like 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 to talk about 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. They don’t believe in ideas on climate. Their only plan is to actively, aggressively make things even worse.

They need to make that 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 on their website, that they would see an empty Chamber on the floor, that they 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. What would you 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, 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 and friends of the earth would say, boy, these areairologues, 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.

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 it, 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.

President Trump 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.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, today, I have filed an amendment 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 to 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 the things that were in 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. These 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 CFCs. On 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 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 air. They came in aerosol cans, and other products. They were 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 the things that were in 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. These 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 CFCs. On 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 go. 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 purpose 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 and 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, however, 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 Resource development folks, the spirit of enterprise, FreedomWorks, the American Chemistry Council, Business Roundtable, and Sierra Club.

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 heart.

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 heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as strange as it seems, socialism is having a bit of a resurence 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? First, 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, the 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 dear friends.

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 make the argument that we all want to be more equal.

But we have been told that we 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 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 are 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 will somehow lead to economic equality. They say: Not true. 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 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 ensure 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 high 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 this? The richest countries in the world is just from the top 1 percent of the wealthiest 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 landscape, 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-President Candidate Hugo Chavez delivered impassioned speeches promising to lead Venezuela into a socialist utopia. 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 the free market and supressed 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 capitalistic system implies an unequal sharing of blessings. The inherent virtue of Socialism is the equal sharing of miseries.

Clearly, miseries would be a result of a current fact: 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 adpopie work to earn their living, 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 sound pretty 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 and soul 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 his March 4, 2016, Wall Street Journal 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 because taxes will always be 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 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 of America.

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 believe 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 different car in each State and then a different kind of truck or car 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 in clean 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-market.

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 technologies in that HFC. They want to be able not just to develop it, but they want to 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 up 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 climate and health.

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 HFC. They want 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 groundwater contamination, to the increases in economic challenges, we are already facing, there is 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 consistency, predictability, 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 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 should be doing under Mr. Wheeler’s leadership.

The Sterigenics facility is causing 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 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 are 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 way he has chosen to do anything more than monitor and collect 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 Senate, expect the EPA to lead efforts to address this gas. Concerns about ethylene oxide being emitted into neighborhoods does not end with that. 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 results in Parkinson’s disease. There are several facilities on the Southeast side of Chicago that emit manganese, and the 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 health consequences 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 climate change as a national security threat. The EPA, which 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, bio refineries, and fuels stations that they would ensure stations could sell E15 fuels this summer. The EPA is coming close to failing to fulfill 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 warning 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, the agency will work to undermine the Clean Power Plan, performance standards for new automobiles, and 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 complimentary vehicle emission standards under the Clean Air Act. That law also recognizes California’s long-standing 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 standards under the Trump administration’s new authority to regulate its own greenhouse gas emissions.

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. Launtenberg 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
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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 Asbestosis, 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 stopped 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. He has shown a clear disregard for the EPA’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. Regrettfully, 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 I watch the looks on their faces, and I realize that he was for them that there is room at the top. 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 get up. He is just a normal person in the bureaucracy. He climbed all the way up, and he reached the top.

Andrew didn’t even know this as he was making his initial speech, but I watched the looks on their faces, and I knew that even though I was overregulated. I know what it is like firsthand. 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 knew 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 direct experience from his service. The United States benefited from his leadership, and now America will benefit as well.

Let’s vote Andrew in and put him to work.

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 capacity as well as in my capacity as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

He served 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 an outstanding 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 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 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, 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. Regrettfully, 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 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 at that time. I put him to the U.S. Senate. When I became chairman at the time, I asked him to be Acting Deputy Administrator, 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. He was confirmed in an 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 get there. 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 get there. He 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 knew 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 direct experience from his service. The United States 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 post-cloture 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         Hoeven        Rounds
Braun           Hyde-Smith     Rubio
Burr            Inhofe         Sanders
Capito          Isakson        Scott (FL)
Cassidy         Johnson        Scott (SC)
Coryn           Kennedy       Smith
Cotton          Lankford      Shelby
Cramer           Lee           Sullivan
Crapo           McConnell     Thune
Cruz            McSally       Tillis
Daines           Moran         Toomey
Enzi            Murray        Wicker
Ernst            Paul          Young
Fischer         Perdue

**NAYS—47**

Baldwin        Harris         Reed
Bennet          Hirono      Schatz
Blumenthal     Heinrich      Sanders
Booker           Jones     Schumer
Brown           Kaine        Shaheen
Carmen          King         Smith
Carper          Klobuchar     Stabenow
Casey            Leahy       Tester
Collins         Manchin       Udall
Coons            Markley     Van Hollen
Cortez Masto   Menendez     Warren
Duckworth       Meney        Whitehouse
Durbin            Marphy     Wyden
Feinstein        Murray
Gillibrand       Pappas

**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 moments, I am 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, filling that 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. Much of its fuel is low sulfur, 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.

