



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019

No. 46

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 14, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SALUD O. CARBAJAL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, thank You for giving us another day.

Your care and wisdom are shown to us by the way You extend Your kingdom into our world down to the present day. Your word reveals every aspect of Your saving plan. You accomplish Your designed purpose in and through the hearts of the faithful who respond to You.

Today, convert our minds and hearts that we may become the great Nation You hope us to be.

Help the Members of this people's House to seek Your presence in the midst of their busy lives. Animate them with Your Spirit, and help them to perform their appointed tasks to come to solutions that will redound to the benefit of our Nation.

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 his approval thereof.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HARDER of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PROPOSED BUDGET

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, the administration released its proposed budget, and I am here to share what those budget cuts actually mean for the farmers in my home, California's Central Valley.

Imagine you are an almond farmer in the Central Valley. Maybe your farm has been a part of the family for multiple generations. Over the past 5 years, you have seen your net farm income has dropped by half, the largest drop since the Great Depression.

Then you wake up this week and hear that the administration, which promised to be in your corner, wants to cut billions of dollars from programs that help you and your family put food on tables across the country:

Programs like crop insurance so if you lose your crops from flooding or from fires your farm stays afloat. Under this budget, crop insurance is cut by \$26 billion;

Programs like drought relief to make up for damaged properties during arid seasons. Well, under this budget drought relief is cut by \$8 billion.

Or imagine you live in a district like mine where water management and storage are essential. Well, under this budget, 30 percent of the Army Corps of Engineers' budget is cut, putting all those structures at risk.

GOOD NEWS ABOUT THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address an issue that impacts all our congressional districts and communities: the opioid crisis.

For years now, it seems that the only news about it has been bad news: 70,000 overdose deaths in 2017, widespread importation of deadly drugs like fentanyl, families devastated, lives wasted.

But now, finally, some good news to report. In my district, specifically, in

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2721

Hamilton County, we have had a 20 percent decrease in opioid deaths in the first half of 2018.

The decline is the result of multiple prevention efforts, a task force of first responders, law enforcement, health officials, and community leaders all working together to tackle this deadly epidemic. Their efforts are truly saving lives in our community.

Most importantly, their successes can be used as a model to help save thousands and thousands of lives across the country. And I can't think of any better news than that.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, this week the President broke his promise to America's seniors that he would not cut Medicare or Social Security benefits.

After Republicans in Congress passed a massive tax giveaway for corporations and the wealthiest 1 percent, the President now wants to balance the budget on the backs of our seniors and students.

This budget cuts \$2 trillion from Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security over the next 10 years, programs that our seniors have paid into for decades.

As students face a \$1 trillion student loan debt crisis, Trump's budget pushes affordable college further out of reach by cutting \$207 billion from student loan programs.

Thankfully, Americans voted overwhelmingly last election to place a check on this President by sending a new Democratic majority to Congress, and they can rest assured knowing that we will not consider the President's cruel budget cuts in this House.

GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have thus far released the interview transcripts of two individuals at the heart of the 2016 DOJ investigations controversy. Today, I am releasing a third.

As I have said before, I believe the American people deserve transparency and deserve to know what transpired at the highest echelons of the FBI during this tumultuous time for the Bureau.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I request the link, dougcollins.house.gov/strzok be placed into the RECORD so that the American people can review the transcript of Peter Strzok.

Out of an abundance of caution, this transcript has a limited number of narrowly tailored redactions relating only to confidential sources and methods, nonpublic information about ongoing

investigations and nonmaterial personal information.

I will continue to work to release as many transcripts as possible. The American people deserve transparency and the truth.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concerns over the proposed budget cuts made in the President's budget and the skyrocketing deficits that will leave our children and grandchildren with trillions more in debt.

While it is imperative that we rein in wasteful government spending and get our national debt under control, we cannot do so at the expense of the men and women living in rural and Tribal communities and our seniors.

This budget proposal slashes trillions from healthcare programs that millions of seniors, working families, and veterans rely on every day. Additionally, it would cut infrastructure programs and funding for critical projects in rural America and hurt farming families.

This is not how we are going to curb spending and get our fiscal house in order. We need to act now to pass a bipartisan budget that addresses the debt crisis and invests in the future of our Nation.

THANKING THE ADMINISTRATION FOR DISASTER RELIEF IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 25 months ago, we saw the crisis in Oroville, California, of the broken spillway at Oroville Dam, belonging to the State water project. Thankfully, emergency services were able to come in and, as soon as possible, get things functioning once again for the safety of the flood control as well as the storage and the hydroelectricity that is produced there.

We had much help that came from FEMA; and I want to say thank you to the folks at FEMA, this administration, and Secretary Nielsen for being on the spot in helping with this restoration process. \$333 million have flowed to helping the crisis at the spillway be restored to a working spillway.

Now, there are those who are clamoring for even more money, but that lies on the backs of the State of California and the DWR for the extra money, bringing it up to \$1.1 billion.

The State of California claims it is in a surplus situation, and it needs to pay its own bills and put the money aside to take care of the project—not the other 49 States—for the nonemergency part of the project.

So, again, thanks to FEMA for their attention to this, as well as the wildfire situation we had in Paradise, California, for helping us in northern California.

SUPPORTING THE DREAM AND PROMISE ACT

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong and unwavering support for H.R. 5, the Dream and Promise Act.

I am proud to represent the 29th Congressional District of Texas. One of the things I am most proud of is the strong and vibrant immigration communities that reside in our district, where thousands of DACA, TPS, and DED recipients live, work, and play beside us as neighbors and colleagues. If Dreamers were forced to leave our district tomorrow, we would lose over \$400 million of GDP.

Our immigration policies put politics over people, which often hurt our children who are in constant fear of being separated and uprooted from the country they call their own. This is wrong for our economy. This is wrong for our communities. This is wrong for our country.

It is time that we pass a permanent solution for these vital members of our society, which is why I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 5.

WE HAVE GOT TO KNOW IF OUR PRESIDENT IS A CROOK

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

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just last week we passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act, with its worthy aim: to ensure that this government represents the voices of all Americans and not just the privileged and powerful.

Now, among the many reforms in H.R. 1, one would require that candidates for President and Vice President must disclose their tax returns. Giving voters personal tax information has been a tradition of Presidents since 1973, when Richard Nixon, of all people, released his returns and said: "People have got to know whether or not their President is a crook." On that issue, I agree with Mr. Nixon.

Now, that seems to be the thinking of my home State legislature, too, which has been working on legislation that would require any Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate who wants to be on the ballot in Illinois to release their tax returns. They think that the people have the right to know the true character of the person who will sit in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to know if our President is a crook. I would like to see the Senate take up this bill.

And if they are unable to follow in the great leadership of this House, I

hope that other States will follow the great leadership of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 208, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 208, the amendments to the concurrent resolution and the preamble, printed in House Report 116-17, are agreed to, and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 24

Whereas, on January 6, 2017, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence released a report concluding that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election”, that the goal of this campaign was “to undermine public faith in the US democratic process”, and that “Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump”;

Whereas, on March 20, 2017, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) testified that he was authorized by the Department of Justice to confirm that the FBI is investigating whether “there was any coordination” between individuals associated with the Trump presidential campaign and the Russian Government;

Whereas part 600 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on March 7, 2019 (in this resolution referred to as “Special Counsel Regulations”), provides for the appointment of a Special Counsel when the Attorney General or Acting Attorney General “determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and—(a) That investigation . . . by a United States Attorney’s Office or litigating Division of the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and (b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter”;

Whereas the Special Counsel Regulations call for any individual named as Special Counsel to be a “lawyer with a reputation for integrity and impartial decision making and with appropriate experience to ensure that both the investigation will be conducted ably, expeditiously and thoroughly, and that investigative and prosecutorial decisions will be supported by an informed understanding of the criminal law and Department of Justice policies”;

Whereas, on May 17, 2017, the Acting Attorney General appointed former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III to serve as Special Counsel “to ensure a full and thorough investigation of the Russian government’s efforts to interfere in the 2016 presidential election”, including an exam-

ination of “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump”, “any matters that arose or may arise directly from the investigation”, and “any other matters within the scope of 28 C.F.R. 600.4(a)”;

Whereas the Acting Attorney General explained that he had appointed Special Counsel Mueller because he “determined that it is in the public interest . . . to . . . appoint a Special Counsel to assume responsibility for this matter . . . based upon the unique circumstances, the public interest requires [him] to place this investigation under the authority of a person who exercises a degree of independence from the normal chain of command . . . [and that] a Special Counsel is necessary in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome. Our nation is grounded on the rule of law, and the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly”;

Whereas Special Counsel Mueller has previously served in the Department of Justice as a prosecutor, United States Attorney, and Director of the FBI under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and his selection as the Special Counsel elicited bipartisan praise recognizing his reputation for competence, fairness, and nonpartisanship;

Whereas the Special Counsel’s investigation has thus far resulted in the public indictment of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction following a jury trial;

Whereas the Special Counsel Regulations provide that “[a]t the conclusion of the Special Counsel’s work, he or she shall provide the Attorney General with a confidential report explaining the prosecution or declination decisions reached by the Special Counsel”;

Whereas, on January 15, 2019, at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Attorney General William Barr testified “I . . . believe it is very important that the public and Congress be informed of the results of the special counsel’s work. For that reason, my goal will be to provide as much transparency as I can consistent with the law”;

Whereas, on February 22, 2019, the chairs of six committees of the House of Representatives wrote to Attorney General Barr to inform him of their expectation that he will make Special Counsel Mueller’s report public “to the maximum extent permitted by law”;

Whereas transparency is consistent with the overall purpose and intent of the Special Counsel Regulations and the accompanying Department of Justice commentary, which notes the importance of “ensur[ing] congressional and public confidence in the integrity of the process”;

Whereas the need for transparency is most pronounced with regard to investigations that involve the President or individuals associated with his campaign as the President is responsible for the appointment of the senior leadership of the Department of Justice;

Whereas the Department of Justice’s United States Attorney’s Manual indicates that in public filings and proceedings, prosecutors “should remain sensitive to the privacy and reputation interests of uncharged third-parties”, that is, of persons who the Department considers may be, but are not yet criminally charged;

Whereas this general nonstatutory policy of sensitivity to the “interests of uncharged third-parties” should be inapplicable to a sitting President because the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel has previously written that “a sitting President is constitutionally immune from indictment and criminal prosecution”;

Whereas the Department of Justice has on numerous recent occasions provided investigatory information to Congress and the public concerning investigations of high-level public officials in both pending and closed cases;

Whereas in the only other instance where a Special Counsel was appointed under the Spe-

cial Counsel Regulations (in 1999, concerning the 1993 confrontation in Waco, Texas), both the interim and final reports, including findings, provided by the Special Counsel were released to the public by the Attorney General; and

Whereas the allegations at the center of Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation strike at the core of our democracy, and there is an overwhelming public interest in releasing the Special Counsel’s report to ensure public confidence in both the process and the result of the investigation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) calls for the public release of any report, including findings, Special Counsel Mueller provides to the Attorney General, except to the extent the public disclosure of any portion thereof is expressly prohibited by law; and

(2) calls for the full release to Congress of any report, including findings, Special Counsel Mueller provides to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 24.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 24 expresses the sense of Congress that any report Special Counsel Robert Mueller delivers to the Attorney General should be released to the public and to Congress. This concurrent resolution is important for several reasons.

First, transparency is fundamental to the special counsel process, especially when dealing with matters of national security involving the President.

In January 2017, the U.S. intelligence community unanimously reported that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. Presidential election” and that “Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.” As a result of the importance of this charge and the clear conflict of interest in a matter involving the President, Robert Mueller was appointed as special counsel by the Acting Attorney General “in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome.”

This is why in the only other instance involving the appointment of a special counsel under the regulations, concerning the Waco tragedy, the special counsel’s report was released in full by the Attorney General.

Second, this resolution is critical because of the many questions and criticisms of the investigation raised by the President and his administration. It is

important that Congress stand up for the principle of full transparency at a time when the President has publicly attacked the Russian investigation more than 1,100 times and counting. Among other things, the President has repeatedly referred to the investigation as a “witch hunt” and called it a “hoax,” “rigged,” and a “scam.”

This resolution is also needed because high-ranking DOJ officials have indicated that they may not release information about individuals who are not indicted. Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein stated last month that “if we aren’t prepared to prove our case beyond a reasonable doubt in court, then we have no business making allegations against American citizens.”

This normally salutary policy must not apply in the event the Department adheres to its policy that it cannot indict a sitting President. To maintain that a sitting President cannot be indicted no matter how much evidence there is because he is a sitting President, and then to withhold evidence of wrongdoing from Congress because the President cannot be charged, is to convert DOJ policy into the means for a coverup.

Third, releasing the Mueller report, even in its entirety, does not absolve the Department of Justice of its obligation to provide Congress with the underlying evidence uncovered by the special counsel. This expectation is well grounded in precedent set by the Department just in the last Congress in connection with three Republican-led investigations into Hillary Clinton’s emails, the dismissal of former FBI Acting Director McCabe, and allegations of bias concerning the Russian investigation.

With respect to the investigation involving Secretary Clinton’s emails, this included the Department of Justice releasing to Congress more than 880,000 pages of documents regarding the FBI’s decisionmaking, identifying to Congress the names of career officials involved in the charging decision, identifying to Congress specific court cases relied on in the charging decision, and making numerous DOJ and FBI personnel available to Congress for transcribed interviews.

With respect to the dismissal of former Acting Director McCabe, this included releasing to Congress all documents relied on by the Office of Professional Responsibility in making its decision.

With respect to claims of bias in the Russian investigation, this included not only releasing to the public an otherwise classified foreign intelligence application, but also releasing to Congress: one, all underlying documents and communications involving the FISA applications; two, four memos detailing the former FBI Director’s communications with the President; three, materials pertaining to classified briefings involving the Trump and Clinton Presidential campaigns; and four, making even more DOJ and FBI officials

available for a total of 21 transcribed interviews and hearings.

These precedents make clear the obligation of the Department of Justice to release all evidence with respect to the Russian investigation.

A vote for this resolution will send a clear signal to both the American people and to the Department of Justice that Congress believes transparency is a fundamental principle necessary to ensure that government remains accountable to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this commonsense resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution, but as a matter of time and coming through this week, I have 30 minutes, so I might as well talk about a resolution that is a restatement of the regulation. I want to provide some background on the special counsel’s regulations.

Special Counsel Mueller is operating under a different regulatory framework from the independent counsel statute that gave us the Starr report.

The Clinton administration Justice Department, which was led by Attorney General Janet Reno, Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder, and Neal Katyal, drafted the special counsel regulations in effect today. They established a regulatory framework that gives the Attorney General flexibility.

Attorney General Barr has a few options when he receives the information from Mr. Mueller. He can give Congress the complete report or a summary, or he can simply tell Congress that the Mueller investigation has concluded.

The Clinton administration regulations do not require a full report to Congress. However, during his confirmation, Attorney General Barr said he wants to be “transparent” with Congress and the public “consistent with the rules and the law.” I have no reason to think Attorney General Barr would back away from those statements he made before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe he is truthful and will be truthful to his word to make as much public as he possibly can.

The American people should not expect another Starr report. The Clinton Justice Department made sure another President would not have salacious stories aired before the American people. Janet Reno herself testified before Congress in 1999 that it was a bad idea for independent counsels to publish final reports.

Many Members of the Democratic majority in Congress today voted against the public release of materials related to the Starr report.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a narrative related to a roll call vote

from the 105th Congress. For the RECORD, I note that the following Democratic Members voted against the release of the Starr materials: Speaker PELOSI, Majority Whip CLYBURN, Chairman NADLER, Chairman CUMMINGS, Chairman ENGEL, Chairman WATERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Chair LOFGREN, and Chairman NEAL, among others.

It is amazing that we have now changed our perspective on that, in light of a Republican in the White House.

Again, this resolution simply, basically, restates the regulations that are currently in place that were written under the Clinton Department of Justice. It is going to go forward. The new Attorney General has said he wants to make as much public to the American people as he legally can.

I believe in transparency. I believe that there are many other things we could be working on, but I am happy to support a resolution that is actually just a restatement of the regulatory burden already placed upon the Attorney General.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Con. Res. 24, which expresses the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Robert Mueller should be available to the public and to Congress.

Special Counsel Mueller has been appointed to ensure a full and thorough investigation of the Russian Government’s efforts to interfere in the 2016 Presidential election and to examine any links and/or coordination between the Russian Government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump.

He has also been appointed with the authority to investigate and prosecute Federal crimes committed in the course of and with the intent to interfere with the investigation, including perjury, obstruction of justice, destruction of evidence, and intimidation of witnesses.

The gravity and magnitude of this investigation, given that it goes straight to the heart of our democracy and involves the President of the United States, requires the public release of the special counsel’s findings.

This is an investigation that affects each and every American, whether it implicates or exonerates the President. Therefore, it must be brought to light so that the American people can see for themselves the findings and determinations made by an objective, impartial investigator who has a reputation for integrity.

In addition, the report will provide valuable insight and information for the important investigations being undertaken in the House, including the

investigation being conducted by the Committee on Financial Services on money laundering and the President's finances.

Special Counsel Mueller has been appropriately deliberate and discreet in conducting this investigation. It is clear from the manner in which the special counsel has approached this investigation that he has taken it seriously and has not conducted what President Trump refers to as a "witch hunt."

So far, the special counsel's investigation has resulted in 199 criminal charges, 37 indictments or guilty pleas, and five prison sentences.

Whatever his prosecutorial decisions may be going forward, it is in the public's interest to be given full transparency into those decisions and the explanations behind them.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished chair of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for yielding and for his sponsorship of this important legislation. I rise in strong support.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller was appointed in May 2017 to oversee the ongoing criminal and counterintelligence investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 election. Over the nearly 2 years since his appointment, the special counsel has indicted 34 individuals and three companies, and secured guilty pleas or convictions from eight individuals.

We do not know when the special counsel will complete his work, but there are indications that it could occur in the near future.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming public interest in the special counsel's report and findings, I am deeply concerned that Attorney General Barr may attempt to withhold Mueller's full report from the public and the underlying evidence from Congress and could instead seek to provide only a CliffsNotes version of the report to Congress.

As this resolution makes clear, Congress will not accept any attempt by Mr. Barr or the President to bury the report and the findings of the special counsel. Withholding this information would be untenable in light of the intense public interest and need for transparency, but particularly so when the Department has provided voluminous production to Congress at the demand of the previous majority, including sensitive FISA materials and other classified and law enforcement-sensitive materials related to the Mueller investigation and the Clinton email investigation.

Last year, I repeatedly warned Department leadership that, in providing these materials to Congress, they were establishing a precedent and one that they would have to live with in the future. They did so anyway.

While anonymous sources at the Department have attempted to publicly blame James Comey for the provision of this information, in fact, the Department has turned over more than 880,000 pages of documents from the Clinton email investigation to Congress, all of them—all of them—pursuant to congressional subpoenas issued after James Comey was fired. They have produced highly sensitive records, including FISA materials, directly related to ongoing investigations at the core of the special counsel's charter.

To be sure, something far more serious than precedent is at stake. Disclosure is uniquely imperative here because the special counsel reportedly is investigating whether the President himself engaged in misconduct. If the special counsel has indeed uncovered evidence of serious wrongdoing on the President's part, then that evidence must be furnished to Congress and ultimately to the American people.

Withholding the full report or underlying evidence would only heighten concerns over a coverup or a pernicious or partisan double standard.

The special counsel's regulations were written, above all, to ensure public confidence in the fair and impartial administration of justice. That charge would be entirely vitiated by an attempt to cover up or conceal Special Counsel Mueller's findings and report, whatever they may be and whenever they are finalized.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of both parties to join me in supporting this resolution and to make clear that anything less than full transparency is unacceptable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

□ 0930

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution requesting that Special Counsel Mueller's report be made available to the public.

There are three reasons why this must happen.

First, the taxpayers paid for this report. The American people funded this investigation. They have a right to see the contents of the report of the investigation.

Second, internal bureaucratic Department of Justice policies do not apply to Congress, especially on matters of national importance.

And third, if we don't get this report, it could amount to a cover-up.

The United States Constitution does not say that a sitting President cannot be indicted. There is nothing in the Constitution that would prevent that.

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has taken the policy position that they are not going to indict a sitting President, which means that the only institution that can hold the President accountable is Congress. If we do not get this information, we cannot effectively do our jobs, we cannot hold the President accountable, and it is something that the American public wants to see.

Over 87 percent of respondents in a recent poll say that this report should be made available to Congress and to the American public. If the Department of Justice does not do this, we all need to ask: What are they trying to hide?

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership and for introducing this incredibly important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation currently under way by Special Counsel Robert Mueller is incredibly important: an open investigation into incredibly serious allegations, potential obstruction of justice, corruption, and possible links of coordination between President Trump's Presidential campaign and the Russian Government, efforts to meddle in our democratic process, and mislead and manipulate American voters.

The allegations at the center of this investigation, as I said, are serious, they are credible, and they are unprecedented. With 37 indictments and counting, it is of paramount importance that the special counsel's report and the underlying evidence be made public for the sake of transparency and trust in our government.

As a nation, as a Congress, and as a Republic, we need to know all of the facts about this investigation and what unfolded between players in the President's campaign and Russia in 2016. We must protect and respect the work of Special Counsel Mueller, and his report must be released, in full, for the Congress and for the American people to see.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the chairman for introducing this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, what we are discussing is one of the most important documents that will ever be produced and given, potentially, to Congress for the American people in

our modern history: a question of whether or not this administration was involved with the Russian Government, our number one foreign enemy, in influencing the outcome of our Presidential election, something tantamount to treason.

The report needs to be made public because the American people have a right to know. The American people, as Ronald Reagan, to paraphrase, said: I paid for this microphone, the American people paid for this report, they paid for the special counsel, they deserve to see the fruits of his work and whether or not, as Richard Nixon said, their President is a crook, they need to know that.

Unfortunately, as I sit here listening to this discussion, I feel like I am thrown back into a time in the 1970s—I think it was 1977, somewhere around there—in Kinshasa, Zaire, not in the Washington, D.C. capitol. It is the Muhammad Ali-George Foreman fight, and the other side, the Republicans, are playing the role of Muhammad Ali. Not the “float like a butterfly, sting like a bee” Muhammad Ali, but the rope-a-dope, sit back, take the punches, let them swing, let them hit you, because they know that eventually they will wear themselves out and they know the outcome, because the fix is in.

There is a reason why the Attorney General was picked by this President, and we will soon find out. But we need to pass this resolution and show the American people that Congress is on the side of transparency and are releasing this report and letting the American public, who paid for this report, know the results of it and know what needs to happen to protect our democracy and the rule of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are, again, reminded that they should refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how about engaging in personalities against the sitting Attorney General? You are saying that he was appointed for a reason.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Is it not also directed at the House to not also impugn the integrity and the character of a sitting Cabinet member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this time, the gentleman from Georgia is advised that the Chair will not issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I wouldn't want to do it either, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not offer an advisory opinion.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Offer? Can you offer it? You said you were able to offer an advisory opinion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will once again advise that the

rule requires Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I made a parliamentary inquiry concerning a Cabinet member, not the President. I understand your advisory opinion against the President. I fully agree with it. I am asking about a member of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the rule does not extend to a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Wow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those are the rules of the House. The gentleman is advised.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Wow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for enlightening us on that. It is okay, basically, if you impugn the integrity of a sitting member of the Cabinet. I guess we just learned something new today. That is encouraging. As far as Members of the House, I get that it is not in the rules, but it also shouldn't be a part of this debate.

This is a simple resolution. It simply restates the regulation. Don't make it any more or any less than what it is. That is why we are here. We are going to approve this, we are going to vote for it, but let's not make it any more than what it is. Let's continue on so we can get a vote, everybody can go home, and maybe we will come back and actually vote on legislation that actually matters.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24, to express the sense of Congress that Special Counsel Mueller's report be made available to the American people and to Congress. We cannot impugn the integrity of the American people by keeping this report silenced.

For nearly 2 years, Special Counsel Robert Mueller and his team have investigated serious and credible allegations about obstruction of justice and collusion at the highest levels of our government. To date, Mr. Speaker, the investigation has led to the public indictment of three companies and 34 individuals, including the indictment of President Trump's former campaign manager and personal lawyer, seven guilty pleas, and one conviction following a jury trial. The allegations range from election interference, to lying to the FBI, to conspiracy to defraud the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be a Republican or a Democratic issue. I hope that my colleagues on the other side

will understand that there should be nothing to hide from the American people about this investigation, a special counsel's investigation into whether there was interference in our elections.

If my Republican colleagues have nothing to fear from this report, if they are willing to stand up for the Constitution, if they are willing to stand up for the American people and put that Constitution over party, over any individual, including the one that sits in the White House, then they, too, will join us in voting unanimously for this resolution.