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 because I worked with 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 Senate has just adopted 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 no cloture motion, but I will not dwell on this because I spoke on this Monday night. Unfortunately, Mr. Ryder has been on the Senate's calendar 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 Senate 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 placed him on a list of nominees that was released 2 weeks 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 at that time. It was simply said: You still keep the cloture motion, and you still will 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 Senate Blunt and Senator LANKFORD to introduce 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.

There have been some conversations. I hope Senator BLUNT and Senator LANKFORD will continue to have those conversations with the Democratic Majority, but the only advice to Democratic Senators, by my counsel, 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.

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

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 the 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 President 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 this 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 who 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. 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 he 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 fill the border wall gap.

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

February 28, 2019

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S1569
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 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 admissible 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 inadequately address these critical issues. Any agreement for the current year should satisfy the following priorities:

—Border Wall, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) President requests $6.7 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 of $7.1 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 $751 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 $751 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, transport, and 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 the FY 2019 supplemental request, 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 in-bound lanes at U.S. Southwest Border Land Ports of Entry (LPOE) would allow CBP to detect 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 legalities 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am in the minority, but I want to speak.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am in the minority, but I want to speak.

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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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 as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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 as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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 as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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 as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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.
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.


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.


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.


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.


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.


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.

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 Head Start participants can gain long-term educational benefits, including increased rates of high school graduation. The sequestration cuts mandated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and the cuts to discretionary funding in the budget resolution proposed by the House for fiscal year 2013 increased rates of high school graduation.

The sequestration cuts mandated by the BCA 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 prosperity.

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 funding 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 us and many of whom I know and a lot of whom I do not, have been here with us for a long time. It is because of Mission: Readiness, Council for a Strong America. 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 all 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 President is correct, 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 defense 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. The OCO gimmick is dead on arrival. 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 recommending the withdrawal of troops, our track record 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 the March 27, 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—who, 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 that he 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, 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 accept a 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 weeks, let’s do it. We’re doing it 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 two hurricanes—devastated Puerto Rico. They are Americans, in our military. They help us in our political alliances, and people’s homes were destroyed.

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 wereunder water from volcanic eruptions, 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 3 miles 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 they have even after the hurricane. Many 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, and it 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 predominately Democratic, but I don’t look at it like that. I look at the fact that they are people in America, and they had a disaster. They should be helped.

Last month, the House passed H.R. 288, a comprehensive disaster package that provides 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 standard. 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, we 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 officials 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 2017 I met with 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 cannot 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. They have 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. Our experience was 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 thought 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 have been 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 are managing 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 appeal for many universities and colleges 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 campuses in China. That is not happening, and 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 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 the United States in trade relations. We plan on continuing to examine China’s influence through its Confucius Institutes and 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 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 were 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.
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, in stifling 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 acknowledged that hosting the Confucius Institute could limit events or activities critical of China, not just at the Confucius Institute but anywhere 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, however, absolutely 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 effectively shut the program down. 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 investigations.

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 educator who wishes 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 network of alumni from over 100 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 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 revoking more than 30 visas 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 regulations 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’s commitment to drafting 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 that 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 part 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.

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 to Bruce King, who has been indispensable at my office, 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.

Bruce 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 1990 to blocking the privatization of Social Security in 2005, in 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 a master of making 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 clearly 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 National League, the Miami Marlins. 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 all 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 Speaker 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 flow, how we tax 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 when you see him that 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 address the shutdown. That route, 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 I don’t want to pay more for the energy you need, you don’t have anything.

I am here to plead with every Democr at and every Republican that when we get the bill to the floor—and it will because before March 16—I am going 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 I 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 from us. Maybe it is Egypt, maybe it is India, or maybe it is somebody else.

I am down here to say that climate 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 with him to address 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. The Pentagon has consistently pointed out that 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, and our defense 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, 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 about 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 this in this Congress. This bill expands to renewable energy projects in the United States, including energy transmission and pipeline companies, the ability to use tax credits to finance projects. If enacted, it would be the first permanent change in terms of energy tax policy.

It would stop picking winners and losers in terms of energy tax policy. It would be, literally, an “all of the above” energy policy. My colleague, Senator Klobuchar, and I are cosponsoring this in this Congress.

The second is the IMPACT for Energy Act—this is the sort of solid, 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 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 Democrat—we 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 worst 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 and I hope 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 through growth in the energy sector 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 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.

Pondering the 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 will not just be more resilient but will also need retraining 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 home the skills 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 whirred 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 companies like China and India and other countries 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 refurbish 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 take the leadership that we, as 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 encourage and offer solutions as we adapt to 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. 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 our workers.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The bill clerk will 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 be made by politicians who are more focused on their personal 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 an affront to 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, and I 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 uncomplicated births. 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.

Let me ask you this: What happened to that bill, that guarantee that prenatal care and maternity care are covered for moms and babies enjoyed by the Affordable Care Act? 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 cut 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?

The 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 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 rates are climbing. More
women are dying, and our infant mor-
tality rate ranks a shameful 32 out of
35 of the world’s wealthiest nations.
The United States of America is 32 out
35 countries—wealthiest countries in
the world—in the number of infants
that are dying in birth. That is some-
thing we need to have a sense of ur-
gency to act on.

There are a lot of things on
healthcare. There are a lot of things to
improve outcomes for children and
moms from 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 chil-
dren. It is time to stop the cynical po-
itical stunts and start protecting—really and truly
protecting—the health of moms
and babies.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk was called.

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 exaggera-
tions that have been claimed by some
on the other side of the aisle.

Earlier this week, we voted on legis-
lation that some of my colleagues
claimed was needed to outlaw infan-
ticide—the killing of babies. How ab-
surd. 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 fac-
tually and medically accurate con-
versation about abortion.

A healthy fetus becomes potentially
able to live outside the womb at about
24 weeks of pregnancy. Very few abor-
tions occur after that—less than 1 per-
cent—and generally are performed ei-
er because the fetus has a fatal con-
dition 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 resuscitate.

Under this bill, doctors will be re-
quired to resuscitate infants born with
fatal conditions, even if the parents did
not want these measures that could
prolong their infant’s suffering and in-
stead 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 in-
the heat of the moment from their doc-
tors 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 brought her story to CNN.

Years ago, Dana and her husband
learned at 31 weeks that their daugh-
ter’s brain had a severe defect. Doctors
told the couple their daughter would
not be able to suck or swallow and
would likely suffer from uncon-
trollable seizures upon birth. They
heard what a resuscitation order would
entail. They listened to what an exist-
ence, 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 this discussion, not a lack of compa-
ッション, what my colleagues have of-
fered this week is inflammatory poli-
tical rhetoric and shaming and intimi-
dating 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 execu-
ting babies after birth.”

Today former Governor Scott Walker
said to a crowd at the Conservative Po-
litical 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
discriminate the Republican Party’s base.

It emboldens violence against abortion
providers—violence which nearly dou-
bled from 33 reported death threats or
threats of harm in 2016 to 62 in 2017, ac-
crediting to the National Abortion Fed-
eration.

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 cut up barriers or
eliminate entirely access and legal abor-
tions 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
ever discuss abortion with patients.

This is a gag rule that this administra-
tion is seeking to impose.

They create loopholes to allow busi-
nesses to exclude coverage for con-
traception 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 ac-
tions and State laws restricting abor-
tion access.

Doing the bidding of these rightwing
ideologue supporters like the Fed-
eralist Society and the Heritage
Foundation, Donald Trump has sent us juri-
des to행 a case with records of attacking a woman’s right
to choose as laid out in the Supreme
Court’s opinion in Roe v. Wade and re-
stanted in Planned Parenthood v. Casey.

These nominees come before the Sen-
ae Judicial Committee on which I
serve, and parrot the line provided for
them by the Trump administration.

As she asked if they will respect prece-
dent and uphold Roe v. Wade, they say
they will “follow the law.” Then, when
they get confirmed, they are in a posi-
tion, with their lifetime appointments,
to do exactly the opposite.

The prime and most dangerous ex-
ample of this kind of bait and switch is
Brett Kavanaugh—a notoriously right-
wing 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 elec-
tion 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 abor-
tion services, a minor must have paren-
tal consent or receive permission from
the judge. This is called a judicial by-
pass—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 will-
ing 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. Yet, 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. 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 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.” 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 obtaining an abortion until a minor unemancipated minor appellant’s 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 prece-dents—myself included—were rightly skeptical that he would respect prece-
dents. So Casey now becomes a precedent of the Supreme Court. 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 multibillion-dollar fishing, shipping, and tourism industries. That is why I spent the Better for the Beaches campaign 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 served in the House of Representatives, I fought to end harmful air pollution coming from piles of pet coke 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 con-firmed. His entire career has been devoted to undermining public health and environmental protections.

As Acting EPA Administrator, he is personally responsible for the most sig-nificant efforts to roll back our Na-tion’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 dangerous 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 profit 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. Can tell you 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 ongoing 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 are currently unregulated by the EPA. Rigorous testing has found that 1 out of every 10 water systems in my State 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 job is to have 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 our 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 job is to have the right person for the job, and 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 it is back out and high in the sky. It is also nearby 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 very 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 time 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 Engineers of the 93rd, 95th, and 97th regiments—engineers 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 Alaska students—like all 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 take this opportunity to talk about that on Monday.

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 Alaska history 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 this road.