It is a big deal for the American people to maintain trust in our democracy and in our government. They have to know the results of the special counsel's report. This is, again, an American issue. It is about doing our constitutional duty to protect our democracy.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to having a unanimous vote on this resolution, passing it through and making it clear that we have nothing to hide. It is our duty to the American people.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I don't know, maybe I need to make the talking points to the other side clear. I agreed on Monday that I was voting for this. We are not opposing this, because it is simply a restatement of the regulation. I know that it is fashionable to think that we are not. So, again, I am sorry, I could have maybe made the talking points more clear at Rules that I was voting for this so we could have saved extra time on some of the discussion here.

Mr. Speaker, again, we will continue to go through this, and, at this point, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the sponsor of this legislation to ensure that the work of the special counsel is not suppressed and will offer valuable assistance on today's resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on this.

Mr. Speaker, the relentless, baseless attacks on an American patriot, Robert Mueller, and his team, have moved us ever so closer to a constitutional crisis. Just as we cannot yield to Trump's attempt to discredit this distinguished team of legal experts, neither can we let them bury the results of this taxpayer-funded investigation.

Having nothing to fear means having nothing to hide. Those who seek to hide this report, obviously, do not believe that the truth will set them free. Rather, as it has for so many of Mr. Trump's sleazy cohorts, they feel that the truth will lock them up. So many lies, so much daily deceit. Already so much evidence of collusion and obstruction and, from the organization's own former lawyer, evidence of an apparent criminal enterprise that bears the name of the Trump organization.

If it is a witch hunt, Mr. President, it has more witches than a Mar-a-Lago

Halloween party. And your witches' brew seems to have cast a spell over many Members of this Congress who find themselves locked in continuing silence or wishy-washy efforts to ignore and bolster your floundering Presidency.

Today's resolution says to President Trump, who has shown some consistent disregard for the rule of law: You cannot seize and secret evidence of conduct that others need to see. Let the taxpayers see the results of the investigation of the wrongdoing, which their dollars have rightly funded.

Our congressional duty is to enforce the borders, to be Border Patrol people, to see that this President, who is willing to cross every line, every constitutional boundary, to see that he is contained within the borders of the Constitution. For the rule of law to stand, the administration cannot be allowed to sit on the special counsel's report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 26½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. And I also thank the ranking member. I very much appreciate his comments that he will support this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I will just observe, as a member of the Intelligence Committee, that we have seen our politics twisted into almost unrecognizable form by the unprecedented attacks of the President on the Department of Justice, on the FBI, on the investigation as a whole.

This report must see the light of day and must be made available to the American public for a catharsis that will allow us to start with the facts, to understand what happened and to rebuild the faith that the American people did and should have in the Department of Justice, in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in the government in general.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Congress, in strong, bipartisan fashion, passing this bill so that the American people will understand that the truth will be out there and it will help fix our politics.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding.

I, too, add my appreciation to Mr. COLLINS' eagerness to adhere to what I think is an appropriate policy that reasserts the article I authority, if you will, of the Congress. And I think it is important for my colleagues to recognize that Americans are wondering. They are wondering. They have heard over and over again of Russian collusion. They have heard the factual affirmation that the Russians did interfere with the 2016 election and tried to interfere with the 2018 election. Therefore, it is important for them, in their concern, to be informed. They are taxpayers. We say this all the time.

□ 0945

And it is important to note that, through this investigation, the National Security Advisor and former foreign policy advisor and many others have gone to court because of Mr. Mueller.

It is indeed important to know that we have learned much because of his report, but we have not learned all. And we must overcome Attorney General Barr's hesitation, because the American people have made the point. The point is that 68 percent of them say that they would like to see this report.

Now, we know that it has been banded around that we cannot indict a President. This is not about indicting a President. But assuming, arguendo, that this regulation is correct, that someone thinks that that is constant law and the President cannot be subjected to criminal process and, therefore, cannot and should not be indicted, it is a logical fallacy to say that because he cannot be indicted by virtue of his office and because it is the Justice Department's regulation not to reveal information about unindicted parties and individuals.

The Justice Department cannot reveal any information or potential wrongdoing by the President and not reveal any information to the body that possesses the constitutional responsibility for holding this President accountable.

So let us follow good policy. Even the words of Attorney General Barr that recognizes that the DOJ's purpose is to release investigations in the public interest. This is in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to all that we do this in a bipartisan way to give to the American people what they deserve and what they want.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on Judiciary, which has oversight of the Department of Justice, and as a Senior Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, which has oversight over our election security infrastructure, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I believe our nation will soon be at an inflection point.

For many years now, Americans have wondered about the role of Russia's interference

in the 2016 election and whether that crime was aided and abetted by Associates of the Trump Campaign.

Americans have been concerned as we have watched a parade of colleagues and contemporaries of the President hauled before court.

This includes the President's National Security Advisor, his longtime confidante, his former foreign policy advisor, and yesterday his former campaign manager and his former campaign manager.

Indeed, the future that awaits the President's former campaign manager is bleak—he is facing 7.5 years in federal prison, and today a 16-count indictment was returned in Manhattan detailing residential mortgage fraud, conspiracy and falsifying business records.

Indeed, most if not all of what we have learned about those who surround the president has been because of the work of the Special Counsel, Robert Mueller.

It is important that whatever work Mr. Mueller has done, be shared by the American people.

This is for any number of reasons.

First of all, broad swaths of the American people want this report published.

The last public opinion poll conducted showed that 68% of Americans want this Mueller report published.

Next, the entire purpose of appointing a special counsel was because the president's first attorney General had to recuse himself because he was found to be less-than-truthful about his contacts with Kremlin officials during the 2016 campaign, on behalf of then Candidate Trump.

According to the former Acting Attorney General, the Special Counsel was appointed in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome of the investigation . . . the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly.

And thus far, Mr. Mueller's investigation has revealed the public indictment of 34 individuals, 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas and one 1 conviction following trial.

Through the work done by Mr. Mueller and his "speaking indictments," we learned that Russian military officials tried to wage an active measures campaign.

We know that the Russians manipulated our social media systems.

They did this by turning our social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, into rowdy and unwieldy debates that turned Americans against one another.

They did this by creating fake online social media accounts and populated them on social media platforms.

After infiltrating the social media accounts of real Americans, these fake accounts sought to sow discord in these online communities by purposely exacerbating divisions within our nation and creating new ones—all with the intent of pitting Americans against one another.

While they were distorting the social media landscape, they were also selectively disseminating emails stolen from the Democratic National Committee and the campaign of Hillary Clinton with the purpose of timing the dissemination to maximize political damage on Secretary Clinton's campaign.

All the while, the President was encouraging this behavior.

And, despite protestations by the President, this is not a witch hunt—it has yielded the

public indictments of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction.

The American people are watching and paying attention.

The most recent public opinion poll shows that a super majority of Americans—a full 68%—wants the Mueller Report made public.

The Mueller Report is one unparalleled way in which Americans can learn this information with confidence.

And, finally, we must tackle a serious issue that is being discussed among elected officials and the Justice Department.

Over the past two years, we have been told that it is Justice Department regulations that a sitting President cannot be indicted. I will note that this principle has not been tested in court.

That regulation was implemented during the Watergate investigation, under the theory that the President cannot be subjected to criminal process.

But, assuming *arguendo* that this regulation is correct, and the President cannot be subjected to criminal process and therefore cannot and should not be indicted, it is a logical fallacy to say that because he cannot be indicted by virtue of his office, and because it is Justice Department regulation not to reveal information about unindicted parties and individuals, the Justice Department cannot reveal any information of potential wrongdoing by the President and not reveal any information to the body that possesses the constitutional responsibility for holding this president accountable.

For these reasons, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24, and urge my colleagues to support it and urge passage so the American people can learn how the 2016 election became a crime scene.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my call today is for full transparency, with a clear focus on the sinister motives of Russia's corrupt leaders. Their interference in our 2016 elections has created confusion, anger, bewilderment, and division—exactly what Russia wanted.

Today's resolution calls for the Department of Justice to make Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report, along with any findings, available to the public to the maximum extent permitted by the law and to provide the report and its findings, in entirety, to the Congress of the United States of America.

So whether you have used Special Counsel Mueller as a patriot conducting a nonpartisan investigation into a foreign power's possible influence in our elections or as a witch hunt, a full accounting and public release of the findings is needed to heal our political differences.

This is not about embarrassing President Trump. This is about closure and full disclosure.

If there was no collusion, as the President has emphasized, then he should want complete transparency. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve no less.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House passed H.R. 1, major legislation to strengthen voter access, address the corrosive influence of dark money in politics, institute national redistricting reform, and hold public officials accountable to higher standards of ethics and transparency.

Taking the next step, this week is sunshine week on the House floor. The House has already passed several pieces of legislation this week to modernize government and increase transparency, accountability, and good governance. They include measures aimed at shining a light onto Russia's malign activities around the world and the suppression of democracy within its own borders.

The resolution we now have before us expresses the sense of Congress that the American public ought to have transparency when it comes to the investigation into Russia's interference in our elections and efforts to undermine our democracy. It says that the special counsel's report ought to be made public to the fullest extent of the law and that Congress should see all of it.

Nearly 9 in 10 Americans believe the special counsel's report should be made public, and we have heard that from Republicans in Congress as well. I hope this will be a bipartisan vote to tell the American people: You have the right to and ought to know the results of this report.

One of my Republican colleagues, Representative MIKE TURNER from Ohio, said in February the report has to be made public.

SUSAN COLLINS of Maine said: "The American people deserve to know what the findings are of Mr. Mueller."

"I believe the report should be released," said Senator COLLINS.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me, Mr. NADLER, Republicans, and Democrats on supporting this resolution and in calling for transparency. Let's come together in a bipartisan vote to make it clear that the American people deserve to know the full extent of what Russia—of what Russia—has done in the objective of subverting and undermining our democratic institutions.

I thank the chair for bringing this resolution to the floor. I urge all of us to support it. Let's send a unanimous message to the Russians and to any other country or entity that would try to subvert our democratic elections that that will not be tolerated.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 26½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said today, and it is interesting to me—I think this is the funny part of this, because so many times we would come up here and we retreat to our partisan sides and we say, I am going to be a "yes"; you are going to be a "no."

The sad part about it is the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), my colleague, I said "yes" on Monday night. I said "yes" to the resolution on Monday night. Yet it seems like somehow, through the process: Well, we need everybody to come together.

We have talked about this. It is nothing but a restatement of the regulation.

Attorney General Barr will follow the regulation. He has said so. He has been in committee, and during his time of confirmation, he has said so.

I think what we need to understand here, and maybe we also need to throw this out here, and maybe this is something because I have heard a lot of my colleagues across the aisle talk about what they believe should be in this report. Well, maybe I have a problem and maybe a news flash to give them: What happens when it comes back and says none of this was true, the President did not do anything wrong? Then the meltdown will occur.

I heard probably, earlier, just one of my colleagues actually on the other side stated that the elections has thrown chaos into the system. No, the reason the election has thrown chaos is because President Trump won and the Democratic candidate didn't know where Wisconsin was. You all remedied that this time, though. The Democratic candidate for President will actually have been to Wisconsin by the election day next time.

There are other reasons to do this. Transparency is good.

As we go forward, my hope would be, on this issue, let's let the report be given to the Attorney General. Let's let the Attorney General do the regulations and follow the regulations and give as much as he has said in his confirmation hearing: that he wants to be transparent, he wants to be a part, he wants this to come out, because he understands the questions and the turmoil that this has caused.

So I have nothing to believe that this would not be true. There is nothing that has been presented here today to think that it wouldn't be true. That is what makes this resolution even more amazing to me: Nothing has been presented that Mr. Barr would not do what the regulations say.

Now, there may be more on it and everything else, but let's talk about what actually the resolution says, and that is what it says.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the gentleman from Georgia implied a few

minutes ago, that we shouldn't be wasting our time on this because it only restates what the regulations require and the Judiciary Committee ought to be spending its time more productively, I simply want to say, first, that the Democratic House majority and the Judiciary Committee are not focused on the President to the exclusion of our legislative priorities.

In the 2 months since we organized, the Judiciary Committee has passed H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, through the House and has passed H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019, through the House. H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, passed through the committee. We have passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, through the House.

The Judiciary Committee has also held a hearing to begin the process of reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act and held a hearing to examine the state of competition in the healthcare industry, as well as the T-Mobile-Sprint merger.

We have introduced H.R. 5, the Equality Act; H.R. 1327, the Never Forget the Heroes: Permanent Authorization of September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act; and the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019, the so-called Dreamers bill.

These are some of the things we have been doing besides looking into the possible misconduct by the President.

In closing, I would like to include the following items in the RECORD:

First, the U.S. Intelligence Community report concluding that Vladimir Putin ordered a misinformation campaign directed against the 2016 Presidential election and displayed a clear preference for then-candidate Donald Trump.

ASSESSING RUSSIAN ACTIVITIES AND
INTENTIONS IN RECENT US ELECTIONS
(January 6, 2017)
KEY JUDGMENTS

Russian efforts to influence the 2016 US presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow's longstanding desire to undermine the US-led liberal democratic order, but these activities demonstrated a significant escalation in directness, level of activity, and scope of effort compared to previous operations.

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the US democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump. We have high confidence in these judgments.

We also assess Putin and the Russian Government aspired to help President-elect Trump's election chances when possible by discrediting Secretary Clinton and publicly contrasting her unfavorably to him. All three agencies agree with this judgment. CIA and FBI have high confidence in this judgment; NSA has moderate confidence.

Moscow's approach evolved over the course of the campaign based on Russia's under-

standing of the electoral prospects of the two main candidates. When it appeared to Moscow that Secretary Clinton was likely to win the election, the Russian influence campaign began to focus more on undermining her future presidency.

Further information has come to light since Election Day that, when combined with Russian behavior since early November 2016, increases our confidence in our assessments of Russian motivations and goals.

Moscow's influence campaign followed a Russian messaging strategy that blends covert intelligence operations—such as cyber activity—with overt efforts by Russian Government agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries, and paid social media users or “trolls.” Russia, like its Soviet predecessor, has a history of conducting covert influence campaigns focused on US presidential elections that have used intelligence officers and agents and press placements to disparage candidates perceived as hostile to the Kremlin.

Russia's intelligence services conducted cyber operations against targets associated with the 2016 US presidential election, including targets associated with both major US political parties.

We assess with high confidence that Russian military intelligence (General Staff Main Intelligence Directorate or GRU) used the Guccifer 2.0 persona and DCLeaks.com to release US victim data obtained in cyber operations publicly and in exclusives to media outlets and relayed material to WikiLeaks.

Russian intelligence obtained and maintained access to elements of multiple US state or local electoral boards. DHS assesses that the types of systems Russian actors targeted or compromised were not involved in vote tallying.

Russia's state-run propaganda machine contributed to the influence campaign by serving as a platform for Kremlin messaging to Russian and international audiences.

We assess Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the US presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against US allies and their election processes.

Mr. NADLER. Second, I include a February 22, 2019, letter to the Attorney General from six House committee chairs expressing the expectation that the Mueller report will be made public and that the Department will make the underlying investigative materials available to committees upon request.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 22, 2019.
Hon. WILLIAM P. BARR,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Recent reports suggest that Special Counsel Robert Mueller may be nearing the end of his investigation into “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump” and other matters that may have arisen directly from the investigation. As you know, Department of Justice regulations require that, “[a]t the conclusion of the Special Counsel's work, he or she shall provide the Attorney General with a confidential report explaining the prosecution or declination decisions reached by the Special Counsel.”

After nearly two years of investigation—accompanied by two years of direct attacks on the integrity of the investigation by the President—the public is entitled to know what the Special Counsel has found. We

write to you to express, in the strongest possible terms, our expectation that the Department of Justice will release to the public the report Special Counsel Mueller submits to you—without delay and to the maximum extent permitted by law.

There also remains a significant public interest in the full disclosure of information learned by the Special Counsel about the nature and scope of the Russian government's efforts to undermine our democracy. To the extent that the Department believes that certain aspects of the report are not suitable for immediate public release, we ask that you provide that information to Congress, along with your reasoning for withholding the information from the public, in order for us to judge the appropriateness of any redactions for ourselves.

We also expect that the Department will provide to our Committees, upon request and consistent with applicable law, other information and material obtained or produced by the Special Counsel regarding certain foreign actors and other individuals who may have been the subject of a criminal or counterintelligence investigation. This expectation is well-grounded in the precedent set by the Department in recent years. In other closed and pending high-profile cases alleging wrongdoing by public officials, both the Department and the FBI have produced substantial amounts of investigative material, including classified and law enforcement sensitive information, to the House of Representatives.

Finally, although we recognize the policy of the Department to remain sensitive to the privacy and reputation interests of individuals who will not face criminal charges, we feel that it is necessary to address the particular danger of withholding evidence of misconduct by President Trump from the relevant committees.

If the Special Counsel has reason to believe that the President has engaged in criminal or other serious misconduct, then the President must be subject to accountability either in a court or to the Congress. But because the Department has taken the position that a sitting President is immune from indictment and prosecution, Congress could be the only institution currently situated to act on evidence of the President's misconduct. To maintain that a sitting president cannot be indicted, and then to withhold evidence of wrongdoing from Congress because the President will not be charged, is to convert Department policy into the means for a cover-up. The President is not above the law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

REP. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary.

REP. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform.

REP. ADAM SCHIFF,
Chairman, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

REP. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

REP. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Financial Services.

REP. RICHARD NEAL,
Chair, House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Third, the introduction to the final report to the Deputy Attorney General concerning the 1993 confrontation at the Mount Carmel complex.

INTRODUCTION

This Report contains the findings of the Special Counsel in response to the questions directed to him by Attorney General Janet Reno in Order No. 2256-99, dated September 9, 1999. The questions pertain to the 1993 confrontation between federal law enforcement officials and the Branch Davidians at the Mt. Carmel complex near Waco, Texas. The Report is issued pursuant to Section (e) of Order No. 2256-99 which provides, in relevant part, that the Special Counsel shall submit "to the maximum extent possible . . . a final report . . . in a form that will permit public dissemination."

The Office of Special Counsel has organized the Report in the following format:

- (I) a description of the Issues investigated by the Special Counsel;
- (II) the Conclusions of the Special Counsel;
- (III) a description of the Investigative Methods used by the Special Counsel;
- (IV) a Statement of Facts relevant to the Special Counsel's investigation;
- (V) Exhibits to the text of the Report; and
- (VI) Appendices that include a narrative summary of the relevant beliefs and practices of the Branch Davidians, a summary of expert findings, a chronological table of events, and the reports of experts retained by the Office of Special Counsel.

Mr. NADLER. And fourth, the Department of Justice commentary interpreting the special counsel regulations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of the Attorney General
28 CFR Parts 0 and 600
[A.G. Order No. 2232-99]
Office of Special Counsel

AGENCY: Department of Justice.
ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This order amends the Code of Federal Regulations to provide regulations concerning Attorney General appointment of Special Counsel to investigate and, when appropriate, to prosecute matters when the Attorney General concludes that extraordinary circumstances exist such that the public interest would be served by removing a large degree of responsibility for a matter from the Department of Justice. These regulations replace the procedures for appointment of independent counsel pursuant to the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994.

EFFECTIVE DATES: July 1, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John C. Keeney, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 514-2621.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Background

The Attorney General is promulgating these regulations to replace the procedures set out in the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994. These regulations seek to strike a balance between independence and accountability in certain sensitive investigations, recognizing that there is no perfect solution to the problem. The balance struck is one of day-to-day independence, with a Special Counsel appointed to investigate and, if appropriate, prosecute matters when the Attorney General concludes that extraordinary circumstances exist such that the public interest would be served by removing a large degree of responsibility for the matter from the Department of Justice. The Special Counsel would be free to struc-

ture the investigation as he or she wishes and to exercise independent prosecutorial discretion to decide whether charges should be brought, within the context of the established procedures of the Department. Nevertheless, it is intended that ultimate responsibility for the matter and how it is handled will continue to rest with the Attorney General (or the Acting Attorney General if the Attorney General is personally recused in the matter); thus, the regulations explicitly acknowledge the possibility of review of specific decisions reached by the Special Counsel.

The regulations also remove §0.14, setting forth procedures for Special Independent Counsels for members of Congress. The regulations in that section have been suspended since April 19, 1989. 54 FR 15752.

Section-by-Section Discussion

Section 600.1. Grounds for Appointing a Special Counsel

"The Attorney General, or in cases in which the Attorney General is recused, the Acting Attorney General, will appoint a Special Counsel when he or she determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and—

(a) That investigation or prosecution of that person or matter by a United States Attorney's Office or litigating Division of the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and

(b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter."

Section 600.2. Alternatives Available to the Attorney General

"When matters are brought to the attention of the Attorney General that might warrant consideration of appointment of a Special Counsel, the Attorney General may:

(a) Appoint a Special Counsel;

(b) Direct that an initial investigation, consisting of such factual inquiry or legal research as the Attorney General deems appropriate, be conducted in order to better inform the decision; or

(c) Conclude that under the circumstances of the matter, the public interest would not be served by removing the investigation from the normal processes of the Department, and that the appropriate component of the Department should handle the matter. If the Attorney General reaches this conclusion, he or she may direct that appropriate steps be taken to mitigate any conflicts of interest, such as recusal of particular officials."

Discussion:

There are occasions when the facts create a conflict so substantial, or the exigencies of the situation are such that any initial investigation might taint the subsequent investigation, so that it is appropriate for the Attorney General to immediately appoint a Special Counsel. In other situations, some initial investigation, whether factual or legal, may be appropriate to better inform the Attorney General's decision. This provision is intended to make it clear that a variety of approaches, even in cases that might create an apparent conflict of interest, may be appropriate, depending on the facts of the matter.

Section 600.3. Qualifications of the Special Counsel

"(a) An individual named as Special Counsel shall be a lawyer with a reputation for integrity and impartial decisionmaking, and with appropriate experience to ensure both that the investigation will be conducted ably, expeditiously and thoroughly, and that investigative and prosecutorial decisions will be supported by an informed under-

standing of the criminal law and Department of Justice policies. The Special Counsel shall be selected from outside the United States Government. Special Counsels shall agree that their responsibilities as Special Counsel shall take first precedence in their professional lives, and that it may be necessary to devote their full time to the investigation, depending on its complexity and the stage of the investigation.

"(b) The Attorney General shall consult with the Assistant Attorney General for Administration to ensure an appropriate method of appointment, and to ensure that a Special Counsel undergoes an appropriate background investigation and a detailed review of ethics and conflicts of interest issues. A Special Counsel shall be appointed as a 'confidential employee' as defined in 5 U.S.C. 7511(b)(2)(C)."

Section 600.4. Jurisdiction

"(a) Original Jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of a Special Counsel shall be established by the Attorney General. The Special Counsel will be provided with a specific factual statement of the matter to be investigated. The jurisdiction of a Special Counsel shall also include the authority to investigate and prosecute federal crimes committed in the course of, and with intent to interfere with, the Special Counsel's investigation, such as perjury, obstruction of justice, destruction of evidence, and intimidation of witnesses; and to conduct appeals arising out of the matter being investigated and/or prosecuted.

"(b) Additional Jurisdiction. If in the course of his or her investigation the Special Counsel concludes that additional jurisdiction beyond that specified in his or her original jurisdiction is necessary in order to fully investigate and resolve the matters assigned, or to investigate new matters that come to light in the course of his or her investigation, he or she shall consult with the Attorney General, who will determine whether to include the additional matters within the Special Counsel's jurisdiction or assign them elsewhere."

Discussion:

Under these regulations, it is intended that a Special Counsel's jurisdiction will be stated as an investigation of specific facts. The regulations also recognize, however, that accommodations can be made as necessary throughout the course of the investigation, with the Attorney General's approval. This provision establishes a protocol whereby Special Counsels are provided with an appropriate description of the boundaries of their investigation, with the full recognition that adjustments to that jurisdiction may be required.

Paragraph (b) establishes a single procedure through which a variety of different jurisdictional issues can be resolved. For example, a Special Counsel assigned responsibility for an alleged false statement about a government program may request additional jurisdiction to investigate allegations of misconduct with respect to the administration of that program; a Special Counsel may conclude that investigating otherwise unrelated allegations against a central witness in the matter is necessary to obtain cooperation; or a Special Counsel may come across evidence of additional, unrelated crimes by targets of his or her investigation. Rather than leaving the issue to argument and misunderstanding as to whether the new matters are included within a vague category of "related matters," the regulations clarify that the decision as to which component would handle such new matters would be made by the Attorney General. The Special Counsel would report such matters to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General would decide whether to grant the Special

Counsel jurisdiction over the additional matters.

“(c) Civil and Administrative Jurisdiction. If in the course of his or her investigation the Special Counsel determines that administrative remedies, civil sanctions or other governmental action outside the criminal justice system might be appropriate, he or she shall consult with the Attorney General with respect to the appropriate component to take any necessary action. A Special Counsel shall not have civil or administrative authority unless specifically granted such jurisdiction by the Attorney General.”