These soldiers worked day and night—200 bridges, 800 culverts, through some of the most rugged terrain on planet Earth, mountains, rivers, moraine, hard, back-breaking work—and then they had 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, and swarms. 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, I get 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, 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 six 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 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. She is 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 officer regiment, 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 soldiers 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 United States Congress for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sullivan). The majority leader.
The following named officer for appointment in the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

Capt. Jeromy B. Williams
Capt. Paul C. Spedero, Jr.
Capt. Milton J. Sands, III
Capt. Curt A. Renshaw
Capt. Daniel P. Martin
Capt. Robert M. Gaucher
Capt. Christopher M. Engdahl
Capt. Jeffrey J. Czerewko
Capt. Robert B. Chadwick, II
Capt. Anthony C. Carullo
Capt. Richard T. Brophy, Jr.
Capt. Michael W. Baze
Capt. Richard T. Brophy, Jr.
Capt. Anthony C. Carullo
Capt. Robert B. Chadwick, II
Capt. Paul C. Spedero, Jr.
Capt. Christopher J. Sweeney
Capt. Jeremy B. Williams

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY’S DESK

IN THE ARMY
PN275 ARMY nomination of Stacie L. Kervin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN274 ARMY nominations (2) 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.
PN273 ARMY nominations (5) beginning JENNIFER J. ARCHER, and ending AARON J. LIPPY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN272 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ALYSSA R. ZUEHL, and ending ASSY YACOUB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN271 ARMY nominations (125) beginning MARGARET E. ABBOTT, and ending TIMOTHY S. MCCARTY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN270 ARMY nominations (15) beginning ELIAM BARANI, and ending BRANDON H. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN269 ARMY nominations (221) beginning HOMAY-RAHAN AHMAD, and ending JOE X. ZHANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN268 ARMY nominations (6) beginning Joubert N. Paulino, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

IN THE AIR FORCE
PN267 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning NANCY E. COSTA, and ending STEVEN S. ZASUETA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN266 AIR FORCE nominations (12) beginning NANCY E. COSTA, and ending TIMOTHY S. MCCARTY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN265 AIR FORCE nominations (12) beginning NANCY E. COSTA, and ending TIMOTHY S. MCCARTY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN264 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning JENNIFER J. ARCHER, and ending AARON J. LIPPY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN263 AIR FORCE nominations (5) beginning JENNIFER J. ARCHER, and ending AARON J. LIPPY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN262 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning ALYSSA R. ZUEHL, and ending ASSY YACOUB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN261 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning ALYSSA R. ZUEHL, and ending ASSY YACOUB, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN260 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning KIMBERLY L. KLOEBER, and ending MARSHA L. SCHUMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN259 AIR FORCE nomination of Joyce C. Beaty, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.
PN258 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.
PN257 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.
PN256 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.
PN255 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.
PN254 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.
PN253 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.
PN252 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.
PN251 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.
PN250 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.
PN249 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.
PN248 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.
PN247 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.
PN246 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.
PN245 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.
PN244 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.
PN243 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.
PN242 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.
PN241 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.
PN240 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.
SAPP, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 12, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN391 MARINE CORPS nomination of Matthew C. Vickers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN382 MARINE CORPS nomination of Bethany S. 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. Price, 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.

PN315 NAVY nominations (46) beginning SCOTT A. ADAMS, and ending BRETT 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 affect 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 rights in the 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 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 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, seeking 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. President el-Sisi’s government took another step to consolidate his rule. Egypt’s rubber-stamp 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 over the country.

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 engulfed in a crisis 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 were 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 real progress toward 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. national interests, and by and large, that has been the case.

It is interesting to compare the Trump administration’s selective condenation of government repression in other countries, where the number of political prisoners is a fraction of those in Egypt, to President Trump’s nunciation 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. The President may be 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, 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.

OPIOD 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
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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 treatment programs (Hubs). Through a Health Home Medicaid plan we’ve built a programmatic framework that links primary care (Spokes) and addiction treatment programs (Hubs) that allows an individual to 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 those 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 task forces to use providers that can employ including: 1115 B Substance Use Waivers, State Plan Amendments, including MAT in managed care organization contracts; reducing wait times 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 treatments system can do too much with an almost 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 prescribed treating ten to Vermont. Treatment is one element of a comprehensive response to the opioid epidemic. Other elements include prevention—reducing people’s exposure to the right place at the right time. 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 two consecutive Governors, Democratic and Republican, who have both provided leadership and resources to address the opioid epidemic in Vermont.

In closing, we’ve 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.

(After 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 rollover vote 31, the confirmation of Mr. Gaetz 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 rollover vote 33, the confirmation 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 rollover 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 Senate minority leaders, 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.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET U.S. SENATE RULES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

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) At any 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 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 of the meeting is—

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management procedures;

(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 information 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—

(1) of which Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) of which 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.

(2) 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 RESOLUTION

(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. on the day prior to the start of a meeting or markup to consider the resolution, during that meeting or markup—

(a) shall not be in order to consider a first degree amendment unless the amendment has been submitted to the chief clerk of the House of Representatives and subsequently submitted to the Senate;
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 by the provisions of subsection (a)(1) to be 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 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

(d) 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 any adjournment or recess, 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 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.

(a) The committee may poll:

(i) internal committee matters including those concerning the committee’s staff, records, and budget;

(ii) the committee business that the committee designates for polling at a meeting, except that the committee may not vote by proxy on roll calls on matters that the committee has designated for polling at a committee meeting following a poll for a vote on the poll decision.

(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 current employment and background, or which is provided as a collateral certification to information on which the individual is nominated, tax returns or reports prepared by federal agencies which are to be submitted 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 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 which he or she would pursue while in that position.

VI. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

(1) When a hearing is ordered, a measure or recommendation reported, following a hearing thereon shall be filed in the Senate at the earliest practicable time.

(2) A member of the committee, who gives notice of his intention to file a 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, 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 thereafter.

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 2 may be displayed at a time.

IX. CONFIRMATION STANDARDS AND PROTOCOL

(1) Standards. In considering a nomination, the committee shall inquire into the nominee’s experience, qualifications, suitability, and integrity and integrity to serve in the position to which he or she is 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 start of the hearing:

(a) A detailed biographical resume which contains information concerning education, employment, and background which generally would be recorded and has been affirmatively requested to be so recorded; except that no member may vote by proxy dur-
1. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

2. All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

3. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness, but shall not be allowed to object, excite, or distract witnesses or the Chairman from testifying in the event of any public or executive hearing and shall be governed by the same rules and discipline as members of the public in the gallery of Committees of the Senate, or in other Congresses, or in the Senate itself, or during testimony before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or in any other Committee of the Senate of the United States, or in any other Congress of the United States, or in any other Congress of the United States of America, or in any other Congress of the United States of America of the United States.

4. The Chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the Subcommittee. This authority may be delegated to the Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or to any other member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.

5. All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

6. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness, but shall not be allowed to object, excite, or distract witnesses or the Chairman from testifying in the event of any public or executive hearing and shall be governed by the same rules and discipline as members of the public in the gallery of Committees of the Senate, or in other Congresses, or in the Senate itself, or during testimony before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or in any other Committee of the Senate of the United States, or in any other Congress of the United States, or in any other Congress of the United States of America, or in any other Congress of the United States of America of the United States.

7. The Chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the Subcommittee. This authority may be delegated to the Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or to any other member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chairman.
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 ruled upon by the Subcommittee. Questions to a witness submitted in writing for the investigation in public hearings may be submitted to committee staff personnel only. Committee Members and authorized Subcommittee Members or staff may proceed with the examination of the witness at any time during the hearing. 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 examination of the witness. Questions by a Subcommittee Member or counsel, on behalf of a Subcommittee or counsel, to define the facts or to inquire into or otherwise adversely affect his or her reputation, may be referred to the Subcommittee to consider. Such request and such statement shall be submitted to the Subcommittee for its consideration and action. If a person requests to file a statement 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 unprivileged during public hearing held before the Subcommittee, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member waive this requirement.

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.

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 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 or, at his discretion, the Majority Counsel. The Majority 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 a reasonable cause to believe that a violation of law has occurred, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member by letter, or the Majority Counsel by resolution, are authorized to report such violation to the proper State, local and/or Federal authorities. Such letter or report may precipitate the need for further action which 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 the 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, to the extent applicable, by the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. QUORUMS. For the purpose of executive sessions, one Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the administration 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.

SUBCOMMITTEE SUBPOENAS. Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, or any of the Members of the Subcommittee designated by him or her, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, provided that the Chairman may suspend the issuance or production of any subpoena within 24 hours excluding Saturdays and Sundays, or other evidence or comment complained of. 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 Chairperson, or a staff officer designated by him or her, in advance of the issuance 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 Chairperson, 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 Chairperson 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 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 “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 Rights 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 Rajah, and to offer Bahrainis a greater voice in their country’s future.

**ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS**

**TRIBUTE TO CHRIST CORREALE**

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I would like 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, 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 projects, Chris is 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.
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 “Promotion, Consumer Education, and Industrial Policy (Acquisition and Disposition of Market Research Data)” (RIN 0581–AD48) 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 “Rangeland Easement Program; Clarification of Certain Loan Eligibility Determination” (RIN 0581–AD57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-451. A communication from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Proposed Rule; Assuming Jurisdiction Over Indian Country” (RIN 1115–AD31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-453. A communication from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments to the Administrative Procedure Act; Clarifying What Authority Agencies May Have When Implementing the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-455. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Provisions to Implement the Affordable Care Act” (RIN 0935–AB13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-456. A communication from the Director of the Committee on the Budget, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Tribal Political Entities; Clarifying What Authority Agencies May Have When Implementing the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The following executive reports of committees were 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 Administrator of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Electric Utilities; Approval of Proposed Rates of the New York State Electric and Gas Corporation” (RIN 1910–AE74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-458. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pumpkins Grown in Virginia; Decreased Accession of Certain Seed Annuals” (RIN 1910–AE75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-461. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Protection of Certain Information Regarding Energy Security and the Emergency Reliability of the Bulk Power System” (RIN 1910–AF74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-462. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Trade Agreements; Revisions to Economic Sanctions Regulations” (RIN 1505–AD25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-463. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Proposed Rule; Reorganization of the Federal Government” (RIN 1548–AD52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-464. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Development of the Next Generation Border System” (RIN 0915–AD23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-465. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Electric Utilities; Approval of Proposed Rates of the New York State Electric and Gas Corporation” (RIN 1910–AE74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were received:

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.