Discussion:

Paragraph (c) is intended to clarify that the Special Counsel’s jurisdiction will cover only the criminal aspects of the matters within his or her jurisdiction, unless other jurisdiction is specifically granted by the Attorney General.

Section 600.5. Staff

“A Special Counsel may request the assignment of appropriate Department employees to assist the Special Counsel. The Department shall gather and provide the Special Counsel with the names and resumes of appropriate personnel available for detail. The Special Counsel may also request the detail of specific employees, and the office for which the designated employee works shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate the request. The Special Counsel shall assign the duties and supervise the work of such employees while they are assigned to the Special Counsel. If necessary, the Special Counsel may request that additional personnel be hired or assigned from outside the Department. All personnel in the Department shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the Special Counsel.”

Discussion:

This provision, providing for the assignment of appropriate personnel to assist the Special Counsel, also includes assignment of needed investigative resources from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is anticipated that most personnel will be Department of Justice employees provided by detail to the Special Counsel, although the regulation provides for additional employment from outside the Department when necessary.

Section 600.6. Powers and Authority

“Subject to the limitations in the following paragraphs, the Special Counsel shall exercise, within the scope of his or her jurisdiction, the full power and independent authority to exercise all investigative and prosecutorial functions of any United States Attorney. Except as provided in this part, the Special Counsel shall determine whether and to what extent to inform or consult with the Attorney General or others within the Department about the conduct of his or her duties and responsibilities.”

Section 600.7. Conduct and Accountability

“(a) A Special Counsel shall comply with the rules, regulations, procedures, practices and policies of the Department of Justice. He or she shall consult with appropriate offices within the Department for guidance with respect to established practices, policies and procedures of the Department, including ethics and security regulations and procedures. Should the Special Counsel conclude that the extraordinary circumstances of any particular decision would render compliance with required review and approval procedures by the designated Departmental component inappropriate, he or she may consult directly with the Attorney General.”

Mr. NADLER. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that one reason for this resolution, given the fact that Mr. Barr, the Attorney General, has, in

fact, said that he would want to release as much as possible—and we appreciate that statement—but he and Mr. Rosenstein, the Deputy Attorney General, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, have both cited the Department policy not to comment on the conduct of someone not indicted.

That leads us to expect that a misapplication of the normal Department policy to a sitting President of not commenting on someone who is not indicted, the application of that normally good policy to a sitting President who the Department believes cannot be indicted because he is a sitting President, would, in fact, greatly limit the ability of the Department or the willingness of the Department to release information in the report to the Congress and to the public.

One of the reasons for this resolution is that we want to say, no, you cannot use that normally salutary policy to convert the Department’s policy of never indicting a sitting President into a coverup that you can’t comment or give to the Congress information about that.

If you can’t indict a sitting President and you can’t give the information to Congress, then you are holding the President above the law, and you are frustrating Congress’ ability to do its job of holding an administration accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

□ 1000

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his indulgence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because I want the whole truth and nothing but the truth to come to light in this matter; I want to know what Vladimir Putin did to our electoral process; I want to know the failures of the Obama administration in reacting to this attack in real time; I want any Americans complicit to face severe consequences; and I want the American people to know as much as they can. As a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I support the efforts and the request for all information pertaining to this investigation to be open to the public. That includes all witness lists, every interview transcript, and every document provided.

The taxpayers paid millions for this information, and they should get to see all of it and not just the assessment of one person.

This resolution should have been broader; it should have been deeper; and it should have covered everything dealing with the investigation. But it is a step in the right direction.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle accept the calls for all the information to be made public because full transparency is the only way to prevent future speculation. Full transparency is the only way to prevent future innuendo.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say thank you to the chairman. I appreciate it. Mr. HURD was on his way over here. I did my best song and dance. It didn’t last long enough. I am from the South. I am bad because I can’t dance that well. So I appreciate the gentleman giving him that moment.

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

Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons stated by all the people who spoke in favor of this resolution, myself and everyone else, I urge adoption of the resolution. I urge everyone to vote for it. It is a very important resolution to maintain the rule of law in this country

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 208, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, answered “present” 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—420

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Clyburn
Adams	Brooks (IN)	Cohen
Aderholt	Brown (MD)	Cole
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Collins (GA)
Allen	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Allred	Buck	Comer
Amodei	Bucshon	Conaway
Armstrong	Budd	Connolly
Arrington	Burchett	Cook
Axne	Burgess	Cooper
Babin	Bustos	Correa
Bacon	Butterfield	Costa
Baird	Byrne	Courtney
Balderson	Calvert	Cox (CA)
Banks	Carbajal	Craig
Barr	Cárdenas	Crawford
Barragán	Carson (IN)	Crenshaw
Bass	Carter (GA)	Crist
Beatty	Carter (TX)	Crow
Bera	Cartwright	Cuellar
Bergman	Case	Cummings
Beyer	Casten (IL)	Cunningham
Biggs	Castor (FL)	Curtis
Bilirakis	Castro (TX)	Davids (KS)
Bishop (GA)	Chabot	Davidson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	Davis, Danny K.
Blunt Rochester	Cicilline	Davis, Rodney
Bonamici	Cisneros	Dean
Bost	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
F.	Clay	DeLauro
Brady	Cline	DelBene
Brindisi	Cloud	Delgado

Demings Kelly (PA)
 DeSaulnier Kennedy
 DesJarlais Khanna
 Deutch Kildee
 Diaz-Balart Kilmer
 Dingell Kim
 Doggett Kind
 Doyle, Michael King (IA)
 F. King (NY)
 Duffy Kinzinger
 Duncan Kirkpatrick
 Dunn Krishnamoorthi
 Emmer Kuster (NH)
 Engel Kustoff (TN)
 Escobar LaHood
 Eshoo LaMalfa
 Espaillat Lamb
 Estes Lamborn
 Evans Langevin
 Ferguson Larsen (WA)
 Finkenauer Larson (CT)
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann Lawrence
 Fletcher Lawson (FL)
 Flores Lee (CA)
 Fortenberry Lee (NV)
 Foster Lesko
 Foxx (NC) Levin (CA)
 Frankel Levin (MI)
 Fudge Lewis
 Fulcher Lieu, Ted
 Gabbard Sarbanes
 Gallagher Loeb sack
 Gallego Long
 Garamendi Loudermilk
 Garcia (IL) Lowenthal
 Garcia (TX) Lowey
 Gianforte Lucas
 Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Gohmert Luján
 Golden Luria
 Gomez Lynch
 Gonzalez (OH) Malinowski
 Gonzalez (TX) Maloney,
 Gooden Carolyn B.
 Gottheimer Maloney, Sean
 Granger Marchant
 Graves (GA) Mast
 Graves (LA) Matsui
 Graves (MO) McAdams
 Green (TN) McBath
 Green (TX) McCarthy
 Griffith McCaul
 Grijalva McClintock
 Grothman McCollum
 Guest McGovern
 Guthrie McHenry
 Haaland McKinley
 Hagedorn McNeerney
 Harder (CA) Meadows
 Harris Meeks
 Hartzler Meng
 Hayes Meuser
 Heck Miller
 Hern, Kevin Mitchell
 Herrera Beutler Moolenaar
 Hice (GA) Mooney (WV)
 Higgins (LA) Moore
 Higgins (NY) Morelle
 Hill (AR) Moulton
 Hill (CA) Mucarsel-Powell
 Himes Mullin
 Holding Murphy
 Hollingsworth Nadler
 Horn, Kendra S. Napolitano
 Horsford Neal
 Houlahan Neguse
 Hoyer Newhouse
 Hudson Norcross
 Huffman Norman
 Huizenga Nunes
 Hunter O'Halleran
 Hurd (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
 Jackson Lee Olson
 Jayapal Olson
 Jeffries Palazzo
 Johnson (GA) Pallone
 Johnson (LA) Palmer
 Johnson (OH) Panetta
 Johnson (SD) Pappas
 Johnson (TX) Pascrell
 Jordan Payne
 Joyce (OH) Pence
 Joyce (PA) Perlmutter
 Kaptur Perry
 Katko Peters
 Keating Peterson
 Kelly (IL) Phillips
 Kelly (MS) Pingree

Pocan Walker
 Porter Walorski
 Posey Waltz
 Pressley Wasserman
 Price (NC) Schultz
 Quigley Waters
 Raskin Watkins
 Reed Watson Coleman
 Reschenthaler Weber (TX)
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigglesman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Lynch
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spano
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Taylor
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Omar
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden

Webster (FL) Wittman
 Welch Womack
 Wenstrup Woodall
 Westerman Wright
 Wexton Yarmuth
 Wild Yoho
 Williams Young
 Wilson (FL) Zeldin
 Wilson (SC)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Amash Gosar
 Gaetz Massie

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver Marshall Schweikert
 Hastings McEachin
 Lofgren Ratcliffe

□ 1030

Messrs. BRADY and BUCK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GAETZ changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on Thursday, March 14, 2019. I had intended to vote "yes" on rollcall vote No. 125.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during today's rollcall vote on H. Con. Res. 24. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 125.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019, TO MONDAY, MARCH 18, 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, March 18, 2019.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1004

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative TOM RICE as a cosponsor from H.R. 1004.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of 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 a unanimous consent request for the consideration of that measure would have to receive clearance from the majority and the minority floor and committee leaderships.

The Chair is unaware at this time of any such clearance. Therefore, the Chair cannot and will not entertain that request at this time.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I urge to immediately schedule this important bill.

DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is an insidious problem that affects far too many people across our country.

One in four women and one in seven men will be the victim of violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime.

Sadly, the scourge of domestic and sexual violence affects our communities, our schools, our servicemembers, and threatens the well-being of women, men, children, the LGBTQ community, our veterans, and others.

But through education and legislative action like reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA, we can and have made a difference.

Since its passage 25 years ago through 2012, the rate of domestic violence decreased by 63 percent. From 1996 to 2015, the rate of women murdered by men in a single-victim/single-offender incident dropped by 29 percent.

This week, we voted in the Judiciary Committee to reauthorize this life-saving legislation.

I look forward to bringing VAWA to the floor so that families may be protected from the tragedy of domestic and sexual violence; so that young women like my granddaughter, Aubrey, feel safe to focus on the things that are most important, like claiming her education, her career, and her happy life ahead of her.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING JEANNETTE RANKIN DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a trailblazing Montanan as we celebrate Women's History Month.

A fearless, principled leader, Jeannette Rankin was a courageous pioneer. The daughter of a rancher and a teacher, she was born and raised in Montana. Growing up, she helped on her family's ranch and, in 1902, graduated from what is now the University of Montana.

As a staunch advocate for women's suffrage, she successfully led efforts to secure women the right to vote in Montana in 1914, 6 years before the 19th Amendment to our Constitution was ratified.

Four years before women could vote throughout our Nation, Montanans elected Jeannette Rankin to Congress. She was the first woman to serve in this body.

Dedicated to her guiding principles, Jeannette Rankin is foundational to Montana's and our country's history. It is my distinct honor to recognize her for her lasting contributions to our country during Women's History Month.

SHED LIGHT ON DARK MONEY

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act, a sweeping voting rights and government reform package that returns the power of our democracy to the American people.

Since this week is Sunshine Week, I want to focus on a particular part of H.R. 1 that is designed to shine some much-needed sunshine on the corrosive influence of dark money.

Multiple sources reported this week that the President's 2017 inaugural fund received tens of thousands of dollars in contributions from shell companies to conceal illegal contributions from foreign donors.

Think about that. Foreign agents lavished tens of thousands of dollars on the U.S. inaugural celebration so they could try to influence our President.

That is why I introduced the Inaugural Fund Integrity Act, which is part of H.R. 1, to close loopholes in the existing regulations, to put an end to donations by foreign nationals and corporations, to ban personal use of inaugural funds, and to require disclosure of all donations and spending by inaugural committees.

It is hard to think of an area more in need of sunshine than a shadowy slush fund rife with opportunities for government corruption.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1695, the Community Services Block Grant Reauthorization Act of 2019.

This bill renews our Nation's commitment to reducing poverty through locally driven, comprehensive approaches.

I am proud to lead this legislation with Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM.

Mr. Speaker, the Community Services Block Grant traces its roots back more than 50 years ago to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This act established local committee action agencies to help people identify why people were in poverty and how to address it using public and private resources and partnerships.

Virtually every county in America has a community action agency. They act as a safety net for low-income individuals and families, but, more importantly, they help to create opportunities to raise people out of poverty—from poverty to independence.

The Community Services Block Grant is the only Federal program with the explicit goal of reducing poverty, regardless of its cause. Unfortunately, this program has not been reauthorized in more than 20 years, which is unacceptable.

It is time to reauthorize the Community Services Block Grant, and I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor and support this bill.

RISING FOR MOLLY

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for my Molly.

I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives as a proud mother of a gay daughter.

When I was in the Air Force, we were taught never to leave anyone behind; and, after the 2016 election, I listened as my daughter, my Molly, cried in my arms.

She was scared for her community, the LGBTQ community. She was scared that America had left her and her community behind.

This is and was the country that I served. This was the daughter that I have raised. I was scared too.

When we decided, as a family, to run for Congress, Molly and I spoke about her story and whether she was comfortable with me sharing it with our Nation. We agreed that it was important.

As a mother, an ally, and now a Member of Congress, I feel it my duty and my privilege to champion the voices of those in the LGBTQ community.

I am proud to cosponsor the Equality Act. I do so for my daughter—my Molly—for my community, the Pennsylvania 6th, and for all of my fellow LGBTQ Americans.

You will not be left behind.

BMW CREATES JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was reported last week that the BMW plant in South Carolina remained the top vehicle exporter in America, with more than \$8.4 billion worth of cars shipped to foreign countries.

Nearly a quarter of a million cars were exported, with the vast majority sent from the Port of Charleston, led by State Ports Authority President Jim Newsome.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, the late Governor Carroll Campbell recruited BMW to South Carolina with export production of 1,400 cars a day. Production in 2018 was 356,749 vehicles.

Governor Henry McMaster and Commerce Secretary Bobby Hitt continue to promote an additional \$600 million investment in Plant Spartanburg, which already at \$10 billion is the largest BMW plant in the world, providing 11,000 jobs.

Thousands of additional jobs in the region have been created by suppliers to the assembly facility.

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

□ 1045

WISHING SUPREME COURT JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG A HAPPY 86TH BIRTHDAY

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and to wish her a happy 86th birthday this Friday.

During this Women's History Month, we celebrate visionary women like Justice Ginsburg, whose work ethic and achievements have motivated me and many women across this country.

Throughout her career, Justice Ginsburg has been a pioneer for gender equality. As a first-year Harvard Law student, she was one of nine women in a 500-person class and became the first female professor to have tenure at Columbia.

She would later cofound the ACLU's Women's Rights Project, paving the way for groundbreaking work around issues like pregnancy and parenting, education equity and equal pay.

Undoubtedly, Justice Ginsburg has set a precedent for women everywhere and continues to do so as a Supreme Court Justice.

I wish Justice Ginsburg many more years of health and happiness. She truly is an American hero.

COMMEMORATING DR. JOHN
BARDO

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

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Wichita State University President Dr. John Bardo, who sadly passed away on March 12, 2019. In his 7 years as president, Dr. Bardo's devotion to education and Wichita State was unsurpassed as he led the university in a bold direction that benefited students and the entire Wichita community.

Dr. Bardo's tenure was not his first job at the university. In 1975, Dr. Bardo, then an assistant professor of sociology, met his wife, Deborah.

When Dr. Bardo returned to Wichita State as president in 2012, he said: "We came home . . . to reposition this university as a key driver of the future of Wichita." From developing the Innovation Campus and WSU Tech, to increasing online courses, research, and dorm space, his leadership accomplished that goal and set the university on a path to be a nationwide leader in education.

Last July, Dr. Bardo was invited to come testify before the House Education and the Workforce Committee about Wichita State's leadership in innovation. As a member of the committee at the time, I will never forget the pride Dr. Bardo showed for the university and our community.

I know Shockers are better off because of his leadership, passion, and vision.

I ask my colleagues to join me in praying for the Bardo family.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF
VICTOR MCELHANEY

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Victor McElhaney, the son of my friend, Oakland City Councilwoman Lynette McElhaney, and his father, Clarence, and to offer my deepest condolences on behalf of the 13th Congressional District.

Victor was tragically slain in a senseless act of gun violence early Sunday morning in Los Angeles. He was killed in a robbery attempt while heading home from a friend's house.

Victor was just 21 years old and a senior at the University of Southern California's Thornton School of Music, where he was pursuing his lifelong love of music. He was a talented drummer and was often playing at jam sessions, displaying his musical genius.

Victor was a son of Oakland, and his passing is a loss for Oakland and the entire East Bay community. My heart is heavy for Lynette and her family and all those who loved and cared for Victor.

Victor was killed in Los Angeles, but his murder reflects the epidemic of gun violence in my district and all around the country, especially communities of color. Even before Victor's tragic passing, combating gun violence in Oakland was a priority for his mother as a city council member.

May God comfort Victor's family as we mourn his loss. May his spirit lead and guide us in the work that we must do to end gun violence in his memory.

May Victor's legacy live, and may he rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF CAPTAIN JAKE RINGERING

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Captain Jake Ringering, a beloved member of the Godfrey Fire Protection District who tragically lost his life in the line of duty on March 5.

While responding to a fire in Bethalto, members of the Godfrey Fire Protection District were attempting to suppress the fire from outside when the building partially collapsed. Captain Ringering and Firefighter Luke Warner both sustained injuries from the collapse.

Captain Ringering served as a firefighter for more than 18 years, beginning with the East Alton Fire Department before joining the Godfrey Fire Department in 2010. He was promoted to captain in May 2014.

The Godfrey fire chief described him as "gold" and leaving a legacy that will be remembered for a long time. Godfrey's mayor, and my friend, Mike McCormick, said his passing leaves "hard boots to fill."

Captain Ringering is survived by his wife and three young children. Please join me in keeping his family, as well as the Godfrey community, in your thoughts and prayers.

OPPOSING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S
BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's budget proposal, which would increase the Federal deficit from \$779 billion in 2018 to \$1.1 trillion in 2020. If the goal is to rein in deficits and debt, this budget represents epic failure.

I am a public servant who takes seriously the responsibility of spending other people's money. As a freshman Member of the Congress, the current deficit hole we have dug for ourselves wasn't my doing, but I was elected to solve problems, not make them worse.

America's \$22 trillion debt is a bipartisan problem. Democrats and Republicans have acted in a way that suggests that debt doesn't matter. But

Utahns know that if it was their small business with books so badly out of balance, they would soon be out of business.

Our government has been living beyond its means for years, and I believe it is wrong for one generation to forever burden generations yet to come.

As a former mayor who had to balance, in bipartisan fashion, a budget every year, I know these choices aren't easy. But it is our job to roll up our sleeves, come together, and work out a budget that takes serious steps toward reducing the dangerous, unsustainable levels of debt in our country. Those steps are not in the President's budget.

CONGRATULATING FIRST
SERGEANT IAN McCLURE

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate First Sergeant Ian McClure, U.S. Army, for being named the 2018 Allied Command Operations Military Member of the Year.

A 2003 graduate of East High School in Cheyenne, Wyoming, First Sergeant McClure went on to serve in the Army Special Forces in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Mali, and he is now stationed at NATO Special Operations headquarters in Belgium.

First Sergeant McClure was selected for this award because of his superior performance and professional excellence. I am proud that General Scaparrotti recognized First Sergeant McClure's significant contributions to the success of alliance operations.

Sergeant McClure exemplifies the best that Wyoming and our country has to offer, and I thank him for his service and his sacrifices for our freedom.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate First Sergeant Ian McClure on this prestigious honor and for being a brilliant example for the entire State of Wyoming.

MAINLAND REGIONAL HIGH
SCHOOL GIRLS BASKETBALL
STATE CHAMPIONS

(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. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to honor some outstanding members of south Jersey. The Mainland Regional High School Girls Basketball team has recently won the New Jersey Group 3 State championship. This is the first time the Mainland Regional High School girls basketball team has achieved this amazing accomplishment.

These girls are the embodiment of teamwork. This win, and the hard work that they have put in to achieve it, is about all of them, not any one individual. I have been told that some of

them have been best friends since they were 7 years old.

This friendship and teamwork have led them to reach an amazing goal. We could all learn a little bit about teamwork, especially in this great House of ours, and we could learn it from these amazing young ladies.

Congratulations to the Mainland Regional High School girls basketball team. Keep up the good work. We are really proud of you.

REMEMBERING THE EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SYRIAN CONFLICT

(Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in remembrance of the eighth anniversary of the Syrian conflict, which resulted in the tragic loss of many human lives and the destabilization of the entire region.

This is all because of the dictator Bashar Assad, who is unwilling to step aside and heed the Syrian people's call for freedom. After destroying Syria, Assad is now attempting to attract economic investment. But in addition to killing over 400,000 Syrians of the Muslim faith, Assad has also failed to protect the religious minority of Christians in Syria.

Having personally met with the Syrian Christians for Peace, I have heard firsthand how Assad repeatedly targeted Syria's most vulnerable populations.

Few Christians continue to live in Assad's Syria, due to brutality by pro-Assad militias. That is why we must support the Trump administration's isolation of the regime and its allies in Tehran and Moscow. That is why the Senate must follow the House and pass the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act.

SUPPORTING THE EQUALITY ACT

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act.

America must live up to its values, and that means treating everyone as equals and ending discrimination. The Equality Act is about making sure all Americans, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, can participate in our society without fear.

New Mexico is home to diverse religious and traditional communities and has stood up for its LGBTQ population for a long time. We stood up early to ban the cruel practice of conversion therapy.

The Equality Act allows us to adhere to our faiths while prohibiting harmful and isolating acts of discrimination experienced by too many LGBTQ Americans.

Consider this: 38 percent of transgender New Mexicans are unem-

ployed; 40 percent live in poverty; 26 percent have been discriminated against during the hiring or promotion processes; 41 percent have been homeless at some point; and 33 percent have been discriminated against at a place of public accommodation.

No one should have to worry about being discriminated against when planning their wedding or struggle to simply get a cake. The Equality Act will outlaw such discrimination, which is why we should pass it as soon as possible.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MAYOR NANCY SHAVER

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Mayor Nancy Shaver and her tenure of dedicated service to the citizens of St. Augustine, Florida. A strong advocate for the Nation's oldest city, Mayor Shaver recently stepped down from her position with an admirable record of leadership in her community.

Mayor Shaver, who previously served as a teacher and businesswoman, was elected to office in 2014. During her time as mayor, she was a tireless advocate for important issues that are very unique to the city of St. Augustine. It was my honor to work with her in the effort to combat sea level rise to protect our coastal economies and safeguard the priceless historical and cultural features that make St. Augustine so special.

As mayor, she exemplified the virtues of local government by putting citizens, not politics, first and remaining devoted to the northeast Florida community.

I thank Nancy Shaver for her commitment to the city of St. Augustine and our fellow citizens, for whom she so dearly cared. I wish her and her family the best in their future endeavors.

OPPOSITION TO USING FEDERAL FUNDS TO ARM TEACHERS

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

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the idea of using Federal funds to arm teachers. This issue has haunted me from the moment it was first discussed after the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School to more recently when it was revisited after the Parkland shooting.

Seventy-three percent of teachers do not want this. More than 60 percent of parents do not want this. And the majority of students do not want this.

Since 1999, in 225 incidents of school campus gun violence, armed personnel failed to disarm a shooter 223 times.

I came to Congress from the classroom. As a teacher, I would never want

the responsibility of securing a firearm in a school. I understand how this would drastically change the school culture and make it feel more like a prison.

As the wife of a police officer, I understand the training that is involved with the responsibility of owning a firearm, and I know that school districts cannot manage that. I could never imagine explaining to a parent that it was my firearm that accidentally injured their child.

I recognize that many local school communities are still trying to decide where they fall on this conversation, yet I cannot overstate the point that Federal funds should not be diverted from student learning outcomes to arm teachers.

This is why, today, I have introduced a resolution to prohibit the use of Federal funds to arm teachers.

□ 1100

GRAHAM CREEK BRIDGE

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with a strong background in the industry, I understand the vital role freight rail plays in getting Hoosier-made and Hoosier-grown products to the market.

Short line freight rail makes up nearly 30 percent of all freight rail, allowing rural communities like those across Indiana's Sixth District to play an integral role in our economy. One such line is the Madison Railroad, which provides exclusive access to the national rail network for many Hoosiers in southeastern Indiana.

The city of Madison is working to obtain Federal grant funding to replace the 100-year-plus Graham Creek Bridge, critical infrastructure that keeps the Madison Railroad safely operating and serving our community.

Built in the 19th century, the current structure poses an immediate safety risk and cannot accommodate heavy commercial freight loads. Replacement of this bridge will benefit southeast Indiana by removing a potential safety risk and creating jobs and economic opportunity for Hoosiers.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the historic architecture throughout Indiana, and the Graham Creek Bridge has been an iconic landmark that extends over the beautiful Muscatatuck River. I hope my colleagues in this Chamber can join me in supporting this infrastructure project.