Drew H. Wrigley, of North Dakota, to be United States Attorney for the District of North Dakota for the term of four years.

Aditya Bambal, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for the remainder of the term expiring January 29, 2023.

Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2023.

By Mr. BURR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.
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 Mrs. 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. CORETTA MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUREN, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERRICK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERRILL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SULLIVAN, 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. LEAHY):

S. 594. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to reutilization innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CANTWELL, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMPTON, Ms. CRUZ, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHatz, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEhouse, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HYDE-Smith, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. Risch, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 601. 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. MURKOWSKII, and Ms. KLOBuchar):

S. 605. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for direct payment for 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. CARPER, Mr. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, Ms. BLACKBURN, Mr. HENRICH, Ms. MURKOWSKII, and Ms. KLOBuchar):

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 Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 607. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for direct payment for physician assistants under the Medicare program for certain services furnished by such physician assistants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 609. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase certain burial 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. 608. 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. DAnes, Ms. SMITH, Mr. ROUNDs, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. Risch, Mr. Jones, Mr. 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. MARKETt, Ms. SCHiRtz, Mr. whiTehouse, Mr. DURBIn, Mr. BROWN, Ms. Smith, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. van HolLEN, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. HENRICH, Mr. vANDER PlaY, Mr. MERRILL, Ms. HIRONo, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. CORTez MASTo, Mrs. SHaReEn, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURRAY, Ms. DUCKWorTH, Ms. BALDwIn, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. PeTtERS):

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. MERRICK (for himself and Mr. MERRILL):

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. MERRICK):

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 rescuse 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 direct 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, Mr. CaSSIDY, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. BENNETt):

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. TiBSwEy (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 619. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. A bill to provide 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, and Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. JONES):
S. 620. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, 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 18 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 minorities 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. CRAMER, 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. MARKET, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. Cramer, Mr. BENNET, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MANNESON):

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' dependents 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 of a reduction or to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTZER MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KEAN, Mr. MARKET, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. 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, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 625. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to carry out a pilot program under which the Commission could 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. LEONARD):

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. COTZER MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. WHITEHOUSE):

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 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 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, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KAIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, 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 "Six Triple Eight"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRUZ (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 workforce training organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKET, 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 Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and National Security 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. HARRES, 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, Mr. MUKOWSKI, Mrs. SHAHEN, Mr. BURK, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HESSICCH, Mr. HASSAN, Ms. 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. SCHUMER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARNER, Ms. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 86. A resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on Congress on the Library; considered and adopted:

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):
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 co-sponsors of S. 236, 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.

At the request of Mr. Cardin, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. Harris) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 316, a bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area.

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. Shaheen) was added as a co-sponsor 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.

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 co-sponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

At the request of Ms. Harrison, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Duckworth) was added as a co-sponsor 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.

At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Manchin) was added as a co-sponsor 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.

At the request of Ms. Klobuchar, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 286, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. McSally) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. 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. 550, a bill to establish the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council.

At the request of Mr. Whitehouse, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand) was added as a co-sponsor 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.

At the request of Mr. Merkley, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Booker) was added as a co-sponsor 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.

At the request of Mrs. Hyde-Smith, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Enzi) was added as a co-sponsor of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

At the request of Mr. Barraso, 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 Nebraska (Ms. Fischer) were added as co-sponsors 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 corporate governance and security 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 publicly traded companies 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 no deficiencies in internal controls, 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 healthcare industry grew from 181,630,520 records exposed by data breaches in the Center, the number of these types of recording 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.

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 have the cybersecurity experts 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–Select Committee 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 cyber roundtables, which is one of the things we are doing to raise our level of awareness, some of the CEOs and senior officers cannot even get to 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. 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. LRARY, Ms. Murray, Mr. Portman, Mr. Reed, Mr. Schatz, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. HAYS-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 one month 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 only to 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 on which the reporting is based; or
(B) collusion between the employer and the employee to evade tax;
(2) except as provided in paragraph (3), if records required to be 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 employer'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 any relevant purpose if the employee performs employment duties of the employee's employment duties within such State than in any other State during a calendar 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 than 50% 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 a 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 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 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 are 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's employment duties are performed.

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 during the 2019-2020 academic year.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "institutions of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON LIMITATIONS ON ABILITY OF STUDENTS TO PURCHASE CLAIMS AGAINST CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

This Act shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 608. 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 President's 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.

The 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 re-live 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 benefits that help working families and middle-class taxpayers keep up with the rising costs of living.
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 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 extended planning outlook as it pertains to tax rules economic growth in the private sector. That letter:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete letter be printed in the RECORD.