RECOGNIZING RAQUEL GUERRERO

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month, I rise

to honor the life and legacy of Raquel Guerrero, a woman who immigrated as a child to Chicago's Pilsen community and who dedicated her life to make it a better place for her family and for all families.

She was instrumental in improving opportunities and demanding more resources and better education for the mostly Latino students in my district.

She understood the value of a good education for children, but it extended beyond books, and advocated for healthy hot meals for students at what is now known as the Pilsen Community Academy, where I had my first years of schooling.

She helped establish Pilsen's annual Fiesta del Sol, the largest community festival in the Midwest.

Raquel was instrumental in securing funds to build the new Benito Juarez Community Academy High School in Pilsen, which has since provided many generations of young people with good public education.

She helped found APO, the Association for Workers Rights, a workers' rights group that still operates in the community.

Raquel's organizing efforts also resulted in the funding of the Rudy Lozano Library in Pilsen.

She was the mother of 11, but treated every child in the community as a part of her family.

Mr. Speaker, we honor her during Women's History Month.

REMEMBERING THE HONORABLE LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that it has been almost a year since we lost our beloved colleague, the Honorable Louise Slaughter.

Louise always believed personal relationships could transcend politics. She set an example for us all through her acts of kindness, particularly with those of us in the other party.

We bonded as members of an exclusive club, a club I wish upon no one: those of us who have lost our spouses. Somehow she made me feel like I was helping her through the loss of her husband when, in fact, she, being much smarter than I, knew that, through my attempts to help her, she was really helping me through the loss of my wife.

It was recently announced that Louise, the first female chair of the House Rules Committee, would be inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame. What a deserving honor.

I will always appreciate my friendship with the Honorable Louise Slaughter and will never forget the efforts she made to take me under her wing from across the political aisle.

FOR THE PEOPLE AGENDA

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind this House of the Democratic For the People agenda, which starts with rebuilding American infrastructure and creating good paying jobs doing so.

It includes expanding healthcare so that it is available to more and more Americans, and bringing down the costs of healthcare and prescription drugs.

It includes cleaning up our American democracy and rooting out corruption in our electoral process.

We achieved the third one this month with H.R. 1, the For the People Act, but the other two took a serious blow this week when we saw the President's budget, which cuts Medicare to the tune of \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years, breaking a core promise of the President's campaign, and also cuts infrastructure spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject that shortsightedness in the President's budget, and let's go ahead and achieve the For the People agenda.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DAVID LEON LOYA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to David Leon Loya. This is a young man who was full of life.

David loved life and enjoyed something that many of us have participated in and that we see more Americans doing across the Nation, and that is bicycling. He was an avid bicyclist and enjoyed the outdoors in Houston, Texas.

He was a young man with a future before him with a loving family.

He was a young man that we want to pay tribute to because we know that he exhibited values of love and generosity, because of the community who came out to express their remorse and their sadness that he lost his life while bicycling.

We understand, in tribute to him, recognizing that as the world changes, more Americans will be riding their bicycle. We want to make sure, in his name, that we have designed bicycle paths, that in the urban areas they cover streets in a lighted way so that vehicles can acknowledge those on bicycles and that they can be protected.

David Leon Loya, we honor him and love him. In his name, Mr. Speaker, we will make these bicycle paths the best and the most safe, and he will not have died in vain.

To his family, my deepest sympathy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter from Mr. Josh Lawson, General Counsel, North Carolina State Board of Elections, indicating that a special election has been ordered for the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

Enclosure.

NORTH CAROLINA,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
March 13, 2019.

Re Notification of Order of new election in Ninth Congressional District of the State of North Carolina.

Hon. CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, c/o Tom Wickham, Parliamentarian.

DEAR MADAM CLERK: The North Carolina State Board of Elections today entered a written Order directing a new election in our State's Ninth Congressional District. The Order, which was separately with your Office, established the following special election calendar, including a primary required by State law:

Primary election: May 14, 2019;
Second primary (if necessary): September 10, 2019;

General election (if no second primary): September 10, 2019; and

General election (if second primary): November 5, 2019.

Our State greatly appreciates all actions that may be authorized by your Office to enable ongoing provision of services to residents within the District.

Sincerely,

JOSH LAWSON,
General Counsel.

EQUALITY FOR THE LGBTQ COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, there are times in Washington that go beyond the mundane, times when you can feel the pull of public sentiment and the weight of history, times that aren't political but become personal. For some of us who serve here and for millions more around the country, this is one of those times.

Yesterday, I was proud to join so many Members of this House to introduce the Equality Act. This bill will ensure full equality under the law for the LGBTQ community, an essential step, given that Americans can still be

fired or discriminated against in nearly 30 States.

We have made marked progress over recent decades, no doubt, but full equality for LGBTQ Americans still lies somewhere over the horizon.

We are not asking for anything more or anything less than any other American enjoys. We are asking to be treated equally, and we are asking for it right now.

I grew up afraid about whether I would be accepted by the world around me and convinced I wouldn't be able to live a full life. This is, unfortunately, a reality today for too many LGBTQ Americans. Too many still live in fear of sharing their truth or telling their stories. Too many contend with injustice because of who they are or whom they love.

There is injustice when more than 4 million workers could face the risk of employment discrimination in this country.

There is injustice when more than 2 million students are left without protections against bullying, harassment, and roadblocks on their path to an education.

There is injustice when nearly 7 million Americans could be subject to discrimination in public accommodations.

There is injustice when 5½ million Americans could be denied equal opportunities to secure housing or credit.

This is heartbreaking. This is not what America stands for, and we can do something about it.

We can take action to support the values and the Constitution of this Nation.

We can take action that will protect the safety and well-being of millions and tell everyone, particularly the LGBTQ youth, that they can reach their full potential.

We can take action and pass the Equality Act.

The Equality Act will end these injustices and establish equality under the law by enshrining sexual orientation and gender identity language into the Civil Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the Jury Selection and Services Act.

We must address this at the Federal level. Equality and human dignity are not concepts that can be left up to the States. Americans who live in Nebraska deserve the same civil rights protections as those living in my home State of New Hampshire. The same goes for those living in Mississippi and in Massachusetts.

The end of discrimination can only begin when we protect our fellow citizens in each and every community across this Nation.

Since Stonewall, millions of LGBTQ Americans have come out and have told their stories. Many have done so at great personal risk, but with a great societal benefit.

Coming out and living openly has done more to change hearts, minds, and laws than anything else. As a re-

sult, we now stand on the cusp of history and of full equality, with the American people and public opinion squarely behind us.

Mr. Speaker, as the people's House considers this bill, I ask my colleagues a simple question: Who deserves to be treated as a second-class citizen just for being who we are? Which Members of this body, which people in your districts, which people in your own lives deserve to be less than equal?

Mr. Speaker, I hope this House gets it right. Full equality under the law—nothing less, nothing more. It is a simple concept; it is a beautiful concept; and it is also an American concept.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the LGBTQ Americans today, for future generations, let's pass H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

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

□ 1115

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as most Members are heading back home, I was reminded in the elevator of someone who said: Well, you know, you guys are getting off this week. I have told friends and some of the media that you guys take vacations all the time.

I explained: You don't want us in session every day. Every day we are in session, we pass something that could be law restraining you in furtherance of your freedoms.

It is a good thing when Members of Congress go home, as most of us do. It is tougher for those on the West Coast, but most of us go home each weekend during recesses or maybe a quick trip to speak here or there just outside of the district. But it is a good thing for Members of Congress to go home and to hear from people back home. That is good. Anyway, sometimes the rigors at home are even more than we face here.

There are at least three things I want to address today. One of them is information that has come out.

I was there for a number of the depositions that were taken behind closed doors of witnesses—formerly from the Justice Department, some still with the Justice Department—regarding what Gregg Jarrett called “The Russia Hoax,” and he documents why that sounds like an appropriate title.

There is an article from FOX News about this by Gregg Re. This quoted Lisa Page. She was an interesting witness. It was interesting watching her testify.

As a former judge who has tried a tremendous number of cases in Federal court, State court, and military court, it is interesting watching people testify. Most you can get a little tell when

they are being dishonest, but it has been amazing to me, especially since I have been in Congress, how many people can look you in the eye and lie. You know they are lying; they know they are lying; and often you can see they don't care. People like that are often able to pass polygraph tests because you have got to have a conscience. You cannot have numbed your conscience to the point that you are not affected by your own lying anymore.

Lisa Page's presentation as she testified was tremendously different from Peter Strzok as he testified behind closed doors. It was amazing to watch that guy. Because of his answers, I knew he was lying. And it appeared to me that there were no tells, that he just didn't seem to be bothered by the fact and that he could sit there and lie under oath. I thought perhaps he would be a great candidate to pass a lie detector test when he is lying.

But then somebody told me, actually, he failed two lie detector tests in the FBI, but somebody like Lisa Page removed those from his file. It is great to have friends to help you out when you do wrong and they can cover for you.

And I am being sarcastic, for friends who cannot figure that out.

But the article points out that former FBI lawyer, Lisa Page, testified: “The FBI was ordered by the Obama DOJ not to consider charging Hillary Clinton for gross negligence in the handling of classified information.”

It goes on and says: “Page's testimony was perhaps the most salient evidence yet that the Justice Department improperly interfered with the FBI's supposedly independent conclusions on Clinton's criminal culpability”—well, stating that that came from JOHN RATCLIFFE, a colleague of ours from Texas, here in Congress. He was questioning her, and he says: “But when you say advice you got from the Department, you're making it sound like it was the Department”—talking about the Department of Justice—“that told you: You're not going to charge gross negligence because we're the prosecutors and we're telling you we're not going to—”

And Lisa Page interrupted and said: “That is correct.”

Lisa Page also testified that “the DOJ and FBI had multiple conversations . . . about charging gross negligence,” and the DOJ decided that the term was “constitutionally vague,” which is really interesting because as a judge, as a lawyer, I tried cases in which gross negligence was alleged. I am not aware of any court case ever indicating that gross negligence was unconstitutionally vague. Maybe there is a case that says that. I am not aware of one.

But if there were to be one from the Supreme Court, then there would be massive criminal and civil judgments that would be due to be undone and be reversed because most lawyers who have done any research, tried any

cases, or done adequate reading know that the term “gross negligence” is not unconstitutionally vague, nor is it negligence.

Now, different States in the Federal Government may have slightly different definitions of negligence and gross negligence, but they are substantially the same. It has just never been a problem with constitutional vagueness from the term “gross negligence.”

Understanding that, it would bring one to the conclusion, if Lisa Page is correct, that the prosecutors in the Obama Justice Department were saying Hillary Clinton was grossly negligent handling classified material but gross negligence is too vague so we are not going to charge her, then it shows one of two things: the Obama DOJ had some of the most ignorant lawyers in the country working there, or the Obama DOJ had some exceedingly dishonest lawyers working there. You choose.

Going back to the article, it says: “In July 2016, then-FBI Director James Comey”—parenthetically, I would insert, another real peach—“publicly announced at a bombshell press conference that Clinton had been ‘extremely careless’ in handling classified information. . . . Federal law states that gross negligence in handling the Nation’s intelligence can be punished criminally with prison time or fines, and there is no requirement that defendants act intentionally. . . . Originally, Comey accused the former Secretary of State of being ‘grossly negligent’—using that term ‘grossly negligent’—‘in handling classified information in a draft dated May 2, 2016, but that was modified to claim that Clinton had merely been ‘extremely careless’ in a draft dated June 10, 2016.”

Comey also said: “Although there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information”—I mean, I am sure the guy from the Navy that snapped a few pictures on a submarine and had absolutely no ill intent whatsoever, though he apparently was acting recklessly and ended up doing prison time, I am sure he would love to know that there was such a high standard applied to Hillary Clinton while he, who put his life on the line, ended up having to do prison time for far less mens rea than, according to Comey, what Hillary Clinton had.

“Then-Obama administration Attorney General Loretta Lynch was spotted meeting secretly with former President Bill Clinton on an airport tarmac as the probe into Hillary Clinton, which Lynch was overseeing, continued.”

And that is pretty amazing: two planes just happen to sit down and get over to where two people can get together. If it weren’t for the reporter who spotted a guy he thought to be Bill Clinton, we would never have known about this.

I wonder how many DOJ officials would have lied about this if no one had spotted it. I mean, they lied

enough about other things, but they got busted being seen out in a remote spot on the tarmac get-together while the DOJ jury was still out on what they were going to do about Hillary Clinton and she had not testified.

And then we find out, actually, they never had her testify. They gave immunity to her lawyer, Cheryl Mills, and all these people who had direct evidence of potential crimes.

And the prosecutors—and I have been one. You don’t give immunity to someone without knowing what they are going to say. If a lawyer comes to you and says, “My client wants immunity,” then you say, “Give us a proffer. What is your client going to say?” Because we are not just handing out immunity and then there is nothing worth giving immunity to get.

Yet the Obama Justice Department handed out immunity like candy to anybody, it appeared, who was associated and had evidence of potential crimes. They could have gotten a subpoena and gotten laptops of the witnesses, but, instead, the Obama Justice Department said: Do you know what? We will give you immunity not knowing what you are going to say because we really don’t want you to say anything.

That is my interpretation, after having read the immunity agreement.

And, look, the evidence you have got, we just want to look, but we promise you we will never use any of it and we will give the stuff back. We just want to look.

That is outrageous. Were these prosecutors that incompetent or were they that dishonest? It is up to individuals to judge for themselves. But to use a term coined by James Comey, no reasonable prosecutor would have done what they did in that case. They sure didn’t do it when they were trying to chase down anything they possibly could regarding our current President, Donald Trump.

It was revealed last month that FBI’s top lawyer in 2016 thought Hillary Clinton and her team should have immediately realized they were mishandling “‘highly classified’ information based on the obviously sensitive nature of the emails’ content sent through her private server. And he believed”—this is the FBI’s top lawyer—“that she”—Hillary Clinton—“should have been prosecuted until ‘pretty late’ in the investigation, according to a transcript of his closed-door testimony before congressional committees last October.”

□ 1130

And, of course, being pretty late in the investigation, actually goes along with what Lisa Page said; that DOJ prosecutors said, we are not charging her.

And then that ties in nicely with the FBI lawyers saying, Okay, I thought she should have been prosecuted. But then it ties in, by the time the DOJ lawyers/prosecutors said “we are not

charging her,” then he decided, Okay, maybe she shouldn’t be.

Among the texts between Lisa Page and Peter Strzok was one concerning the so-called “insurance policy.”

During her interview with the Judiciary Committee, July 2018, Page was questioned at length about the texts, and essentially referred to the Russia investigation, the insurance policy referred to the Russia investigation, while explaining that officials were proceeding with caution, concerned about the implications of the case while not wanting to go at a total breakneck speed and risk burning sources, as they presumed Trump would be elected anyway.

Further, Lisa Page confirmed investigators only had a paucity of evidence at the start.

Comey, last December, similarly acknowledged that when the FBI initiated its counterintelligence probe and possible collusion between Trump campaign officials and the Russian Government in July 2016, investigators, “didn’t know whether we had anything,” and that, “in fact, when I was fired as Director in May 2017, I still didn’t know whether there was anything to it.”

And that was from Comey.

Trey Gowdy had asked, “I want to believe the path you threw out in Andy McCabe’s office, that there is no way he gets elected, but I am afraid we can’t take the risk. It is like an insurance policy in the unlikely event you die before you are 40.” And that was the quote from the text sent from Peter Strzok to Lisa Page in August of 2016.

So clearly, they were talking about coming up with this bogus Russia investigation as an insurance policy just in case Donald Trump got elected, then they could try to take him out of office, basically, a DOJ coup for the first time in the history of this country.

And, unfortunately, there is no George Washington around to stop this attempted coup that continues today.

“So, upon the opening of the cross-fire hurricane investigation”—which was the name that these DOJ officials who have been shown to have acted totally inappropriately; that is the name they gave the investigation into Donald Trump—it goes on to say “we had a number of the discussions up through and including the Director regularly in which we were trying to find an answer to the question, right, which is, is there somebody associated with the Trump campaign who is working with the Russians in order to obtain damaging information about Hillary Clinton? And given that it is August, we were very aware of the speed and sensitivity that we needed to operate under.”

It is really amazing.

You see, the way our justice is supposed to work in the United States, and in every State in the union, if you have probable cause to believe a crime

was committed, then you can go after someone for that crime.

In the case of Donald Trump, his campaign, and those that worked with him, they did just the opposite. They said, Here is Donald Trump, he has got a chance of winning—though we don't think he will—so let's try to find something.

And if you go back and look, you can find an Op Ed written by, I believe, Bruce Ohr. And basically, it was from 2007 talking about Russia collusion. And, of course, Donald Trump was not mentioned at all. And then when they came up with this Russia hoax investigation without any evidence at all, there are indications that somebody—perhaps Brennan—had asked the British to spy on Americans so it wouldn't be Americans spying on Americans, which is not supposed to happen unless there is probable cause to believe they have engaged in a crime or—under the Patriot Act—that they are conspiring with a known foreign terrorist.

That is what we were sold when the Patriot Act was reauthorized.

But as we have come to find out that has been greatly loosened up by the DOJ, CIA, NSA, and they pretty much go after everybody they want to.

I found out—I had not been aware of it until this week—that clear back in 2012, the Obama Justice Department made a motion to the FISA court to allow them to unmask information about American citizens if—under this new incredibly relaxed language—it might be of assistance to someone outside the scope that is supposed to be allowed to see this information, if it might assist them in assessing other information.

Well, it doesn't get much more vague than that. And I know from having been on the Judiciary Committee for years, that until the Obama Administration, I had a lot of colleagues on the other side of the aisle that were extremely concerned with privacy issues and the government gathering evidence without probable cause and the government violating the Fourth and Fifth Amendments.

Somehow during those years, I lost my colleagues on the other side that quit being as concerned about privacy invasions and Fourth and Fifth Amendment violations, but I am not aware of anybody on our Judiciary Committee that knew about this motion to just blow the door wide open. And, I think, against the wording of the law, they came up with a motion and got a judge to sign off, apparently, to say, Okay, yes, you can unmask and spread information to anybody outside the originally indicated circle, if it might help them assess other information.

For Heaven's sake, that is an outrage. I couldn't believe it when I was reading that motion.

And what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, it is not classified. It was ordered declassified back years ago. But I haven't met anybody here in Congress that was aware that in 2012, back at that time,

the Obama DOJ was going to blow the door open and start spreading information that people should never have had it, making sure they got it.

And perhaps, that explains to some extent how somebody like Samantha Power could have, I think it was hundreds of American citizens' information unmasked. I mean, basically, they were running our intelligence agency as a political operation to go after anyone that they felt like might be a potential problem for a Democratic administration.

Very, very alarming.

This article from Town Hall is really talking about the bill H.R. 1.

I love the idea of making information more public. It was called For the People legislation. This article says that is really for the government. I would submit it is really more for Democratic politicians. The things in there that would degrade our election process are phenomenal.

We really ought to be going back to paper ballots; that would be the appropriate thing to do, and put proper safeguards on those ballots. I think it would be a good thing to do.

I also like RON KIND's bill—he has been filing ever since he has been here—that would require each person seeking Federal elected office to disclose the identity of anyone who donates anything. You have got a \$200 floor. And I like what RON KIND, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, his bill he has been pushing for years, you know, whether you are a Republican or Democrat, we want to eliminate this having people donate without knowing who is donating.

It leaves open the possibility—and surely, it has happened—that somebody with a lot of money could give \$50, \$50, \$150, over and over and over.

And since you don't have to report it, who it came from, they could be violating—and criminally violating—our election laws.

So I hope that we will have some cleanup of election laws, but not the kind of thing that allows you to go out and harvest votes that didn't happen until after the election.

We have an election day in this country. And to leave that election open so that you could have a Lyndon Johnson style of finding votes after the fact—whether they voted in alphabetical order or not—is just not a good idea. It leaves an opening for stealing elections.

We have an election day, and there ought to be a cutoff; no ballots accepted after this day, at this time. And don't come bringing in a bunch of ballots the next day after you find out how many ballots it is going to take to overturn the election that finished the day before.

I mean, it is third world-type activity with this election. If we heard that a dictator somewhere had put into place some of the things in H.R. 1, we would be outraged and say that is what a dictator does, and it is not right. You

are trying to manipulate the election, and it is totally inappropriate.

Another topic that is, I think, very important, we took up in Judiciary Committee a bill called the Violence Against Women Act; it hadn't been reauthorized in a while. And there has been inequality in the treatment of women compared to men in a number of ways that needed to be addressed. And the Violence Against Women Act addresses some of those.

But now this bill goes too far and does damage to so many of the equality gains by women over the decades. And one of the problems created in the new Violence Against Women Act involves what most people call transgender, but the Diagnostics and Statistical Manual, Fifth Edition—which in many ways the DSM-4, DSM-5—they begin to incorporate a great deal of politics in some areas as much as they incorporated medicine.

□ 1145

The definition or the term given in DSM-5 for what is commonly called transgender is someone who suffers from gender dysphoria. That is a bit of a reclassification from where DSM-III and DSM-IV were.

The definition they give for gender dysphoria is “distress that accompanies the incongruence between one's experienced and expressed gender and one's assigned or natal gender.”

Then it also defines dysphoria as a condition in which a person experiences intense feelings of depression, discontent, and, in some cases, indifference to the world around them.

Some have said, well, dysphoria is the opposite of euphoria, so it is someone who has difficulty dealing with the gender with which they were born. That is someone unhappy with, confused about, displeased with, or depressed about the gender which they have.

We have made so much progress over the years. I saw it as a felony judge. So often in cases involving domestic abuse, involving sexual assault, the women have not been treated fairly, and they have been demonized. Their victimization has not been properly considered.

Over the years, we have gotten better and our justice system has gotten better. It certainly has in Texas.

Some people, including my old friend, former Congressman Ted Poe, another former felony judge from Houston, saw the way women were not always treated properly as victims of sexual assault.

Most D.A.'s offices were required to have victim's assistance that could help, advise, counsel, and comfort victims of sexual assault. But this Violence Against Women Act that was passed by the committee with many of the Republicans voting “no”—maybe all of us; I am not sure—it sets women's rights back significantly.

I am pointing this out with a heart that has broken for women who I have

seen so abused. Sometimes it was even harder on the women because they would end up blaming themselves. There were many times when I would call either a woman victim or a child victim up because I could tell they had that mentality that “I probably deserved what I got.”

After the trial was over, I would tell them: You need to understand, this is not your fault. You didn’t deserve this. This was a crime committed against you. You had nothing to do with this. It was nothing that you should have done. It was a crime being committed against you, and you were not properly protected. For that, I am sorry.

Again, this Violence Against Women Act does not take into account what has come to be known. As we have tried to be more sensitive and caring, and appropriately so, for female victims of domestic abuse, sexual assault, and aggravated sexual assault, the crimes against women can be, obviously, committed against men and have been. But most often, it is against women and, therefore, deserves special consideration.

If you go to health.com, this site has information talking about female victims of sexual assault. Most people are familiar with post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, for soldiers. But this points out: “In some ways, the trauma from sexual assault may be worse than the trauma from combat because, normally, soldiers are prepared and trained for combat.” It points out that PTSD affects about 3.5 percent of U.S. adults, but women are twice as likely as men to have PTSD.

For those who are not aware, there is a difference between men and women, and these kinds of statistics bear that out.

Another article from Lindsay Burgess in March of 2018 says: “For survivors of sexual assault, the odds of developing post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, are high: Up to 94 percent,” and it is talking about women who experience or are victims of assault, “experience symptoms during the first 2 weeks after the incident, and up to 50 percent may struggle long term. For these survivors, day-to-day events . . . can hit especially hard. And like any mental health issue, PTSD can be debilitating.”

It also goes on to point out: “PTSD is commonly associated with combat veterans, but around 50 percent of PTSD cases in the U.S. develop in the aftermath of sexual or physical violence. Despite the high number, it is important to recognize that some sexual assault survivors feel ‘okay’ afterward, and that is equally valid.

“‘Being sexually assaulted or abused is such an invasion of our body, personal space, and safety,’ says Kande Lewis, executive director of The Positive Results Corporation. ‘People often can’t move past that point.’

“Psychotherapist Akiami McCoy, LCSW, LCSW-C, explains that PTSD is more common among survivors who

felt that their lives were in danger during the assault. ‘The brain does not perform well for a victim during a sexual assault,’ says McCoy. She explains that this is because the ‘fight or flight’ response kicks in. ‘Unfortunately, most victims are overpowered, and they can do neither. They may instead disassociate themselves from the act, and that is where the mind escapes the body until the assault is over.’

“Because dissociation is common among sexual assault survivors, during and after the event, a 2015 study looked into and found strong links between dissociation and PTSD.”

It goes on to say that most people who have lived through major trauma don’t develop PTSD. Unfortunately, survivors of sexual assault and rape have particularly high chances of experiencing symptoms of the disorder.

In fact, the overwhelming majority of rape victims experience at least some PTSD symptoms within just 2 weeks. Almost a third of all women continued to experience their symptoms 9 months after being raped. Overall, more than two-thirds of all victims of sexual assault and rape develop stress reactions that qualify as moderate or severe.

In a study published in 2005 in the journal “Behaviour Research and Therapy,” a team of British researchers explored the connection between unwanted memories in survivors of sexual assault and the severity of PTSD symptoms. The researchers found that assault survivors who are easily and frequently triggered by visual reminders of their trauma can experience a sharp increase in their symptom’s intensity.

Then this goes—I guess it is commonly reported—that one out of four women will be victims of sexual assault. When you consider, if that is accurate, those kinds of numbers, that you have that many women who have been sexually assaulted, and they go into a public restroom that is for women, in a confined space, having a biological man come walking in because he indicates he feels like a woman that day, it can trigger those experiences of sexual assault all over again.

Why would we do that? Women have made so much progress toward equality. And I understand the hearts of my Democratic friends who wanted to allow transgenders to go in any restroom they feel like they should go into. I understand they want to help people who are often victims of abuse themselves. I get the desire to help them, but why traumatize women when it is unnecessary?

We had people in the community say, well, there is no indication anybody has ever been bothered by having a biological man come into a women’s restroom or private facilities for women. I am sure they were being sincere. They were not familiar, but they abound.

That is why there is a lawsuit in Fresno, California. This is a homeless

shelter. Who goes to homeless shelters? Often, very often—and I have been there; I have talked to them—it is women who have been sexually abused. Often, it is domestic abuse by a partner or a spouse or a husband. They have nowhere else to go. They are afraid if they go to a friend’s home, that husband will find them. They do have to be careful.

Right in Marshall, Texas, the inspiration for Kari’s Law that we passed in the last Congress, she was afraid of her husband. He was abusive, but she was supposed to let him see the kids. He took them to a hotel room, and he pulled her into the bathroom and beat her with his fist for many minutes. Eventually, he took a knife and began stabbing her over 20 times, ultimately killing her, while her young daughter was trying to dial 911, not knowing she had to dial a prefix.

It was one event out of far too many events where a victim of domestic abuse, just trying to hang on and not be abused further, they go to a homeless shelter, having been abused, beaten, many times raped, and they think, at a homeless shelter, they would be protected against triggers that would make them relive the trauma of their aggravated rape.

□ 1200

When you talk to people who work in those facilities, they work there because they care deeply about women who have been harmed. They have immense hearts caring deeply. That is why they are there. Yet this law will end up forcing these women to be cohabitating with biological men.

Whether they are honest about feeling like a woman or not, why should we pass laws that force women victims of sexual assault to be further traumatized?

That is not appropriate for a government role.

In this case from the “Toronto Sun,” a predator—who claimed to be transgender—because of his sexual crimes had been declared to be a dangerous sexual offender. Let’s face it, like this guy in Toronto, Canada, since you don’t have to have any overt proof, Mr. Speaker, no patent proof that you feel like a woman, you can just say it, and people under the new Violence Against Women Act have to recognize it, then this will not be an isolated incident.

I have seen it, I have prosecuted it, and I have sentenced it. These predators look for any way they can to get a woman in a defensive position—a woman or a child—someone whom they can render helpless. If they will drill holes through walls so they can spy, do you think they wouldn’t go to the trouble of walking in?

Because if you drill a hole and spy, Mr. Speaker, you can be arrested for being a Peeping Tom. But if you, under the new proposed laws, simply say: “I feel like a woman today,” then you can go in and be a voyeur all you want to,

and it opens the door to sexual deviants that should not have a door available to them.

There is another here from “The Courier” in the U.K. The mom of a super-market sexual assault victim warns that her attacker will strike again.

Regarding the lawsuit from the Eastern District of California about the man who claimed to be transgender, why would we pass a law that would undo the great appropriate advances that have occurred for women’s rights toward equality and toward not being victimized?

I know the intention is to try to help people who have gender dysphoria, gender confusion, from being victims so they can walk into any restroom they want to, but it is a mistake that will do far more damage to women, and it is just tragic to have that kind of law included in the Violence Against Women Act.

It was mentioned by a friend across the aisle—and I know his motivation. He has a big heart and he cares about people who are victims, and that includes people who have gender dysphoria—but he was bragging about—apparently according to what he said—that equality law was being passed yesterday that will open the door to equality for transgender across sports and education and across the board.

We are already seeing something that is just incredible. Martina Navratilova is probably one of the top five women tennis players of all time and has been an icon for so many tennis players, especially for liberal tennis players, liberal women, because she has fought so for gay rights. Yet she is now being attacked because she dared to say that she didn’t think that someone who is a biological man with biological advantages over a biological woman, in most cases, should be able to compete in women’s tennis.

How is that something to beat her up for verbally?

How is that something to abuse her for?

What will happen to the great progress of equality for women if that bill becomes law will be it will eliminate women’s sports. You may occasionally have a woman who desires to compete as a man who is extraordinary and can win some things. The doctors talk about the potential for greater muscle mass, they are built differently, can do better in some sports than women can, as a general rule. And, yes, I know there are women that could kick the rear of many men, including me, I know, I get that. But we are talking about competition at the highest levels, and it is grossly unfair to allow a biological man to compete in women’s sports. No matter how gender dysphorically confused the person is, it is unfair to the great progress of women’s equality.

What that bill will do if it becomes the law is it will bring an end to women’s sports. You will be left with mainly men’s sports and co-ed sports—co-ed

sports consisting of the women and the men who say they are women, and it will end the equality, the fairness that has come to be known in Title IX and through women’s sports and women’s professional sports, that they will become co-ed sports. It is tremendously unfair to women.

Now, the final thing I want to bring up is the resolution we took up in here regarding hate last week. The reason that all came about were specific comments by a Member of the House that most everyone here, not all, but most believe were anti-Semitic. For those in Congress who don’t understand, anti-Semitic comments are not criticism of one person for something they have said or done. That is not anti-Semitic, even if that person happens to be Jewish. It is not. So when I criticized George Soros for damage I believe he has done to my country by the things that he has contributed to, by the damage he has done to countries yearning to be free in Europe as he has pushed them toward socialism—why would a billionaire push people toward socialism?

Because socialism means everybody is treated equally.

It is because he knows that in a Socialist country after you eliminate the middle class, what you are left with, Mr. Speaker, is a very thin veneer of a ruling class and everybody else who is ruled over by the ruling class. That is where socialism goes. Some billionaires think, oh, they will be there in that tiny, little, ruling class, not understanding that historically if you go to full-bore socialism or communism, you are going to end up killing off the billionaires and taking their money. So it is an amazing thing to see that.

I am also aware that even Israel’s defense ministry has pointed out the damage that George Soros has done to Israel. Because I have criticized George Soros, people say: Oh, you are anti-Semitic.

It is not anti-Semitic to criticize somebody for things they have done, things they are paying for, or things they are contributing to just because they happen to be Jewish. What makes it anti-Semitic is when you slander or libel an entire race or group of people and smear them as all having the same characteristics and belittle them as a group.

So there was a resolution that was supposed to address specific anti-Semitic remarks by a Member of Congress, and then we hear, well, there were protests because they didn’t want her condemned for anti-Semitic remarks. So it got watered down.

I printed out the copy of the resolution as it was at 3 o’clock that afternoon. I came over here ready to speak against that resolution because it had been so watered down, and I was told: well, actually, that one got pulled and they watered it down even further, and here is the new one, as of about 3:20 that afternoon.

It kept being watered down until it basically said that we are against all

kinds of hate. Of course, they didn’t mention the kind of political hate that would cause a Democrat—and if it had been a Republican who supported Donald Trump, that would have been what everybody talked about, oh, gosh, this is what Trump inspires, but since it was a Bernie Sanders supporter, I don’t know of any Republican, including me, who has blamed BERNIE SANDERS for the criminal who shot STEVE SCALISE and tried to kill my baseball friends and colleagues. He wanted to kill them all, but that wasn’t singled out.

In fact, when we were taking testimony on gun crime in Judiciary, the majority would not even allow STEVE SCALISE to testify. Oh, well, if he comes in and testifies, it might open the door to all kinds of other Members of Congress.

Well, why don’t you just say that we will restrict the testimony from Members of Congress to those who have been shot by somebody who hates them and their party?

How about that?

But STEVE was not even allowed to come testify before our committee. That kind of thing was not mentioned in what was, basically, we are against all kinds of hate, except for that, and we are also not going to call out the hate that causes the hate hoaxes which there seem to be a rash of people saying they are the victim of some hate when actually it is their hate that created a hoax.

But I have made loud and clear repetitiously, the reason I and 22 others voted against that resolution was because it did not do what it should have done, and that is, call out specific anti-Semitic comments.

Now, some were bothered that I said that there is no moral equivalence between the Holocaust and say the years of slavery, the slavery that is continuing today. I was shocked to find out this year that there are 40 million slaves in the world today, more than any time in history. We ought to do all we can to stop it. It is horrendous. It did so much damage to the core of this country for far too long. But there is a special hatred that the Jewish people have experienced that we need to stop when it starts. For those morons who didn’t know, I voted against the first anti-hate resolution.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 18, 2019, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

376. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AE97) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

377. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Limited Exception for a Capped Amount of Reciprocal Deposits From Treatment as Brokered Deposits (RIN: 3064-AE89) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

378. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Depository Institution Management Interlocks Act (RIN: 3064-AE92) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

379. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ongoing Data Collection of Centrally Cleared Transactions in the U.S. Repurchase Agreement Market (RIN: 1505-AC58) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

380. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hiring Flexibility Under Professional Standards [FNS-2017-0039] (RIN: 0584-AE60) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

381. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — SPR Standard Sales Provisions (RIN: 1901-AB29) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

382. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Selenomethionine Hydroxy Analogue [Docket No.: FDA-2015-F-2712] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

383. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA: Emission Reduction Credits [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0226; FRL-9990-74-Region 4] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

384. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes [EPA-R01-OAR-2018-0790; FRL-9990-94-Region 1] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

385. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's

final rule — Air Quality Designation for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard; Arkansas; Redesignation of the Independence County Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0624; FRL-9990-00-Region 6] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

386. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendment to Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds from Consumer Products [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0153; FRL-9990-86-Region 3] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

387. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Serious Area Plan for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0490; FRL-9990-89-Region 9] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

388. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; San Joaquin Valley, California; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0535; FRL-9990-90-Region 9] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

389. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCA-2017-0324; FRL-9990-04-Region 6] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

390. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls [CG Docket No.: 17-59] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

391. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Misuse of Internal Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service [CG Docket No.: 13-24]; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

392. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Legal and Policy, Auctions Division, Office of Economics and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; Universal Service Reform — Mobility Fund [WT Docket No.: 10-208] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

393. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of Amended Section 203(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Power Act [Docket No.: RM19-4-000; Order No.: 855] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

394. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-563, "Short-Term Rental Regulation Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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 Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. REED, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. MILLER):

H.R. 1753. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. BARR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELAURO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GABBARD, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COOK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 1754. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 1755. A bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and 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 Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. SHALALA):

H.R. 1756. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer reports and consumer information in making any determination involving auto

insurance with respect to a consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois):

H.R. 1757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the amount individuals can deduct for certain State and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1758. A bill to provide for the retroactive application of the mandatory increase in insurance coverage under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance for members of the Armed Forces deployed to combat theaters of operation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MURPHY (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to extend reemployment services and eligibility assessments to all claimants for unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1760. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the availability of HA-LEU for domestic commercial use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1761. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of State firearm ownership databases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LONG, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 1762. A bill to provide high-skilled visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1763. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1764. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to permitting terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama,

Ms. ADAMS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicare program for FDA-approved qualifying colorectal cancer screening blood-based tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 1766. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFALZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERSON, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1767. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1768. A bill to reauthorize subtitle G of title VII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, relating to diesel emissions reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KIND, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. REED, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LONG, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. DELGADO):

H.R. 1769. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCAUL (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain amounts realized on the disposition of property raised or produced by a student agriculturist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. BASS, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 1771. A bill to require consultations on reuniting Korean Americans with family

members in North Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1772. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to penalize false communications to cause an emergency response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 1773. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition and other material to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 1774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 1775. A bill to establish a task force on NOTAM improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1776. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CRIST, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. PAL-LONE, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1777. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide equal treatment of LGBT older individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1778. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a special rule for the period of admission of H-2A non-immigrants employed as dairy workers and sheepherders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1779. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to authorize a person

awarded the Medal of Honor to designate an individual to receive the special pension after death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1780. A bill to establish the Commission to study the potential creation of a National Museum of Irish American History, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1781. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission with access to certain drug payment information, including certain rebate information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1782. A bill to establish and strengthen projects that defray the cost of related instruction associated with pre-apprenticeship and qualified apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1783. A bill to provide for increased scrutiny with respect to pesticide residues of glyphosate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. HECK, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. OMAR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILD, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Il-

linois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SOTO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BERA, Mr. GALLEGU, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KILMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MENG, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1784. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1785. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in timber harvesting entities or mechanized timber harvesting entities from child labor laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 1786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the cover over of distilled spirits taxes to Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands and to transfer a portion of such cover over to the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. FRANKEL, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1787. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to impose certain additional requirements on applicants for COPS grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HILL of California (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COX of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the penalty for late enrollment under part B of the Medicare Program to 15 percent and twice the period of no enrollment, and to exclude periods of COBRA, retiree, and VA coverage from such

late enrollment penalty; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1789. A bill to eliminate the discount for UHF television stations for purposes of the limitation on the aggregate national audience reach of television broadcast stations in which a party may have a cognizable interest; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 1790. A bill to require any amounts remaining in Members' Representational Allowances at the end of a fiscal year to be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt survivor benefit annuity plan payments from the individual alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HILL of California, Mrs. LURIA, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to address health, safety, and environmental hazards at private military housing units, to prohibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 1795. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish directed energy capabilities that address threats to the United States, deployed forces of the United States, or Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 1796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualifying advanced coal project credit, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1797. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to remove the authority of the National Capital Planning Commission with respect to property owned by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest and to exclude from gross income discharges of income contingent or income-based student loan indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COLE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1799. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 1800. A bill to modify the minimum allocation requirement for the emergency solutions grants program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1801. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy to recruit and retain mental health providers, to direct the Secretaries of the military departments to develop medication monitoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1802. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive the requirement of certain veterans to make copayments for hospital care and medical services in the case of an error by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1803. A bill to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit qualified amateur sports organizations from prohibiting or substantially restricting the use of an athlete's name, image, or likeness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. COLE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 1805. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemora-

tion of the centennial of the establishment of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1806. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and fossilized ivory products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1807. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 51. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDA:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution recognizing the necessity of preserving official and unofficial records of meetings between the President of the United States and foreign leaders, for the purposes of promoting transparency and the national security of the United States of America; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 229. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of August as National Destroyer Recognition Month; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COOK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H. Res. 230. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Res. 231. A resolution keeping guns out of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H. Res. 232. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 14, 2019, as "National Pi Day"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H. Res. 233. A resolution condemning the Government of the Philippines for its continued detention of Senator Leila De Lima,

calling for her immediate release, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. POSTER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREs, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRUJALVA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 234. A resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 235. A resolution recognizing Women's History Month and the historic contributions of women to the American labor movement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H. Res. 236. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that welfare programs discourage marriage and hurt the institution of the family in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRUJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BARR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 237. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 21, 2019, as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 238. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H. Res. 239. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to remove the motion to recommit; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEADOWS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 240. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 30, 2019, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H. Res. 241. A resolution condemning the anti-Semitic comments of Representative Ilhan Omar from Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to

the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Ethics, 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

6. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 85, urging Congress to enact the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 163, urging the United States Congress to pass legislation to automatically enroll veterans for benefits they are entitled to in the United States Department of Veterans Affairs system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relative to House Resolution No. 122, commending and supporting the President of the United States and his decision to secure our borders by declaring a national emergency, and commending and thanking the men and women of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 1808) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 1753.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1754.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 1755.

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

Art. 1 § 8

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 1756.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1757.

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

Constitution of the United States, Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1758.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. MURPHY:

H.R. 1759.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress the power to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 1760.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1761.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof" and the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which states that the "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1762.

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 Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 1763.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution [Page H3003]

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1764.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1765.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1766.

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

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1767.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1768.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1769.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 1770.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 1771.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution [Page H1 0170]

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1772.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1773.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1774.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of, and the Sixteenth Amendment to, the United States Constitution. [Page H4186]

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 1775.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to the regulation of Commerce with foreign Nation, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes).

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1776.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 1777.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 1778.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1779.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 1780.

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

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

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1781.

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

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

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1782.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1783.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1784.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 1785.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Miss GONZALEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 1786.

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

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Moreover, the Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 1787.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. HILL of California:

H.R. 1788.

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

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

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1789.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1790.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1791.

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

As described in Article 1, Section 1: “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 1792.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1793.

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. LEWIS:

H.R. 1794.

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. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1795.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1796.

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

Article 1 Section 8

Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1797.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1798.

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

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1799.

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

Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2, Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any State on account of race, color, or perilous condition of servitude.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 1800.

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

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1801.

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

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1802.

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

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1803.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate commerce with Indian Tribes).

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 1804.

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. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1805.

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

Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.”

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1806.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

“The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states, and with the Indian Tribes”

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1807.

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. KING of New York:

H.R. 1808.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.J. Res. 51.

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

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both Houses deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 95: Mrs. AXNE and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 101: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 273: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 302: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 303: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 307: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 444: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 445: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 500: Mrs. MILLER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. COOK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 597: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 613: Ms. SLOTKIN.

- H.R. 641: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 647: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 656: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 662: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 677: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 689: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 692: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 693: Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 712: Ms. HILL of California and Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 730: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 741: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 754: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 759: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 794: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 816: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 838: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 873: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. CISNEROS.
 H.R. 906: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 948: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 949: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 959: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CONNOLLY, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. WILD, and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 960: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CONNOLLY, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. WILD, and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 978: Mr. HORSFORD and Ms. WILD.
 H.R. 1002: Ms. SHALALA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 1004: Mr. MEEKS and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1044: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
 H.R. 1066: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 1073: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 1081: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 1104: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1117: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1185: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. STEPANIK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BARR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HECK, and Mr. SIREN.
 H.R. 1226: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 1232: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1237: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 1254: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 1255: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 1256: Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 1285: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1298: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CROW, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1306: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
 H.R. 1310: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 1325: Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 1328: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 1348: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 1354: Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 1379: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1380: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 1397: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 1423: Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 1434: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. SPANO.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 1454: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 1473: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 1504: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 1545: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1553: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 1573: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 1581: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 1595: Ms. MENG, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. DEAN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 1615: Mr. KIM, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. GOLDEN.
 H.R. 1616: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 1622: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 1630: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1641: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SHERILL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1644: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1673: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1690: Mr. NADLER, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mrs. DEMINGS.
 H.R. 1730: Mr. LATTI and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 1739: Mr. BUCK.
 H.R. 1748: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. KIND.
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. COSTA.
 H. Res. 23: Ms. HILL of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H. Res. 54: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GOLDEN, and Mr. NEGUSE.
 H. Res. 92: Mr. WALTZ.
 H. Res. 107: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. LATTI, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. NORMAN.
 H. Res. 114: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H. Res. 124: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BERA, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BASS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VELA, and Mr. ROUDA.
 H. Res. 141: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 173: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

- H.R. 1004: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019

No. 46

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, we praise You for the greatness of Your faithfulness. Faithfully guide our lawmakers along the path that leads away from pride, providing them with the humility that comes with wisdom. Lord, help them to remember that in the multitude of counselors, there is safety. May this knowledge prompt them to be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger. Open their hearts to Your love, their minds to Your truth, and their desires to Your guidance. Replenish them daily with Your grace and power.

We pray in Your sovereign 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1 AND H.R. 1617

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 1617) to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, later today, the Senate will vote on a resolution related to the state of emergency the President has declared on our southern border. Let me first say, I support the President's decision. So I will vote today to uphold it and reject this resolution of disapproval.

I want to begin where this whole discussion should begin—beyond all the partisan rhetoric and denials of reality we see from our friends across the aisle, just the facts of the matter, and the facts are not at all ambiguous. There is a clear border security and humanitarian crisis on the southern border of the United States of America.

It was only last week that the President's top officials in the matter—Secretary Nielsen and CBP Commissioner McAleenan—each came before Congress to once again lay all this out.

The man charged with protecting our Nation's borders didn't mince words ahead of last week's hearing. This is what he had to say: "The system is well beyond capacity, and remains at the breaking point."

The system is well beyond capacity and remains at the breaking point. The Commissioner pointed out to our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee

that the 76,000 attempted illegal crossings documented in February marked an 11-year high for that month, and, based on CBP projections, by the middle of this month—tomorrow—apprehensions for fiscal year 2019 will already be twice what they were in all of fiscal year 2017.

In front of the House Homeland Security Committee, the Secretary of Homeland Security elaborated by saying the following: "Our capacity is already severely strained, but these increases will overwhelm the system completely."

This is one of the President's senior advisers—a Cabinet Secretary—and she is telling Members of Congress that the current situation is very much a crisis, one that requires immediate action.

Over the past 5 years, CBP has recorded a 620-percent increase in apprehensions of family units at the U.S.-Mexico border. Last year's figure marked an alltime high.

Research suggests upward of 30 percent of women apprehended at the border report experiencing sexual assault during the journeys. Lately, a daily average of 56 individuals taken into CBP custody have required emergency medical care.

The men and women of the Border Patrol are great. They are well trained, they are highly skilled, and they volunteered for a very challenging job, but today they are facing challenges they are not fully equipped to overcome.

It is no secret I take the Senate as an institution extremely seriously. I take the separation of powers extremely seriously. I take Congress's prerogative over appropriations extremely seriously, but—as I argued yesterday in the context of the Yemen resolution—the Senate should not be in the business of misusing specific resolutions to express opinions on more general matters.

President Trump has not invoked some vague article II authority or simply swept aside existing law, as President Obama did to establish his DACA

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1855

policy. He has simply operated within existing law—the National Emergencies Act of 1976—to invoke a narrow set of authorities to reprogram a narrow set of funds.

If Congress has grown uneasy with this new law, as many have, then we should amend it. If the 116th Congress regrets the degree of flexibility the 94th Congress gave the Executive, the 116th Congress has the ability to do something about it. I have suggested to the chair of the Homeland Security Committee that they examine how the law can be updated to reflect these concerns. I hope they can report bipartisan solutions through the regular order that the full Senate can actually take up.

Let's not lose sight of the particular question that is before us later today, whether the facts tell us there is truly a humanitarian and security crisis on our southern border and whether the Senate, for some reason, feels this particular emergency on our own border does not rise to the level of the 31 other national emergencies which are currently in effect.

In my own view, these narrow questions are not especially difficult ones to answer. The President is operating within existing law, and the crisis on our border is all too real. So I will vote to support the President's decision later today, and I encourage our colleagues to do the same.

TRIBUTE TO "STEW"

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a completely different matter, few of us can aspire to the fame and fortune that are signified when a celebrity is known by just one name.

There is Cher; there was Prince; there is Madonna; and there is "Stew." Everybody knows Stew—not Don Stewart, certainly not Don, just Stew.

For more than 12 years, Stew has been the larger-than-life personality patrolling the Ohio Clock corridor, camping out in the Press Gallery, and prowling the hallways of the Capitol complex—the guy who knows everything about policy, procedure, and communications with the office just off the Senate floor.

Stew is one of the best known staff members in all of Congress. It has been my great fortune to lean heavily on him every single day for more than a decade as my communications director and deputy chief of staff.

So, you can imagine, it is proving difficult to grasp that today is the very last workday I will have Stew by my side. After serving so well for so long, he is taking a leave—shall we say—for greener pastures.

So, this morning, I am exacting a little revenge. I am doing the one thing I suspect will make my deputy chief of staff's stomach churn more than anything else. I am actually turning the spotlight on him.

Now, the complete "Legend of Stew" is somewhat of a winding tale. This

scrappy son of Riverside, CA, did not stroll a typical path to the corridors of power.

What came after high school was work, including what I understand was a spell as a bouncer. I am certain that position offered no useful preparation at all for wrangling our distinguished friends in the press corps. Then came Army service, then back to school in Georgia, and then politics.

Our late colleague Senator Coverdell hired Stew to represent him with his constituents down in Georgia. Not long after, he asked him to relocate to Washington.

The way I understand it, the ink was barely dry on Stew's lease, and the unpacking had just started when his boss tragically passed away, but Stew landed on his feet. He found his way to a pair of tough Texans, handling press for Senator Phil Gramm and then Senator CORNYN. He became famous as the communications director who could outsmart everybody and outwork everybody in a town where it is very hard to do either.

That is where Stew caught my eye. As I prepared, in 2006, for the possibility of becoming Republican leader, I knew we would need the most sophisticated communications shop a Senate leader had ever constructed, and it was clear Stew was the guy to build it.