Today, a diverse group of organizations, including the National Biodiesel Board, the American Trucking Associations, and the National Corn Growers Association, among others, have joined us in urging Congress to extend the expired 26 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 those provisions were created. We should not retroactively punish these businesses 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, have joined us in urging Congress to extend the expired 26 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 those provisions were created. We should not retroactively punish these businesses 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, have joined us in urging Congress to extend the expired 26 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 those provisions were created. We should not retroactively punish these businesses 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, have joined us in urging Congress to extend the expired 26 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 those provisions were created. We should not retroactively punish these businesses for Congress’s inaction.
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 treat 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 not just my colleagues, Senator COLLINS. She deserves a lot of credit for 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 the 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 right 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.

These decisions need to be made after we resolve the short-term crisis caused by the current lapse. These provisions have not been 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 and effective tax extender 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, temporary 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. SHAHIDEN, Mr. BURR, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSSAN, 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 a close the 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 in too many Americans without access to safe drinking water.

This very issue is a matter of 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-Tilliss-Stabenow-Rubio-Merkley-Gardner-Reed-Murkowski-Bennett-Manchin bill will force EPA to begin the rulemaking process to protect 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 Dixon.

In his confirmation hearing, Andrew Wheeler said, and I quote:

It is these Americans that President Trump and Vice President Pence 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 America 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 Maryland was recently told by public health officials that up to 110 million Americans could have PFAS-contaminated water.

It is essential to act now 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 get 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, Ms. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. BENNET,
Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDS, Mr. WATERS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PIETERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. COPEL, Ms. CASTRO, 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, change is caused 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 legislation or that legislation. 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. Why would a political party in America largely deny 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 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 Congress members 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 the 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 tell the President, whose declaration has serious implications for the separation of powers, that Congress’s power to appropriate—plain 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 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 $65 million to construct a formal training unit at Holloman Air Force Base in the south-central 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 in 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 emergency emerging 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 by 44 percent. 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 2007. The data had a 15-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 communities 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. 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 constitutional boundaries 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 prerogatives 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 commandeering 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 correct 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, but it was understood that there was a 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 so 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 power 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 President 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 Government Accountability Office 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 about 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 spend on standing of what should qualify as an emergency. 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 captures the constitutional principle that brings us to the floor today. Let us defend the Constitution.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 86—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDERING 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:

The Resolution

Whereas, in 1919, an organization 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 their families, including a “Bill of Rights” for children with disabilities in 1961 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, since its inception, 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:

The Resolution

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. Shelby, Ms. Klobuchar, and Mr. Udall.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Blunt, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Ms. Klobuchar, and Mr. Leahy.
WHEREAS the 6 officers wounded or injured were (5) Officer Reynaldo Rivera, who has served since 2005; (4) Officer Adam Miller, who has served since 2016; (3) Officer Marco Gomez, who has served since 1995; and (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 2011 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; (2) Josh Pinkard, age 37, of Oswego, Illinois, a plant manager for the company since 2011, 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 (1) 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 such amazing valor and bravery that, in its aftermath, 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 gunfire and those who stood ready to battle are just 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 the 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 tragedy; 

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. STA NiNO, Ms. BERNSTEIN, and Mr. WEINER) 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 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 2012 (Public Law 112–58; 126 Stat. 723); and 

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 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 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:

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 70% 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 wildlife and fish populations;

Whereas the trafficking of wildlife products, particularly ivory, rhinoceros horns, and pangolin scales, has contributed to the rapid depletion of many species and has posed a threat to international security and the safety of those who work in law enforcement; and

Whereas wildlife poaching negatively impacts local communities that rely on natural resources for economic development, including tourism;

Whereas assisting institutions in developing nations, including by providing material, training, and diplomatic support, can reduce illegal wildlife trade;

Whereas wildlife poaching 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 450,000;

Whereas, from 2007 to 2012, the number of elephants killed in Kenya increased by more than 800 percent, from 47 to 387 elephants killed; and

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 ivory; and

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 2013;

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 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 70% 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 wildlife and fish populations;

Whereas the trafficking of wildlife products, particularly ivory, rhinoceros horns, and pangolin scales, has contributed to the rapid depletion of many species and has posed a threat to international security and the safety of those who work in law enforcement; and

Whereas wildlife poaching negatively impacts local communities that rely on natural resources for economic development, including tourism;

Whereas assisting institutions in developing nations, including by providing material, training, and diplomatic support, can reduce illegal wildlife trade;

Whereas wildlife poaching 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 450,000;

Whereas, from 2007 to 2012, the number of elephants killed in Kenya increased by more than 800 percent, from 47 to 387 elephants killed; and

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 ivory; and

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 2013;
SEC. 2. PRINTING OF DOCUMENT.

In addition to the usual number of copies printed, there shall be printed the lesser of—
(1) 52,500 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).


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 $226,000, with distribution of the copies 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 of the minority party of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the Senate, and 25,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

(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 J. Donaldson, of Texas, 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 Members 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. 6) 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 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 today's RECORD 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'.)
To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. DONELLAN

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the reserve component to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12302.

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SCOTT M. BROWN
CAPT. CASITY J. MOTO
CAPT. STEPHEN R. TEFORD
CAPT. ERIC H. VERHAAR

The following officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 3741.