Something else quickly became clear too. Stew was not quite like anybody else any of us had ever met before. One former colleague recalls that Stew would end a phone call with a plan already formed in his mind, then push off his desk with both hands, sending his rolling chair rocketing backward and slamming into the wall behind him. That high-octane crash was the official notification that Stew was about to make something happen. "It was really endearing," this colleague explained, "in retrospect."

Restless energy has always been Stew's calling card. Every news story, every request from reporters, every shift in public sentiment, Stew was literally on top of it all. Seven days a week, almost literally 24 hours a day.

I was recently reminded that, in Stew's early days with me, some around the Capitol questioned whether he was an actual person or some kind of automated email system our office had built to blast out memos and bulletins literally around the clock.

The instant mobile devices started to provide email alerts, Stew's bat-like sleeping habits and inexhaustible work ethic probably rendered half the alarm clocks in Washington completely obsolete.

Questions, answers, press clippings, battle plans, they would pour into inboxes until after midnight, pause for a couple of hours, and resume before anyone else had even woken up, but circadian rhythms weren't the only thing Stew's presence reprogrammed. His energy, his careful foresight, his patriotism, all these things were just as infectious.

As our chief spokesman, key strategist, close adviser, team leader, morale-builder, resident dog lover, heavy metal music aficionado, and happy warrior, Stew helped me in my office through the Iraq war, the financial crisis, seismic policy battles, nomination debates, three different Presidents, and two reelection campaigns.

No matter what the day brought, I always knew what my deputy chief of staff would bring—razor-sharp instincts, a level head, a steady hand, and a boatload of integrity. For more than 12 years, I entrusted Stew with my words, my goals, and my reputation, and he has never let me down. He never flagged. He never slowed. Our watchdog never lost a step. He is totally trustworthy, completely reliable, and unbelievably competent—the greatest luxury a leader could have.

With these characteristics, you might think the person I am describing could be a little stiff, a little stern. Maybe that energy would occasionally boil over into harsh words or heated moments. But, remember, Stew is a bit of an unusual guy. That intensity doesn't overflow into frustration or unkindness or sharp words; instead, it overflows into generosity, good-heartedness, and compassion.

Stew is famous around Washington for his encyclopedic memory of birthdays, kids' birthdays, and anniversaries. Like clockwork, notes and greeting cards arrive, and texts and emails roll in. What I am saying is that work challenges aren't the only thing Stew is good at keeping in perspective. I was reminded of that fact a few months back when Stew brought his mother, Nancy, to visit here in the Senate. For all the history Stew has helped make, for every victory when he has allowed himself a brief smile, his colleagues aren't sure they have ever seen him happier than when he was ushering his mom around the corridors and showing her all he has built.

For all Stew's own accomplishments, we aren't sure we have ever seen him prouder than when he brags on his daughter Kylie. Lately, that has meant her career in software engineering and the apps she has created. Stew loves his family. He is loyal to his family. It is just our good luck that he came to see the Senate as part of that family as well.

My former chief of staff reminded me of the day he brought his boys to work. Stew loves kids, so he made a beeline, but one son felt a little shy. Instead of shrugging and walking away, it somehow occurred to Stew to say this: "Did you know I could do a standing jump right onto that table right there?" One more time for good measure—he is kind of a unique individual. The boy was understandably perplexed, but then this friendly stranger crouched down and leapt right up onto the table, with tie, dress shoes, and everything—a total spectacle, just to put that young man at ease and coax a smile. That is not your typical Senate moment, but that is the thing—for me and

for all of Stew's colleagues, that level of good cheer and concern for others really has been typical for a dozen years.

That is why his departure has triggered an avalanche of tributes from people all over Washington and beyond, people—many of them junior people—whom he wrote back with advice, met for coffee, shared some wisdom; this sprawling family tree of men and women who all feel that, one way or another, they owe a significant part of their success and careers to him. On that note, I have to say I know exactly how they feel.

So today I have to say goodbye to an all-star staff leader who took his job about as seriously as anybody you will ever meet but who took himself far less seriously than most people you will ever meet in the process. Professional excellence and personal humility are rare virtues. Having a heavy dose of either is impressive, but only the combination can explain Stew. There are plenty of people in this town who haven't tackled nearly the challenges or rubbed nearly the elbows he has, but you better believe their egos dwarf his. His resume looks like he belongs in fancy cocktail parties in tony neighborhoods, but I am not positive Stew would even be allowed into a fancy cocktail party. Regardless, I doubt he would find much time for the elite guests; he would be too engrossed in conversation with the security guards, valet parking attendants, hospitality staff, talking Nationals baseball and everything else under the Sun with the people who actually made the thing go.

Never before yesterday had I seen a large number of Capitol police officers gather to surprise a departing Senate staffer and send him off as if he were one of their own. That is the admiration and love that Stew has for the men and women who keep us safe—and vice versa. I know nothing I say today will really compete with that tribute. The only kind of man who would earn that sort of salute is the kind of man who would prize it above and beyond any fancy praise offered in a place like this. Don't get me wrong. Stew reveres this institution, but he never once seemed to covet the trappings or the power for its own sake; he just seemed honored to serve.

My colleagues and I are sad to bid farewell to the Senate staffer who made himself thoroughly famous by trying not to make himself famous. We are sorry to part with our tough-talking workaholic who can't bypass a cute puppy without stopping for a good scratch and a photo shoot. We will sorely miss our true-blue patriot who so loves this country where a kid can grow up from working odd jobs to counseling Senators and statesmen and not lose an ounce of his character along the way.

Stew, we can't quite imagine a place without you, but we are so grateful for what you have made it while you were here.

Happy trails, buddy.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Committee on Armed Services is discharged from further consideration of H.J. Res. 46, and the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO "STEW"

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague and friend from Tennessee for deferring.

First, on Donald Stewart, I know Leader MCCONNELL talked about him. Everyone is going to miss him here in the Senate. He was truly somebody whom everyone liked. He always had a great sense of humor and a big smile. He served his boss, MITCH MCCONNELL, extremely well, but he never let that get in the way of being friendly and working with the other side. He is somebody we will all miss. I enjoyed my interactions with him a great deal. I think that is probably true of just about every Member here.

We wish Stew the best and thank him for serving this body so long and so well.

H.J. RES. 46

Today, Madam President, the Senate will vote on the resolution to terminate the President's declaration of a national emergency. This is not a normal vote. What we are doing here today—this is not a normal day. It is

not your typical vote on an appropriations or authorization bill. It doesn't concern a nomination or an appointment. This will be a vote about the very nature of our Constitution, the separation of powers, and how this government functions henceforth.

The Framers gave Congress the power of the purse in article I of the Constitution. It is probably our greatest power. Now the President is claiming that power for himself under a guise of an emergency declaration to get around a Congress that repeatedly would not authorize his demand for a border wall.

The President has not justified the emergency declaration. You would think in a moment like this, when there is not a war, when there is not an immediate disease, or when there is not a disaster—that is when we had other declarations. They don't need an elaboration, but this one would. But the President hasn't done that. He simply said he "didn't need to do this." That is amazing, folks, my colleagues. The President said he didn't need to do this, and yet he is declaring an emergency. It is a direct contradiction of his own words.

Everyone here knows the truth. Democrats and Republicans know the sad truth. The President did not declare an emergency because there is one; he declared an emergency because he lost in Congress and wants to get around it. He is obsessed with showing strength. He couldn't just abandon his pursuit of the border wall, so he had to trample on the Constitution to continue his fight. That is not how this democracy is supposed to function. That is not how this democracy has functioned. I have never seen it, where, out of anger and out of a desire to win the fight regardless of the consequences, a President would do this.

The President has not laid out where he plans to divert funds from, though we know it is going to be from our military—from the men and women serving us and from the things they need.

Senators who vote against this resolution this afternoon may be voting to gut funding for a military installation in their State or for a cut to military pay and military pensions. How could they do that?

Most importantly, President Trump has shown zero understanding of what his emergency portends for the separation of powers in our democracy. The President seems to regard the government, not just the Justice Department, as his own personal tool to do whatever he wants, whether it is in the private sector or the public sector. We have never had a President like this.

We have had lots of Presidents with lots of foibles, but none of them seem to equate their own ego with the entire functioning of the government of the United States, except this one.

We can't succumb to that. It is our job here, in Congress, to limit executive overreach, to defend our core powers, to prevent a President—any President—from ignoring the will of Congress every time it fails to align with the will of the President. That is what the balance of powers is. That is what checks and balances is. That is what every one of us learned in second grade civics class.

All that teaching in the second grade civics class seems to be lost on so many of my Republican colleagues in blind obeisance to this President, no matter what the consequences.

This is not an issue of the wall. It goes way beyond that. We have had our fights and disputes on the wall for several years here. However you feel about our policy on the southern border and however you feel about the President, Senators should vote yes on the resolution to terminate the emergency declaration.

This resolution is about more than this President. It is about the Presidency now and on into the future.

It should not be difficult for any of my Republican colleagues to take this vote. Conservative principles would demand it, and some of the true conservatives, like Mr. LEE, yesterday, understood that logic. Conservatives have always feared an agglomeration of power in any branch of government, but particularly in the executive branch. The conservative movement has been designed to reduce the powers of the Federal Government. That is why they are for lowering taxes so much.

All of a sudden, again, because President Trump simply wants it, they say: Let's abandon those principles and vote to change, fundamentally, the way the balance of power works—shame.

If conservatism today is to mean anything, self-branded conservatives should vote to terminate the resolution. Deep-seated principles like that shouldn't take a back seat to the politics of the moment. They should not be abandoned just because the President shares the same party.

Now, let me speak from the heart to my Republican colleagues. I know that President Trump is extremely popular among Republicans for many reasons. I know he commands the vast majority of the Republican Party, and I know that the President never shies away from threatening, bullying, or publicly castigating members of his own party if they refuse to do what he wants.

So, I realize this. It is a much more difficult vote for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to take than for those of us who are Democrats. I would say to them, and I would say to every Republican: There are times when loyalty to America, to our Constitution, to our principles, and to what has made this country great should lead Members to rise above and rise to the occasion.

I hope and I pray that this moment is one of those times when Members choose country over party and when

Members rise above politics for the sake of fidelity to our constitutional principles and to this great United States of America.

In conclusion, on this issue, this is not an everyday moment. This is not just about going along with this President or that one. This is a red-letter day in the history of how the U.S. Government functions. The judgment of our Founding Fathers and the judgment of history weighs upon this vote.

TARIFFS

Madam President, the trade negotiations with China are moving forward, and I continue to have concerns that President Trump will accept a weak deal for the sake of a headline. Apparently, I am not alone. President Trump's former top economic adviser, Gary Cohn, told a podcast that the President is "desperate" to reach a trade deal. He also expressed deep skepticism that the administration would be able to stop the Chinese from stealing intellectual property and hold the Chinese accountable.

I hope Gary Cohn is wrong. The President, to his credit, was not desperate for a deal in North Korea and stood up to Kim Jong Un and looked strong for that. I hope he realizes that, as he negotiates with someone with even more consequences at stake for the long run of America—President Xi—and with a country that can do far more harm to our country, ultimately, in the long run.

Ambassador Lighthizer has said that there are still major issues left to be resolved. If that is the case, President Trump should not be pressing for a quick solution. The Chinese are more desperate for a solution than we are, although, obviously, some harm has been created to bring the Chinese to the table with tariffs.

The Chinese are desperate, and it is like they are ahead in the seventh inning, and then you say: I quit the ball game; I lose.

Don't do that, Mr. President. The tariffs you have imposed, at some political cost, have brought China to the table and given us the first opportunity in decades—in decades—to make the Chinese reform so they don't take total advantage of American workers and know-how. Soybean purchases and promises to import more American goods are not sufficient if we don't win concrete concessions on major issues.

If President Trump caves to China for the sake of soybean purchases, he would be trading America's future, literally, for a hill of beans. We want to help the soybean farmers. We want to help everybody else, but not at the expense of the future viability of jobs and wealth in America.

My message to President Trump is the same one I mentioned to him and I gave to him before he met with Kim Jong Un: Don't back down.

The President should be proud that he stood up to North Korea and walked away. He will be proud if he does the same with China, unless President Xi

makes enduring, verifiable reforms of China's economic and trade policies, because the odds are high that if the President walks away from a weak deal, he will be able to get a much better deal down the road.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, Tennesseans have asked me: Is there really a crisis on the southern border? Do you support President Trump's border wall?

And my answer to both questions is yes, I do.

I have urged the President to build the 234 miles of border wall that he asked for in his January 6 letter to the Senate and to do that in the fastest possible way, with a minimum delay and legal challenge, by using the \$5.7 billion already approved by Congress.

But the President's emergency declaration to take an additional \$3.6 billion that Congress has appropriated for military hospitals, for barracks, and for schools—including one in Fort Campbell—is inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution that I took an oath to support and to defend.

Never before has a President asked for funding, the Congress has not provided it, and then the President has used the National Emergencies Act of 1976 to spend the money anyway. The problem with this is that after a Revolutionary War against a King, our Nation's Founders gave to Congress—a Congress elected by the people—the power to approve all spending so that the President would not have too much power. This check on the executive is a source of our freedom.

In addition, this declaration is a dangerous precedent. Already, Democrat Presidential candidates are saying they would declare emergencies to tear down the existing border wall, to take away guns, to stop oil exports, to shut down offshore drilling, and for other leftwing enterprises—all without the approval of Congress.

I believe the crisis on our southern border is real. U.S. Customs and Border Patrol arrested more than 66,000 illegal aliens in February of 2019—the highest total in a single month since March 2009. In the last 2 years alone, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers have arrested 266,000 illegal aliens in the United States with criminal records. Each week, approximately 300 Americans die from heroin overdoses, of which nearly 90 percent come across the southern border.

During the last 25 years, Congress approved and President Obama, President Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President George H. W. Bush built 654 miles of barrier along the 1,954-mile southern border. In 2013, the comprehensive immigration bill that received 68 Senate votes, including mine, included \$40 billion for border security, including physical barrier, and enforcement. Last year, I voted with nearly

every Democrat for a bill that included \$25 billion for border security, including physical barrier.

So one might ask: Why is President Trump the only President not allowed to build more wall on the southern border?

But in this case, as the Wall Street Journal said on March 12, “The President doesn’t need to invoke a national emergency to build his wall along the southern border.” He has the money immediately available in other accounts already approved by Congress. Any appreciation for our structure of government means that no President should be able to use the National Emergencies Act to spend money that Congress refuses to provide.

The late Justice Antonin Scalia, who is revered by constitutional conservatives, put it this way for us. Justice Scalia said:

“Every tin horn dictator in the world today, every President for life has a Bill of Rights. That’s not what makes us free. What has made us free is our Constitution. Think of the word “constitution,” it means structure. That’s why America’s framers debated not the Bill of Rights, but rather the structure of the federal government.”

Justice Scalia wrote:

The genius of the American constitutional system is the dispersal of power. Once power is centralized in one person, or one part of government, a Bill of Rights is just words on paper.

That was Justice Scalia.

I fault Democrats for not supporting President Trump’s reasonable request for more wall on the border after 25 years of approving physical barriers and border wall for four other Presidents. That is not an excuse to ignore the constitutional separation of powers, especially when the faster way to build the 234 more miles of border wall that the President has asked for is to use \$5.7 billion already approved by Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Wall Street Journal dated March 12, 2019, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 12, 2019]

TRUMP’S EMERGENCY EXIT

HOW HE CAN DECLARE VICTORY ON WALL MONEY WITHOUT LOSING A VOTE

(By The Editorial Board)

The Senate will vote on a resolution to override President Trump’s emergency declaration as early as Thursday, and rarely has there been a clearer case of needless self-harm. Mr. Trump should listen to the Senate Republicans offering him a safe emergency exit.

On Tuesday Vice President Mike Pence met with several GOP Senators ahead of a vote on the override resolution that passed the House with ease. As many as 10 to 15 GOP Senators may vote to override.

Republican Senators up for re-election in tough states are in an impossible position. Susan Collins of Maine and Thom Tillis of North Carolina are both up in 2020, and they’re voting to rebuke the President. Martha McSally has to fight for her seat in Ari-

zona in 2020, and to win she’ll need a coalition of Trump voters and the President’s skeptics. No matter how she votes she isolates potential supporters. Ditto for Cory Gardner of Colorado.

And for what? The President doesn’t need to invoke a national emergency to build his wall along the southern border. Sen. Lamar Alexander of Tennessee has pointed out that the White House already has funds at its disposal without declaring an emergency.

Consider: The President wants \$5.7 billion for the wall. Congress provided \$1.375 billion in appropriations. The President plans to tap \$601 million from a forfeiture fund at the Treasury Department that can be used for general law enforcement purposes. Mr. Trump also plans to use \$2.5 billion from Defense Department accounts that deal with drug smuggling, though Sen. Alexander notes that the law allows him to tap up to \$4 billion.

In other words, if the President moved \$3.7 from the Pentagon drug account, he’d reach his \$5.7 billion goal without needing to pilfer \$3.6 billion from military construction. The White House noted this in a fact sheet last month but declared an emergency anyway. The irony is that the President can’t possibly spend all this money on wall construction before the fall’s budget negotiations for fiscal 2020, when he can work on winning more funding.

Mr. Trump could rescind the order and say he’ll spend the money available under the law first, and reconsider if facts warrant. This would keep the money out of the courts. The President would also be better positioned to win the 2020 defense spending he wants if he isn’t raiding the military to pay for the wall. In his budget proposal this week, Mr. Trump asked Congress to backfill the money he is taking from military construction. House Democrats have no incentive to cooperate.

The alternative is a divisive vote that Mr. Trump is sure to lose and a bipartisan resolution he’ll have to veto. And that’s for starters. The National Emergencies Act allows a vote in Congress every six months until an emergency is terminated. Democrats have found a gift that will keep on giving.

Some Republicans are proposing fixes to the National Emergencies Act, which would be welcome. A proposal from Mike Lee of Utah would let the President declare an emergency as he can now, but after 30 days Congress would have to vote to continue it.

Republican Senators don’t want a pointless showdown with Mr. Trump, but they can’t avoid one if the White House won’t change course. Mr. Trump should declare victory on wall funding for this year and live to fight next year.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Madam President, for the recognition. It is great to be joined on the floor by Senator COLLINS, who is going to speak after me to stand up for the Constitution, and I very much appreciate Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER’s comments also. He is a real student of the Constitution, and I respect very much the conclusion he has come up with here today.

When each Senator is sworn into office, we take a fundamental pledge to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That vow that we support the Constitution dates back to the very first Congress in 1789. Defend-

ing the Constitution is our first and foremost sacred duty.

The Founders built a system of checks and balances into our Constitution. They made sure that the three branches of government exercised their own separate powers, and they made sure that no one branch, no one person, could exercise too much power, especially over the use of taxpayer money. The Founders gave to Congress the power of the purse, one of our most fundamental powers. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution could not be more clear: “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.”

Congress holds the power to spend taxpayer money, not the President. It is our job to make sure that spending decisions have widespread public support and are not the product of an extreme minority, much less one man or one woman.

We all know that the President wants a wall. We just had a major debate about border security funding. The President shut down the government for 35 days because Congress refused his wall request.

Eventually he relented, but now he has declared an “emergency” to simply try and take the money that he couldn’t get from the appropriations process. He said: “I didn’t need to do this.” He flaunted the fact that this is not a real emergency.

The President is testing the limits of Executive power. The questions before the Senate today are these: Are we going to let this happen or are we going to open Pandora’s box? What about article I of the Constitution? What about the 35-day governmental shutdown? What about Presidential budget requests? What about the Appropriations Committee? Are we really going to let a President raid taxpayer money after Congress denies the request?

The opposition to this power grab is bipartisan, as it should be. Among the American people the numbers are overwhelming. Almost 70 percent of the American people oppose the President’s emergency declaration to raid taxpayer money for the wall. That is almost 70 percent.

My fellow Senators, it is time for the Senate to do its job. It is time for us to assert our authority over the purse. It is time for us to honor our oath of office. Every Senator should vote yes on the resolution to terminate the President’s emergency declaration.

I want to thank my cosponsors in this effort. Earlier I mentioned Senator COLLINS, who is on the floor with me and will speak after me—Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator SHAHEEN. Again, I know that Senator COLLINS is on the floor to urge us to do the right thing, to stand up for Congress’s authority.

This vote is historic. The Constitution’s principle of separation of powers is at stake. If the Senate enables the President to hijack our power to appropriate, history will not remember us fondly.

This vote is not about the wisdom of building a wall along the border. This vote is not about party. This vote is about whether we will let any President trample on the Constitution, whether we will sit by and let the President take away our constitutional authority to appropriate.

I rise today, hopeful that my Republican colleagues will speak up. In addition to Senator COLLINS and Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator TILLIS stated firmly in a recent opinion piece:

I support Trump's vision on border security. But I would vote against the emergency.

Why does he say he would vote against the emergency declaration? Because, he said, "[a]s a U.S. Senator, I cannot justify providing the executive with more ways to bypass Congress."

Former Governor Kasich authored an opinion piece recently titled "It's time for Republicans in Congress to put country over party." He states:

Let's be clear. This vote is not about the situation at the border; it's about an executive power grab and, above all, congressional respect for the democratic process.

I couldn't agree more with Governor Kasich.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full pieces by Senator TILLIS and Governor Kasich.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 2019]
I SUPPORT TRUMP'S VISION ON BORDER SECURITY. BUT I WOULD VOTE AGAINST THE EMERGENCY

(By Thom Tillis)

Thom Tillis, a Republican, is a U.S. senator from North Carolina.

President Trump has few bigger allies than me when it comes to supporting his vision of 21st-century border security, encompassing a major investment in technology, personnel and infrastructure, including new physical barriers where they will be effective. It is a vision that will take many years and tens of billions of dollars to fully realize, and the president can count on me to help.

The president is rightfully frustrated with Congress's inaction regarding the humanitarian and security crisis at the nation's southern border. Even though Republicans and Democrats spent the past several decades in the halls of Congress and on the campaign trail promising the American people that they would work to secure U.S. borders, some of my colleagues seemingly made a politically calculated decision to block the president's good-faith efforts to finally get it done. They have regressed to the point where a Democratic presidential contender such as Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (N.Y.) and a possible candidate, former congressman Beto O'Rourke of Texas, are even entertaining the possibility of tearing down existing physical barriers. Although Trump certainly has legitimate grievances over congressional Democrats' obstruction of border-security funding, his national emergency declaration on Feb. 15 was not the right answer.

From the perspective of the chief executive, I can understand why the president would assert his powers with the emergency declaration to implement his policy agenda. After all, nearly every president in the modern era has similarly pushed the boundaries

of presidential power, many with the helping hand of Congress.

In fact, if I were the leader of the Constitution's Article II branch, I would probably declare an emergency and use all the tools at my disposal as well. But I am not. I am a member of the Senate, and I have grave concerns when our institution looks the other way at the expense of weakening Congress's power.

It is my responsibility to be a steward of the Article I branch, to preserve the separation of powers and to curb the kind of executive overreach that Congress has allowed to fester for the better part of the past century. I stood by that principle during the Obama administration, and I stand by it now.

Conservatives rightfully cried foul when President Barack Obama used executive action to completely bypass Congress and unilaterally provide deferred action to undocumented adults who had knowingly violated the nation's immigration laws. Some prominent Republicans went so far as to proclaim that Obama was acting more like an "emperor" or "king" than a president.

There is no intellectual honesty in now turning around and arguing that there's an imaginary asterisk attached to executive overreach—that it's acceptable for my party but not thy party.

Republicans need to realize that this will lead inevitably to regret when a Democrat once again controls the White House, cites the precedent set by Trump, and declares his or her own national emergency to advance a policy that couldn't gain congressional approval.

This isn't just conjecture. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and other prominent Democratic elected officials have already hinted that emergency declarations will be part of the playbook for the left, with Pelosi musing, "just think about what a president with different values can present to the American people."

Conservatives should take these warnings seriously. They should be thinking about whether they would accept the prospect of a President Bernie Sanders declaring a national emergency to implement parts of the radical Green New Deal; a President Elizabeth Warren declaring a national emergency to shut down banks and take over the nation's financial institutions; or a President Cory Booker declaring a national emergency to restrict Second Amendment rights.

Those on the left and the right who are making Trump's emergency declaration a simple political litmus test of whether one supports or opposes the president and his policies are missing the mark. This is about the separation of powers and whether Congress will support or oppose a new precedent of executive power that will have major consequences.

As a U.S. senator, I cannot justify providing the executive with more ways to bypass Congress. As a conservative, I cannot endorse a precedent that I know future left-wing presidents will exploit to advance radical policies that will erode economic and individual freedoms.

These are the reasons I would vote in favor of the resolution disapproving of the president's national-emergency declaration, if and when it comes before the Senate.

[From CNN, Mar. 12, 2019]

JOHN KASICH: IT'S TIME FOR REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS TO PUT COUNTRY OVER PARTY

(By John R. Kasich)

John R. Kasich is the former governor of Ohio, serving from 2011 to 2019. A Republican, he was previously a member of the House of Representatives. He is the author of "Two Paths: America Divided or United."

The opinions expressed in this commentary are his. View more opinion articles on CNN.

During my 18 years as a member of Congress—not so long ago—my colleagues and I didn't robotically toe the line with the President. Republicans didn't vote in lockstep with Republican presidents, not even Ronald Reagan. And Democrats departed from their party's president when they thought it was the right thing to do. We took party loyalty seriously, but we gave even greater weight to principle.

In recent decades, of course, partisanship in the House and Senate has become far more intense, and the nation is worse as a result. But even now, in this hyper-partisan era, there comes a time when our elected leaders must put country over party.

One such moment: the ongoing debate over President Donald Trump's national emergency declaration to fund construction of a wall on the US-Mexico border. Sometime soon, Republican senators will have the opportunity to demonstrate—as 13 Republicans did in the House—their love of country and their commitment to constitutional values by voting for the resolution to disapprove the President's emergency declaration. Instead of acting like they're afraid of their own shadows, Senate Republicans must use this vote to—at long last—stand up and defend the Constitution.

THE REAL NATIONAL EMERGENCY IS NOT AT THE BORDER

Let's be clear. This vote is not about the situation at the border; it's about an executive power grab and, above all, congressional respect for the democratic process. Whatever their views on the border situation—which I agree is serious—Republicans should oppose the President's declaration. Standing against the President on this issue is important not just for today, but for our future.

For years, Republicans decried executive overreach by President Barack Obama. If we are serious about our constitutional values, we can't complain only about actions by the other party. We have to apply consistent principles whenever we have a president from our own party as well.

We should be especially concerned about President Trump's effort to circumvent Congress simply by invoking the magic word "emergency." If presidents can do end runs around Congress merely by claiming "emergency," then there's almost no limit to executive authority. This would create a gravely dangerous situation, not only for this president but for all future presidents as well.

Legal scholars are debating what the word "emergency" means as it's used in the National Emergencies Act, and the courts will resolve that question if Congress fails to override an expected presidential veto of their resolution of disapproval. But there's no real doubt about what the word is supposed to mean. A president's emergency powers are intended to be used for addressing sudden or unexpected events, not just serious problems. Indeed, the National Emergencies Act, passed in 1976, aimed to curtail—not expand—presidential discretion to declare emergencies.

What's also clear is how emergency declarations should be used: To address problems in ways for which there is not only a general consensus, but also where the pressing nature of the challenge requires speedy action without the formal and oftentimes slow process of congressional action. Nothing about the current situation matches up to that standard.

President Trump's emergency declaration for border wall funding is almost the antithesis of that model. The problems at our border may indeed be severe, but they are chronic. Even more significantly, there is

not a consensus to pursue the President's approach. To the contrary, Republicans and Democrats in Congress did negotiate a compromise—and the President signed it into law. But then he proceeded to turn his back on the negotiation, the process and the agreement by declaring a national emergency.

That kind of unilateralism not only conflicts with our Constitution, it amplifies the worst of our present-day politics. President Trump is playing to his base, focused on politics not policy. The result of his approach is more bitterness and alienation, less trust between parties and a continued loss of public confidence in our government. It leaves both parties—our government—far less able to do the things the American people need and desire. I am proud to have joined with three dozen former Republican members of Congress to urge those Republicans currently serving there to stand for our values and by standing up to the President against his emergency declaration. President Trump remains popular within our party, but so is a deeply ingrained commitment to constitutional conservatism. Opposing your party's president is never easy, but I am hopeful that Republicans will vote to uphold the constitutional principles I know they hold dear.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, to get this wall money, the President caused the longest government shutdown in our Nation. The shutdown caused hardship for millions of Federal employees and lasting pain for thousands of Federal contractors, not to mention the millions of Americans who were denied services for 35 days—services they paid for with their tax dollars.

I visited with New Mexicans hurt by the shutdown and it was very, very painful to hear their stories.

In the end, Congress decided on a bipartisan basis not to spend the \$5.7 billion the President demanded for his wall. He got \$1.3 billion. I didn't want to see that much, and I wanted to see more restrictions as to specifically what it was going to be spent for, but it was a hard-fought compromise, and a deal is a deal.

Congress's determination should have ended the debate for this fiscal year, the year that we are in.

Now the President is asking Congress for \$8.6 billion for the border wall next year. That is his prerogative, but make no mistake, it is not only Congress's prerogative, it is Congress's constitutional responsibility to decide if he gets that money. As the old saying goes, the President proposes and Congress disposes. President Trump is being treated no differently than all previous Presidents. That is how our constitutional system works—or at least how it is supposed to work.

The President's emergency declaration is an end run around Congress, plain and simple. If any Democratic President issued an emergency declaration like this, say for climate change or gun safety funding, Republicans in this body would scream bloody murder and vote to disapprove.

I am on record that climate change is one of the most pressing issues on our planet, and I am on record that gun violence is a national crisis. I have voted for and proposed actual legislation on

these topics, as our system is supposed to work. No previous President has used the National Emergency Act to bypass the appropriations process like this. Our Constitution, the rule of law, separation of powers—all of these rise far above the day-to-day controversies like the President's border wall.

On a practical note, the President wants to take real money away from real military construction projects, which will have a real impact on national security. These military construction projects have been vetted through years of scrutiny, through the military, through numerous congressional committees in Congress, and they are projects deemed essential to national security—projects all across the Nation, in our States, that are now at risk.

We have a long list of military construction projects by the President. Yet he has not bothered to tell us which projects would be cut to build his wall. Will he raid \$793 million to rebuild Camp Lejeune, NC, after the devastation from Hurricane Florence?

Will he steal up to \$800 million for Navy ship maintenance to make sure that accidents like what happened to the USS *McCain* and USS *Fitzgerald* never happen again?

Will he raid \$125 million from my State of New Mexico for Holloman Air Force Base to develop unmanned aerial vehicles to track terrorists and for White Sands Missile Range to build a badly needed information systems facility?

The answer is that we don't know, but these critical projects in all of our States are at risk.

We each need to think about our States and the people we were sent here to represent. I am from one of the four States that border Mexico, one of the four States that would be the most directly impacted by any border wall, and I am here to state there is no national security emergency along my State's border with Mexico. What is happening at our border does not justify the use of this authority.

New Mexico's border communities are flourishing with economic, cultural, and educational activity. Border communities are as safe as or safer than others in the interior.

This is not a partisan view along the border. Republican WILLIAM HURD represents more than 500 miles of the Texas border with Mexico. He not only believes the President's emergency declaration is unconstitutional, but he also thinks the President's wall is "the most expensive and least effective way to do border security."

Again, whether you support or oppose the border wall is not an issue. What is at issue is our oath to support and defend the Constitution, whether any President can toss Congress aside and raid critical funds at will.

We have an opportunity to stand up to an unconstitutional power grab. I urge everyone in this Chamber to seize that opportunity.

With this, I yield to Senator COLLINS, who, from the beginning, has worked with me as we have our resolution in, and we are working hard to make sure that we stand up for the Constitution. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you.

Mr. President, later today, the Senate will make a significant decision with implications for our constitutional system of government.

We will vote on a resolution to reverse the President's ill-advised national emergency declaration that funds the construction of a border wall using money that Congress has appropriated and the President has signed into law for other purposes, such as military construction.

I want to thank Senator UDALL, the Senator from New Mexico, for working together with me. We introduced a companion resolution to overturn the President's declaration, and I commend Senator UDALL for his leadership.

By declaring a national emergency, the President's action comes into direct conflict with Congress's authority to determine the appropriation of funds, a power vested in Congress by the Framers of our Constitution in article I, section 9. That is why this issue is not about strengthening our border security, a goal that I support and have voted to advance. Rather, it is a solemn occasion involving whether this body will stand up for its institutional prerogatives and will support the separation of powers enshrined in our Constitution.

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."

For the past 65 years, the courts have determined the boundary of Presidential authority vis-a-vis Congress under the doctrine of *Youngstown Sheet & Tube*, the 1952 Supreme Court case that reversed President Truman's seizure of U.S. steel companies during the Korean war.

As Justice Robert Jackson explained in his profoundly influential concurrence in that case, the question of whether a President's actions are constitutionally valid should be determined by examining the source of the President's authority. In this concurrence, the Justice goes through three scenarios in which he assesses the President's power.

According to Justice Jackson, when acts taken by the President are against the express or implied will of Congress, the President's power is at its lowest ebb. President Trump's declaration clearly falls in that category.

The President rests his declaration on the National Emergencies Act, and that act fails to define precisely what constitutes an emergency. There is a commonsense rule we can apply. It is a five-part test that was used by the Office of Management and Budget under

former President George Herbert Walker Bush to determine whether requested funding merited an emergency designation under our budget rules. Under that test, a spending request was designated as an emergency only if the need for spending met a five-part test. It had to be necessary, sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and not permanent.

Whether one agrees with President Trump that more should be done to secure our southern border—and I do agree with him on that goal—his decision to fund a border wall through a national emergency declaration would never pass all of this five-part test.

Another concern I have with the President's declaration is, it shifts funding away from critical military construction projects. We don't know which ones. We have not been able to get a list, but this could have very real national security implications. Again, I would note that the Military Construction appropriations bill incorporated projects recommended by the President and his Department of Defense, was passed by both bodies, and signed into law by the President.

Let me emphasize, once again, that the question presented by this resolution is not whether you are for a border wall or against a border wall; it is not whether you believe that border security should be strengthened or whether it is sufficient; it is not whether we support or oppose President Trump; rather, the question is a far more fundamental and significant one. The question is this: Do we want the executive branch, now or in the future, to hold the power of the purse, a power the Framers deliberately entrusted to Congress?

We must stand up and defend Congress's institutional powers as the Framers intended we would, even when doing so is inconvenient or goes against the outcome we might prefer.

I urge my colleagues to support the rulings of disapproval and our Constitution.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is a debate worth happening. I appreciate the comments from my New England neighbor. It is an important matter for us to consider.

President Trump declared a national emergency, citing a "crisis" at the southern border, but it has become more and more evident he did it for one reason, to do an end run around Congress and the Appropriations Committee, and use taxpayer money to build a wall on the southern border that Congress has refused to fund.

For 3 years, he failed to convince Congress—a Republican-controlled Senate and a Republican-controlled House—that his wall was a good idea. For 3 years, he requested that Congress fund his cynical campaign promise to build a "big beautiful" wall on the southern border, and for 3 years, the Republican-controlled Congress re-

fused. Even when his own party controlled both Chambers of Congress, he could not convince enough Members that it was a good idea. Certainly, nobody accepted his pledge that Mexico would pay for the wall. We all knew the U.S. taxpayers would have to pay for it.

So instead of accepting that we are in a democracy, and he is not a monarch, instead of accepting that we are in a democracy and there are two other coequal branches of government that could constrain his actions, the President has decided to ignore the Constitution and the will of Congress and go it alone. Actually, Congress alone has the power of the purse. Congress having exclusive power over our government spending priorities is one of the most critical checks and balances in our constitutional system.

Anybody who goes back and reads the history of the founding of this country knows that the reason we are the oldest existing democracy currently in the world, is that we believed in checks and balances.

The President, of course, could propose funding for whatever projects he wants, but it is the job of Congress to decide where to invest the American people's hard-earned tax dollars. In a democracy, every President from George Washington to now is supposed to respect those decisions. After not getting what he wanted, this President has invoked the National Emergencies Act. He is stretching the powers given to him in that act beyond all recognition. He has declared a national emergency on the southern border.

We are not responding to a national emergency. There is no crisis on our southern border requiring such extreme action. What kind of national emergency is declared only after you lose a 3-year funding fight with Members of your own party? What kind of national emergency is resolved by a vaguely defined, multiyear construction project? The truth is clear. He is trying to use this authority as a means to a political end.

When Congress enacted the National Emergencies Act in 1976, it conveyed certain powers to the President to use in the event of a true emergency that required quick action. I remember. I was here during the debate. There was a Republican President. It assumed that whoever sat in the Oval Office would have enough respect for the office and the power being conveyed not to abuse it. Those of us in the Senate, at that time, felt that whether it was a Republican or Democratic President, they would not abuse the power. President Trump has failed that test.

Presidential emergency powers should only be invoked in a true time of crisis. It is an abuse of power to invoke these authorities just because he couldn't do what he wanted in any other way. We are now seeing what he would do if he had these powers.

The President wants to raid money meant for military housing and mili-

tary base improvements to pay for his wall. This comes almost in the same week we see in the news that so much of military housing is infested by mold, by rats, by asbestos, and by all these other problems. Is he going to take the money that would make this housing safe for the men and women in our military to pay for his wall? Is he going to take money from Camp Lejeune that was hit by Hurricane Florence and badly damaged? I know Camp Lejeune. When my son was in the Marines, he spent time there. Is he going to take money from Tyndall Air Force base, which was flattened by Hurricane Michael? What about money for schools for military families, like the school at Fort Campbell, KY, or a child development center at Joint Base Andrews in Maryland? What about essential training facilities that would ensure military readiness, like a special operations training facility at Fort Bragg, NC—which I have visited. Congress chose to fund these projects over an ineffective, wasteful wall. Congress had to say, where does the money go? We felt these things to help our military and military families made far more sense than the wall. Congress used its constitutional power—let me emphasize that—Congress used its constitutional power of the purse to set priorities for how to invest the American people's hard-earned tax dollars.

The President is trying to label opponents of his action as weak on border security or weak on crime. That is nonsense. I don't know any Member of the Senate, of either party, who doesn't believe in border security or is in favor of crime.

Let's see what he asked for. Instead of border security, he wanted \$5.7 billion for the wall. Congress approved a border security package—money for fencing along with technology added between the ports of entry, and additional personnel. That is real border security, not a political stunt. Now the President is saying: Thank you for your views; thank you for following your constitutional power, but I am still going to do it my way. Where is he going to stop?

The fact that it is a political game was shown when this Congress passed, overwhelmingly, \$1.6 billion for border security. The President threatened to veto that. Then after closing the government for 35 days—costing the taxpayers billions and billions of dollars for nothing—he signed the bill that did not give him the \$1.6 billion that he threatened to veto but that gave him \$1.3 billion, and that he signed. If anybody thinks this is just playing games, that states it.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen the erosion of our institutional checks and balances in the face of creeping authoritarianism. The time has come for Congress and Members of the President's own party to take a stand. Congress simply cannot afford to remain silent in the face of such an unprecedented violation of the separation of powers.

I understand Senator LEE has introduced a bill to reform the National Emergencies Act. I appreciate the thought he has put into this issue. I am certainly going to review his legislation with an open mind, but make no mistake, legislation to fix future abuses of this law does not address the abuses we have that are happening right now. His bill does not address the fact that this President is trying to do an end run around Congress—an end run around Democrats and Republicans alike—and is cynically using an emergency declaration to fund a request on which we had voted but of which we did not approve. We must send a message to the President that this is unacceptable. This is not something we never voted on. We have voted on this matter, and under the Constitution, that is what is supposed to carry the day.

I hope my Republican friends will take a moment to take stock of where we are. President Trump is going to be but a moment in our Nation's history. The Constitution controls our history no matter who is President. For the sake of appeasing a man who made a foolish campaign promise that was never grounded in reality, will they not stand up for the institution in which they serve? For the sake of appeasing a President who detests any limits or checks on his authority, will they forever diminish the role of Congress as a coequal branch of government?

Now is the time for country over party. I will vote aye on the joint resolution of disapproval, and I urge all Senators to do the same.

I do not see any Senator who seeks the floor.

Mr. President, is this under controlled time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is controlled equally between the proponents and opponents.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed by the quorum be equally divided between both sides.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on the President's declaration of a national emergency. We have reached a moment of crisis, but it is not a constitutional crisis; it is a crisis on the border, a crisis of American sovereignty. When hundreds of thousands of foreigners arrive at the southern border and demand entry, that is not migration; that is an emergency and a threat to our sovereignty. The stories speak for themselves.

Last Thursday, an American citizen named Rocio Alderete was shot to

death on a bridge over the Mexican border near McAllen, TX. Early reports suggest Rocio was caught in a shootout between cartel gunmen and the Mexican police, but whatever the case turns out to be, Rocio has perished—the latest American victim of lawlessness at our southern border.

Since last October, Border Patrol agents have apprehended more than 260,000 illegal aliens at the border, which is a surge of 90 percent—almost double from the previous year. For the most part, these aren't young men who are coming for work, as has been so often the case in the past; rather, they are Central Americans who are gaming our generous asylum laws. Instead of running away from the Border Patrol, these illegal aliens run to it so they can be captured and released into the country, with notice to appear in court, which they hardly ever do. Thanks to stupid laws and activist judges, illegal aliens are even using little kids as legal force fields because being detained with minors increases their odds of being held in America rather than to be turned around and sent home.

As a result, we see all of the horrors of the human smuggling trade at the border today. Women and girls are sexually assaulted at horrific rates. Hundreds die in the desert each year of thirst and exhaustion. Infectious diseases we had all but eradicated with vaccines are appearing again in border communities. ICE health officials have found 236 confirmed or probable cases of mumps among detainees in the past year after having reported zero cases for the previous 2 years.

This surge of illegal aliens is swamping law enforcement's ability to do its job. "Overwhelmed" is the word we hear so often from agents. Border Patrol Commissioner Kevin McAleenan says: "This is clearly both a border security and humanitarian crisis."

The consequences of this crisis stretch far beyond the border. Sometimes it stretches thousands of miles away. An American—1 of 192 every day—dies of a drug overdose. The poison in his veins flows across the Mexican border. A brave police officer and father, Corporal Ronil Singh, of California, was shot dead the day after Christmas after his killer snuck into the country illegally. We have failed to protect our border, as any sovereign nation must, and our people are dying because of it.

The President has declared a national emergency because of this crisis. Yet the administration's sensible, long overdue efforts to secure the border have been met only by howls of outrage from the Democratic Party and its media wing. Judging from their reaction, you would think the real emergency was not our lawless border but any genuine effort to secure it. The minority leader called the President's emergency declaration a "lawless act" that showed "naked contempt for the rule of law." Other members of the

self-styled resistance have compared the President to Hitler.

These are curious, overheated claims, I have to say. To be lawless, after all, one must act outside the law. Yet the President's critics don't even bother making that case, probably because they don't have much of one to make.

The President isn't purporting to invoke his inherent Executive powers under article II of our Constitution. He does not even claim to defend his constitutional prerogatives from legislative encroachment. On the contrary, he is only exercising the statutory authority that has been delegated to him by us, by this very body—the U.S. Congress. More than half of the \$8.1 billion the President is using to build the wall and secure the border comes from non-emergency statutes that have been passed by Congress. The remainder comes from an explicit delegation of various powers to the President in the event of a national emergency, just like the one the President has declared, which we also delegated him the authority to do. I should add, the National Emergencies Act passed nearly unanimously, with only five "no" votes in the House.

I am sympathetic to arguments that the National Emergencies Act is too broad and gives the executive branch too much power. That is a reasonable debate to have. Believe me, Congress has ceded too much power to the Executive for more than a century and has expanded an administrative state that increasingly deprives our people of having a meaningful say in their government, so I invite my Democratic colleagues to reconsider the wisdom of this path.

Maybe we can also reform the EPA. Perhaps we can require up-or-down votes in Congress in order to approve big regulations so politicians around here can show some accountability for once. I am ready to have those debates. Believe me, I am ready. In the meantime, don't pretend we didn't delegate all of these powers or that it is lawless for the Executive to use the laws we have passed just because you deplore him.

If you want to see lawless Executive action, by the way, you can look, instead, to the last administration. President Obama purportedly gave millions of illegal aliens legal status and work permits, which was in clear violation of statutes that had been passed by this Congress. He also expressly defied our ban on bailout payments from the ObamaCare slush fund to big health insurance companies. It is strange how I don't recall the self-styled resistance manning the ramparts and rushing to the Ninth Circuit back then. In fact, I only recall a lot of congressional fanboys of the President's using the pen and phone to encroach on our constitutional prerogatives.

I have also heard from some Senators who admit the President is acting lawfully but who worry about the slippery slope of Executive power. I respect this

view. Our system of separated powers calls on each branch to jealously protect its own powers, but one can ski to the bottom of a slippery slope pretty fast. A Republican declares a national emergency today on the border. A Democrat—or who knows these days, maybe a socialist—will tomorrow declare a gun violence emergency to confiscate guns or will declare a climate change emergency to shut down coal-fired powerplants.

I acknowledge it doesn't take much to imagine such abuses by a future liberal President, especially with the gang they have running today, but that is precisely what such actions would be—abuses. What the law says matters here. We have delegated to the Executive the power to enforce the Nation's immigration laws, including by an emergency declaration. We have not delegated to the Executive the power to confiscate guns, to close powerplants or any of the other common entrants in the parade of horrors on the slippery slope. That is the difference between lawful and lawless government, and that is the case here.

Still, others claim the crisis on the border isn't bad enough to call a national emergency. Some have gone so far as to deride it as a fake emergency. If killings, caravans, and cartels at the border are fake emergencies, I would really hate to see a genuine emergency.

Let's suppose we take their claim seriously. We at least ought to compare the crisis at the border to past national emergencies to see how they all stack up. Right now, there are 32 national emergencies in effect—32 national emergencies. Among them is a national emergency related to election fraud in Belarus. Another is in response to the breakdown of the rule of law in Lebanon. A third is in response to a failed coup in Burundi.

I don't deny that those are all genuine problems or that an American response may well be warranted—far from it. Yet I doubt many Americans would put them ahead of a serial violation of our sovereign border by millions of foreigners. If the Belarusians warrant an emergency declaration, then surely Americans do, too, when we face a crisis at our southern border.

The Democrats used to take border security seriously, but in elite society these days, “border security” are bad words, and “wall” is practically a four-letter word unless they are the walls that protect the rich and the powerful and the politically connected from a dangerous world. Look in the news. The Democrats' newest Presidential aspirant, Robert Francis O'Rourke—a former Congressman and failed Senate candidate—has gone so far as to suggest the tearing down of existing barriers at the southern border, which I am sure has thrilled all of the good people in El Paso who don't live in a world of private planes and security details.

Regrettably, the Democrats' hostility to border security couldn't come

at a worse time for our country because there is, indeed, a crisis at the border, and we ought to be addressing it.

We could be spending this valuable legislative time tightening up our asylum laws or cracking down on employers who exploit illegal aliens instead of hiring American workers or ramping up drug enforcement. Instead, we are debating whether a crisis at our southern border can be called an emergency. Instead of solving a problem, we are trying to spin it.

So I have a simple suggestion for my colleagues: If you are genuinely alarmed by the President's invocation of the very emergency powers we delegated to him, instead of frowning your brows and tugging your chins and gravely citing Youngstown Sheet, let's tackle this emergency declaration by making it unnecessary. Let's get to the root of the problem and secure our border once and for all. No more border crisis, no more emergency—it is as simple as that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last month, I launched a new series of floor speeches to recognize what is going on with prescription drug pricing across America.

When you ask the American people about the economic things that are on their minds, it is No. 1—the cost of prescription drugs. No. 2 is, have I saved enough money for my retirement? It really gets to the heart of the concerns families have every day. Each one of us knows that the cost of prescription drugs is going up, and we also realize how vulnerable we may be as individuals if one of those drugs is a matter of life and death.

I came to the floor 2 weeks ago to talk about the cost of insulin. Seven and a half million diabetics across America have seen dramatic increases in the cost of insulin—increases that can't be justified because the same American companies selling the same drugs in Canada do it for a fraction of the cost. Americans pay outrageous prices.

Humalog, which is one of the most popular forms of insulin, costs \$329 a dosage in the United States. Twenty years ago, it was about \$29. It has gone up in price 35 times in that 20-year period of time. How much does the exact same drug that costs \$329 in the United States cost in Canada? It is made by the same company. Thirty-eight dollars. You look at that and you think there is something wrong here. The pharmaceutical industry is not focus-

ing on giving American consumers a break.

What I want to talk about today goes to an issue that is hard to believe but true. A few years ago, the New York Times reported that nearly \$3 billion worth of drugs was wasted each year. These are not ordinary drugs; these are cancer drugs used in chemotherapy. Medicare, Medicaid, and private health insurers spend billions of dollars on medications. Many of them are literally thrown in the trash. How could that possibly be?

You see, for many of the most expensive drugs, like new cancer treatments, the pharmaceutical industry produces them in a one-size-fits-all container, a single-use vial that a physician has to draw from to give a treatment to a patient. The dosage for the patient in the cancer therapy is based on the patient's size and weight. The problem is that the pharmaceutical industry insists on selling these drugs in excessively large vials that contain dramatically more medicine than the average patient would need, so doctors administer the proper dosage and throw away the rest.

Here is a graphic to illustrate what I am talking about. Here is why we are wasting billions of dollars each year on cancer drugs. One size does not fit all.