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JEFFREY T. ANDERSON
CAPT. MICHAEL W. BAZZ
CAPT. MARK K. BUYER, JR.
CAPT. ANTHONY C. CABALLO
CAPT. DARRYL F. CABEL
CAPT. JEFFREY C. CZEKIWO
CAPT. MICHAEL F. DONNELLY
CAPT. CHRISTOPHER E. DROBAC
CAPT. ROBERT M. GAUCHER
CAPT. JOHN V. MESENI
CAPT. DAN S. MORELL
CAPT. SCOTT P. ROBERTSON
CAPT. MILLION T. RUI
CAPT. PAUL C. SPEDERO, JR.
CAPT. JEROME R. WOODSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 8002.

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. VIRELIN JAMISON

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JASON D. HOSKINS, TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NANCY R. COSTA AND ENDING WITH ALEXANDER G. KEEFPATRICK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JAYMIE A. HANLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JENNIFER C. BOUZA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MILLER S. CRUMP, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ALEXANDRA E. FELTON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JAMES T. HEITZMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JAMIE E. JENKINS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LANCE K. JENSEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MATT C. KREIDEL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JACK E. PETLAK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PETER J. PENNINGTON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PHILIP J. RAMIREZ, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF STEPHEN M. ROBBINS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF WILLIAM M. SILVER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DEAN M. TARR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PHILLIP J. TIDWELL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF WILLIAM B. YOUNG, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF GREGORY D. ZUG, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

IN THE NAVY

The following officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 3741.

To be mayor

LT. GEN. VIRELIN JAMISON

NAVY NOMINATION OF JASON D. HOSKINS, TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIO ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH ANGIE L. JAMES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 24, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JORDANNA M. HOSTLER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TALIAT A. ANIMASHAUN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KATHERINE M. AUBERT, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER P. MOELLERING, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JERRY D. HALLMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JEFFREY M. BARR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF NORMA J. BARTOLUCCI, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JON T. PETERSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL S. CRENSHAW, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JEREMIAH J. ZEISZLER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JON T. PETERSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JONAS A. MCINTOSH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH A. BROWN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ALISTAIR J. HURD, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RUSSELL L. COHAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ANTHONY A. RUHS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PATRICK M. KURZ, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOLANNA L. ADAMS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY K. COX, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RYAN R. GRAY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JASON T. HANAHAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ADRIANNE L. VASQUEZ, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.
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 KOHJALY 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 Kohjaly Massacre, and to honor the victims of this horrendous act.

The appalling massacre perpetrated on the innocent people of Kohjaly 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 international community, it is important that we continue to remember what happened in Kohjaly 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 sponsor 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 Burneyville, 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 devoted 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 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
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. Clear- ly, 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 personal 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 Innovation to Entrepreneurs Act): YES; Roll Call Vote Number 89 (Passage of H.R. 328, the Recognizing Achievement in Classified School Employees Act): YES.
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 for start-up 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 colleagues 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 millionnaire 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 1826 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 attended 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 titles of industry, including batting 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 could frighten 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 BETTY 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. By 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 the perfect 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.

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 and beyond 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 re dedicate 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 melodic 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—for an expensive border wall few think will ever work. Now, it’s on the Senate to take up and pass this resolution without delay.

RECOGNIZING MRS. IНЕZ DOROTHY YOUNG GIBSON 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, 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 wish her a very happy 100th birthday. Congratulations are in order as she celebrates this extraordinary milestone.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SECURING DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY 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 Firearm 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 high-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 JIMENEZ, U.S. NAVY, ON EIGHT YEARS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE 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, reviewing 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.
HONORING DR. ADOLPHUS HAILSTORK

HON. PAUL TONKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 2019

Mr. TONKO. 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.
The strike would last nine months—and Keweenaw chapters of the Western Federation of Miners. In response to long work days, low wages from around the world, and producing 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 72ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOJALY 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 Khoyala 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. Khoyala, 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. Judge McMahon, when news of Kevin's passing became known all across the state, there was an enormous outpouring 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 fair play 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, he and his wife, 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. Harvey 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, Doretha 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, Tallia, 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.
Thursday, February 28, 2019
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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 S1593–95

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.

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”.

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.

Pages S1606

Rare Disease Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 90, designating February 28, 2019, as “Rare Disease Day”.

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


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.

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.

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.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

**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.

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.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

**Fleming Nomination—Cloture:** Senate began consideration of the nomination of John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

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.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.
- Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

**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.
- 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.
- 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.

**Messages from the House:**

**Measures Read the First Time:**

**Executive Communications:**

**Executive Reports of Committees:**

**Additional Cosponsors:**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:**

**Additional Statements:**

**Privileges of the Floor:**

**Record Votes:** One record vote was taken today. (Total—33)

**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


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 testimony 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.

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H2311–15

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.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
11:30 a.m., Monday, March 4

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.

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11:30 a.m.
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