This drug, Velcade—the vial size available is 3.5 milligrams. The patient dose is 2.2. The amount that is left over is 1.3. Oh, you are going to recycle that? You can't do it. That is the end of it, and it is thrown away. In 2016, \$300 million was wasted in this way.

This vial, the first one here that is produced, is a vial that would apply to a person who is 6 feet 6 inches tall and weighs 250 pounds, which means our linebacker Khalil Mack on the Chicago Bears—God forbid he would ever need it—that would be his dosage size. Most people are not as big as Chicago linebackers.

Why is Pharma sending us one vial, take it or leave it? Because they make money. They make money when we buy it and have to throw it away.

Takeda Pharmaceutical sells this drug for those who are suffering from multiple myeloma and lymphoma. As I mentioned, it is for a person who is 6 feet 6 inches and weighs 250 pounds. Takeda made \$310 million in the year 2016 off of unused Velcade that got thrown in the trash—\$310 million.

What makes this even more appalling is that the pharmaceutical industry titans actually sell the same drug in smaller containers in other countries but not in the United States. Here, we are forced to buy the largest container and throw away the difference.

This chart shows that the same company—Takeda—that makes Velcade sells this drug not in 3.5-milligram vials, as in the United States, but, in Europe, in 1-milligram vials. It seems like a simple thing, doesn't it, that you would dispense this drug in a manner so that it is not wasted? Sadly, wasting and throwing away the drug is part of their marketing strategy.

Another Japanese company, Eisai, sells its chemotherapy drug Halaven only in 1-milligram vials in the United States but sells smaller vials—0.88 milligram—in Europe.

Merck's immunotherapy drug KEYTRUDA, which is truly a breakthrough, an amazing drug—research was done by taxpayers at the National Institutes of Health, which led to the development of this drug—they sell this drug, KEYTRUDA, only in 100-milligram vials in the United States but in 50-milligram vials in Europe. In 2016, Merck made \$200 million on KEYTRUDA—this lifesaving drug—that was thrown away.

In 2016, I asked the inspector general of Health and Human Services about this waste of taxpayers' money. The inspector general uncovered that Medicare spent \$195 million in just 1 year on 20 identified drugs for medication that was thrown away. That year, Takeda received \$47 million in taxpayer funding for amounts of Velcade thrown in the trash. It wasn't alone. Genentech's Rituxan, one of the most common cancer medications, only comes in vials that are 100 milligrams or 500 milligrams. In 2013, Medicare wasted \$10 million on Rituxan that was thrown away.

It is for this reason that I am presenting my second Pharma Fleece Award to Takeda, Eisai, Merck, and Genentech. Patients in America should not face higher drug costs because these Pharma fleecers choose to sell their expensive cancer drugs in excessively large drug vials that are necessarily going to be wasted.

Two weeks ago, I teamed up with Republican Senator ROB PORTMAN of Ohio to introduce the REFUND Act—a simple bill that Senator PORTMAN and I have introduced, and I hope others will join us. It says that taxpayers will only pay for the drug that is given to a patient, not for the part that is thrown away. Medicare already tracks how much of this medication is being discarded, so the REFUND Act simply requires Medicare to determine how much was wasted and to recoup the money from the drug companies. We then provide a portion of that money back to seniors for the 20-percent coinsurance they have to pay for the drugs.

An important point: When Medicare is paying for these drugs, and a lot are being thrown away, the seniors are still paying their 20 percent, even for the drug portion that is being thrown away. So ROB PORTMAN's bill—the one I have introduced with him—says that the money recouped from the drug companies will go back to the benefit of these seniors. Under our new bill, this pharma fleecing for drug vial waste will soon come to an end so that not just the patients but our government will save money.

Remember the bottom line. When you ask the major health insurers today: What is driving the cost of health insurance premiums, they say: Senator, prescription drug pricing is No. 1.

Blue Cross Blue Shield, based out of Chicago, when I sit down with them, say: We spend more money on prescription drugs than we do on inpatient hospital care.

To give you an idea, it is out of sight. You can't turn on a television set, particularly if you are over the age of 50, without being bombarded with all these drug ads, right? You have heard them over and over again.

The No. 1 drug being sold on television today is HUMIRA. What is it for? psoriatic arthritis. It is serious. If you have that arthritis, that may be a lifesaver for you, but it is now being sold for that little red patch on your elbow called psoriasis. Interesting. Do you know how much HUMIRA costs each month? Five thousand dollars.

I have legislation that would require these drug companies to advertise the cost of their drugs on television. They tell us everything else; don't they? They tell us, if you are allergic to HUMIRA, don't take HUMIRA. I have never understood that warning. They tell us everything under the Sun, but they never mention the price. So what I want to do is get the price out in front of the public, and let them know what being perfect in a swimsuit is going to cost you per month.

From my point of view, there are people who need these drugs desperately, and we ought to try to get the prices within their reach. For those who are overusing and abusing the airwaves of America to advertise drugs—to try to push doctors into writing the scripts even when it is not necessary—we have to come to grips with this. If we don't, we are not going to have a serious effort to reduce the cost of health insurance and the healthcare costs that face our Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Presiding Officer on being in the Senate and presiding over the Senate.

I come to the floor to remind us how we got here. President Trump told us over and over and over again during his campaign that Mexico would pay for the wall. He said it at the beginning of the campaign. He said it in the middle of the campaign. He said it at the end of the campaign.

He made that promise over and over again. The U.S. Congress didn't make that promise. There is no way for Congress to force Mexico to pay for the wall. We cannot force Mexico to pay for the wall. It is not Congress's fault. It is the President's fault, and it is his promise he has broken.

Instead of going to Mexico to get them to pay for the wall, as he said he would do over and over again, he has now asked Congress to pay for it. He has now asked the American taxpayer to fulfill his broken promise.

By the way, that is after 2 years of having a Republican majority in the Senate and a Republican majority in the House who said: We don't want to build your wall. We are not going to help you keep your promise. In fact, you promised Mexico would pay for the wall. Go get Mexico to pay for the wall is what the Republican Senate and the Republican House said.

So he was frustrated. He said how frustrated he was. He went out to the American people during the 2018 election, and the people rewarded him by electing Democrats to be the majority in the House of Representatives.

Then, last December, those Democrats offered the President \$1.3 billion for border security. It wasn't for his medieval wall. It is for what he now calls steel slats.

Instead of accepting that fact—the fact that nobody here wants to fund the wall he said Mexico would pay for—he shut down the government for 35 days. Then, after all the misery he inflicted, after the billions of dollars he cost our economy, to say nothing of what he did to the Federal workers, he basically got exactly the same deal as he got before he shut down the government, making the shutdown pointless, making the billions of dollars of lost wages and economic activity in America pointless, all a casualty of his inability to keep his promise that Mexico would pay for the wall and his inability to get Republican majorities in the House and the Senate to build his wall.

So having failed to get Mexico to pay for the wall, having failed to get a Republican Congress to pay for the wall, he now says he is going to declare a national emergency to pay for the wall.

We should ask ourselves—we must ask ourselves—whether this is an appropriate use of emergency power. By the way, if it was an appropriate use of emergency power, why didn't he just declare an emergency before he shut the government down for 35 days? Why cost the economy billions and billions of dollars if you can just do this by declaring an emergency? The easy answer for that is that it is not an emergency.

He is only doing this now because he lost the negotiation. He lost his leverage. He embarrassed himself by having the longest shutdown in American history.

This is not a national emergency. This is just plan B. The President has admitted as much as he was signing the declaration itself—the declaration of emergency. He said:

I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster. . . . I just want to get it done faster, that's all.

It is not an emergency. He just wants to get it done faster, which is astonishing coming from a guy who has not spent the money that Congress has already appropriated for the wall. He

hasn't even spent that money, and now he is saying he wants to go faster, and he has to declare a national emergency to do it.

By the way, America, you may have noticed that the President is also now saying that "much of the wall has already been fully renovated or built." "Much of the wall has already been fully renovated or built." That is what your President is saying to you at the exact same time he is saying that he needs a national emergency to build the wall. It is preposterous. It is a joke.

On top of everything else, he is not telling the truth about that. He has not built a mile of this wall since he has been President of the United States, even though Congress has appropriated more than \$1 billion—I think about \$1.7 billion—to do it.

When he signed the emergency declaration, he said that national emergencies have "been signed many times before. It's been signed by other presidents from 1977 or so; it gave the presidents the power."

"There's rarely been a problem" the President said. "They sign it. Nobody cares." That is what he said.

Nobody cared because those were real emergencies, not fake emergencies. They weren't emergencies being declared by Presidents who had promised that Mexico would do something, and then it didn't happen, and now they had to declare an emergency. They certainly were not cases where the President came to the Congress, including a Congress of their own party, and said, I want to do something, and they said no. Then, they said: Well, we are going to declare an emergency.

That has never happened before in American history.

By the way, if we go down this road, this will not be the last time this happens. This will happen time and again, which is why every Member of the Senate should vote for this measure of disapproval.

Since 1976, when Congress passed the National Emergencies Act, Presidents have declared national emergencies 58 times. Fifty-three of those times have been to do things like block the sale of weapons to foreign countries or to sanction governments, like Iran and North Korea. The four remaining cases were after two U.S. planes were shot down by Cuba, after we invaded Iraq and desperately needed to protect critical infrastructure, after the outbreak of swine flu, and after 9/11.

Failing to fulfill his promise that Mexico would pay for the wall is not a national emergency, and if he thinks it is, he should sanction himself for failing to keep his promise.

As I said earlier—and this should bother everybody who believes in our system of checks and balances and who believes in the Constitution—never has a President sought to enact a national emergency like this after Congress has said no. In our Constitution, Congress has the power of the purse. Every single Senator should be voting to protect that.

Over the months and now stretching into years, I have been shocked at how the people around here who declare that they are constitutional conservatives have put up with a President who obviously doesn't care about the rule of law, doesn't care about the separation of powers—as you see here—isn't concerned about having an independent judiciary, and wants to threaten the leading journalists of this country, calling them fake news.

I would think this step would be one step too far, even for anybody in this Chamber who supported this craziness up until this point.

Let's add it all up. What has it gotten us? The President couldn't get Mexico to pay for the wall. He couldn't get a Republican House and a Republican Senate to pay for the wall. So now he is violating the Constitution to steal money that has been appropriated by this branch—by Congress. He is stealing that money from the Department of Defense, from our warfighters, and from the U.S. military to expropriate private land held by American farmers and ranchers—many of whom I assume are Republicans—through eminent domain.

As I have said on this floor before, if any President tried to do that in Colorado, there is not a person in our delegation who would support that—stealing our farms and ranches.

It must be said that, for a politician, he has a very unusual view about eminent domain. Here are some quotes of his: "I think eminent domain is wonderful."

For those of you who don't know what eminent domain is, it is when a government decides it wants a project, and your house is in the middle of where that project is going to go. Then, the government can use this thing called eminent domain to take your house and pay you for it. That is what it is. It is rarely used because most people don't want the government deciding whether they can live in their house or on their farm or on their ranch, which—in the case of people on the border of the United States—has been in their family for generations. That is why the local Congressman down there doesn't want this wall built. I think he is a Republican.

But the President said: "I think eminent domain is wonderful"—not sometimes essential, not a tool that is useful from time to time. He said it is "wonderful."

He said: "Eminent domain is something that has to be used, usually you would say for anything that's long, like a road, like a pipeline, or like a wall, or a fence."

He didn't say steel slats, but I am sure the same thing applies.

Here is another quote. This is fascinating. I have not met a single person in Colorado who would agree with this—not one—and I bet you there is not a person in Mississippi or Texas or Alabama who would agree with this sentiment either. This is what the President of the United States said:

Most of the time, they just want money. It's very rarely they say, "I love my house, I love my house, it's the greatest thing ever."

Here is another quote—and just for everybody who is watching this because people are going to come out on this floor and say: Oh, no, the money will not be used for it in this case—not for a wall, not for eminent domain.

Donald Trump says:

We are going to need a little eminent domain to get that wall built, just so you understand. . . . You need eminent domain, you have to take certain areas, okay?

That is the kind of language you would expect out of some autocrat someplace, not in a democracy.

I say to my Republican friends here who are going to vote with the President on this bill, that is what you are supporting when you are voting with him on this bill.

I don't know how anybody goes home and defends that. For anyone who wants to go home and defend misappropriating money that has been dedicated to the Department of Defense and to our military and to take that money extra-constitutionally and use it to take the property of law-abiding citizens, I don't understand how you defend it.

I am not making any of this up. These are his words. By the way, it is no wonder he can't get it through the people's Representatives in Congress because there is not a single person here who would ever admit to doing what he is about to do and what he says he wants to do. What a betrayal of conservative principles this is.

As I said, this whole exercise itself is an admission that he has broken his promise to the American people.

We didn't break it, Republicans in the Senate. We didn't break it, and we should not help him keep it if it is going to break the Constitution. In fact, we can't help him keep it unless somebody around here has a way of persuading Mexico to build the wall or pay for the wall, which I don't think there is a single person here who has that kind of influence, as influential as all of us think we are.

I don't understand it, but it is amazing to me why people would cash in their conservative principles so cheaply—\$3.6 billion.

The idea that you would be willing to give up your principles in such a tawdry exchange should be infuriating to the real conservatives who I know are in this country. Many of them live in my State of Colorado, which is a third Republican, a third Independent, and a third Democratic. Don't come to our State and tell us you are taking away our houses because we don't care about them—that we will just take the money instead for a broken promise that you didn't keep. That would not sell in Colorado. I don't know why it sells in Texas. I can't imagine that it does. I don't know how anybody could support that.

By the way, that is not even the most important point. The most important

point is that we have ground ourselves up for a 35-day government shutdown, for 3 months of media cycles on this fight by the President on a wall that he now says is almost fully built, while he is declaring an emergency to build a wall that hasn't been built.

While we are screwing around here to keep a broken promise that Mexico is going to pay for the wall, this is what was going on in China. By the way, I know somebody is going to say: Hey, they have a wall. They do have a wall. They built it 500 years ago. That is not what they are working on today. They took care of that medieval wall 500 years ago.

Today, what they are doing is they are spending \$125 billion on high-speed rail this year alone. That is \$125 billion on high-speed rail. You get on one of those trains and you could hear a pin drop. If you go on Amtrak, which I take all the time—I feel grateful that we have it—it is less than half the speed, and you can't put your Coca-Cola on the table in front of you without it falling over or falling on your neighbor.

China has spent \$300 billion on new roads, bridges, and ports across the globe through their Belt and Road Initiative. They have bought stakes in 16 different ports across Europe and the Mediterranean, some of which have fallen into their hands because—and this is part of the plan—the debt that the countries have put on to build the ports is so onerous that China gets to own the ports. They have built the longest sea bridge in the world. They have laid over 3,700 miles of fiber optic cable to connect Africa to Latin America and, ultimately, to China. On that Belt and Road Initiative, they have laid their technology over that with fiber optic cables so they could extend the surveillance society that they are building inside of China right now, while we screw around with this wall.

By the way, on the \$3.6 billion for the wall, here is an interesting chart. Here is how much cement China used over a 3-year period, from 2011 to 2013. This is what they used in 3 years, 2011 to 2013. I was in the Congress then. We were in the depths of the great recession during that period of time. It was 6.6 gigatons of concrete. Here is how much we have built in concrete in 100 years: 4.5 gigatons.

They used 4.5 gigatons in 3 years. They have used dramatically more than we have used in 100 years, and we can't even get an infrastructure bill off this floor. The White House can't even write an infrastructure bill.

All night, every night, on the cable, all we hear is \$3.6 billion for the wall, the wall, the wall—the wall that the President says has already been mostly built, that he is now declaring a national emergency to build.

The world is racing ahead of us, as I have said on this floor over and over again, while we are getting run around by one inane distraction after another. It has been said that the President is

somebody who is mostly concerned with winning the politics of any given day. That is what he tries to do, and he is often very effective at it. We spend a lot of time talking about him and his priorities, unlike figuring out a plan to counteract what China is doing or others are doing.

I bet they have a great strategy in China and Iran. Russia is not so obviously good at that strategy. Actually, come to think of it, they are pretty good, too. If you can stay off FOX News, the President will not pay any attention to what you are doing, so go do whatever it is you want to do while we fritter away one day after another of the American people's time over a broken promise that he never could keep.

Unless we are prepared to be the first generation of Americans to leave less opportunity, not more, to the people coming after us, we need to do a lot better than what we are doing, and part of that is to ensure that we preserve the institutions that built this country, like the one we are standing in right now.

I know that among some people there is an effort to divide the government from the American people and that there are people here who think they have been sent here for one purpose, which is to discredit the Federal Government.

I have a lot of problems with the Federal Government—lots of them. I was a school superintendent before I came here. I have a lot of problems with what is happening to poor children who are going to schools in our public system of education across the country, so I am not here to defend government or the way it works right now. In fact, I don't think Democrats should be the party defending bad government. We should fix it where it needs to be fixed.

We are talking here about our institutions. We are talking here about the rule of law. We are talking here about the Constitution that generation after generation after generation of Americans has preserved—not always perfectly, often very imperfectly.

Every generation of Americans has seen it as their obligation, their responsibility, to at least try to live up to the pages in our founding documents, and where we failed, we got up and we tried again. This whole country is founded on the idea that we will have disagreements because we live in a Republic, and in a Republic, you have disagreements. There is no King or tyrant to tell you what to think. That is the reason we live in a democratic Republic.

This place here and the Chamber down the hall are part of the mechanisms that were drafted into our founding documents for us to resolve our disagreements. The Founders believed something. They had no good example in the past, but here is what they believed. They believed that out of that vigorous disagreement, we would create more imaginative and durable solu-

tions than any tyrant could ever come up with on their own. That is why they designed the institutions the way they did, and that is why they created the checks and balances that they did. There is a reason no President has ever done what this President is trying to do.

They exercise self-restraint because of what is in the Constitution and because nobody on this floor would have supported him. There are many ways this generation of politicians—and I accept my share of the blame. There are many ways in which we have degraded these institutions in our time. We have destroyed the Senate's responsibility to advise and consent on judicial nominations and Supreme Court nominations. That has been turned into a purely partisan exercise by this generation of American politicians. I am ashamed of that. I am ashamed to have been here when we did that, and I take my share of the responsibility.

What I say to my colleagues is that we cannot continue to degrade these institutions and expect that the next generation of Americans is going to look back on us with anything except contempt. Generation after generation after generation of Americans has preserved these institutions so the next generation could have the opportunity to resolve their disagreements in these Chambers. We will regret it. We will regret it if we go down this road.

As the majority leader said in another time: Things have a way of changing around here sooner than you think, and someday the shoe will be on the other foot. If this Republican sets this precedent and some Democratic President follows it, that is one more step away from living in the Republic that we all claim we cherish, from the democracy we all claim we cherish, to put power in the hands of a tyrant who may or may not represent the will of the American people.

We may never get another vote like this around here. This is going to be the time that each of us is going to decide whether we are going to act to preserve these institutions for the next generation or whether we are going to continue to degrade them in our mindless partisanship and, in this case, to somehow fulfill a promise the President never could keep. That would be a shameful day in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, when President Trump declared a national emergency over the crisis along our southern border, it was immediately met with expressions of concern—some, in my view, illegitimate; others, quite legitimate.

As I have said in the past, I will repeat again that this—what we are doing here today—is no one's first choice, but it is useful to recall how we find ourselves at this point today.

Of course, when it comes to funding, when it comes to appropriations, Congress holds the purse. That is why,

each year, the Congress receives the President's budget request for the upcoming fiscal year, just as we did earlier this week.

Even though, in the President's budget, he outlines his priorities, my experience in the Senate is that most Presidential budgets, while they are an expression of the President's priorities, are dead on arrival. It then falls to us, in the Senate and the House, to look at his request and to work on a compromise budget and appropriations process and fund the operations of the Federal Government.

This process is arduous, it is time-consuming, and it is often frustrating, but it is the way the system is supposed to work. As all Americans can attest, what we have seen over the last few months looks like something very different. The refusal of Democrats in the House and the Senate to engage in negotiations on border security funding led us to a 35-day government shutdown.

Despite the clear message from border security experts, despite seeing the humanitarian crisis at the border, described by President Obama in 2014, get many times worse, our Democratic colleagues decided to play politics instead of dealing with the problem.

We heard the Speaker of the House call border barriers immoral. The minority leader here in the Senate said that there would be no additional money for physical barriers along the border. They know, just as I know, that back in 2006 and 2008, the Secure Fence Act was passed with broad bipartisan support, including support from then-Senator Barack Obama, then-Senator Hillary Clinton, and Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, currently the Democratic leader in the Senate, who now feels that this President should not get any additional money to fund border security measures that the President believes are an important response to the crisis we see at the border.

My preference would be for the normal appropriations process to be used, but when your negotiating partners refuse to take a seat at the table, normal goes out the window. Our colleagues across the aisle left the President with few options to fund what he believed was so important for the Nation's security, and that is what led us to this situation.

Enter the 1976 legislation, the National Emergencies Act. What the President did is ask his lawyers to look at what other authority, under congressionally passed laws signed by previous Presidents, might he have to access additional funds, and his lawyers pointed to the 1976 National Emergencies Act, which has granted Presidents, since that time, broad powers to reprogram funding previously appropriated by Congress.

This idea that somehow this is an unconstitutional act by this President is simply wrong. Congress has given the President this authority. They may regret it today or they may disagree that

this is an emergency or they may disagree with the way the President wants to spend the money to secure the border, but, clearly, the President is using authorities the Congress has previously granted, not just to him but to all Presidents since 1976.

My father liked to remind me growing up—one of the things he always told me is that hindsight is always 20–20. Our predecessors did not anticipate the fights we would be having today, which are largely contrived and unnecessary. We should be working together to solve these problems, not engaged in a zero-sum game of political brinkmanship. That is what brought us to where we are today.

I think it is appropriate to look at what Congress did in 1976, and in a prospective sort of way, ask ourselves: Have we delegated too much authority to Presidents since that time? There are literally 123 statutory authorizations that could be invoked under the National Emergencies Act—123 times that Congress has said a President, upon the declaration of a national emergency, can reprogram money that Congress has appropriated—123 times. That was a shock not only to me but, I dare say, to virtually all of our colleagues here in the Senate.

Many of these statutory grants of authority are exceedingly broad. They cover everything from the military to public health to Federal pay schedules. With these broad authorities already part of the law, the emergency powers provision could be viewed as a fail-safe for an agenda that the administration—an administration alone—is pushing. Let's say, hypothetically, that a future President decides there is a need to declare a national emergency over climate change. Maybe they decide this is a way to enact the Green New Deal being pushed by some of our colleagues across the aisle.

Considering the potential scope and scale in which these powers could be abused in the future and this overdelegation of authority that Congress has done 123 times, I believe we should take a look at the National Emergencies Act, once we vote today, and have a fulsome debate and discussion about whether this is really the sort of delegation of powers that the Founding Fathers intended when they said that distinct separated power should be given to each branch of the government: the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branch.

It is clear that the President is operating within the authority Congress has given to him. You don't have to like it. You don't have to agree with it, but it is clear the President is operating within the authority Congress delegated to him. Rather than talking in circles and debating that fact, I think our discussion should focus on the structure of emergency powers moving forward.

I believe there is a need to rein back in some of the authority that Congress has delegated to presidents just as a

constitutional concern, as a constitutional matter, which is why I am co-sponsoring a bill which has been introduced by our colleague Senator LEE which gives Congress a stronger voice in processes under the National Emergencies Act.

That bill will now be referred to the Homeland Security Committee. Chairman JOHNSON has said he will give that bill a hearing and then a markup. Then I would expect, at some point, that legislation will make its way to the Senate floor where we will have a debate and a vote.

The proposal would allow the President to maintain his statutory powers to declare an emergency, but that declaration would end after 30 days unless Congress affirmatively votes to extend it. This would maintain a President's ability to provide funding during national emergencies while restoring Congress's proper authority under article I of the Constitution. I think this is an honest and important effort to hopefully prevent us from ending up in this predicament in the future.

The real cause of where we are today is just politics—Ms. PELOSI's deciding that building any border barrier was immoral, after Democrats and Republicans had not made that a particularly political decision in the past. In fact, it had been bipartisan that we did support it as one tool in the toolbox for Border Patrol, in addition to technology and personnel, some physical barriers.

Rather than scolding the President of the United States for exercising statutory authority that Congress has already given, we should try to work together to solve these problems rather than engaging in the kind of political brinkmanship that brings us here today. We should fix—should it be the will of Congress—this massive delegation of authority not just to this President but to any President since 1976.

I have to disagree with our colleague from Colorado and others who suggest that what is happening at the border is not serious. By the way, I haven't heard any of them suggest any alternative solutions. Perhaps instead of Border Patrol securing the border we ought to have police officers at the border directing traffic, waving people through to their chosen destination. I think that would be a terrible mistake, but that seems to be the only alternative our friends across the aisle are offering to this humanitarian crisis and emergency at the border.

Last month, 76,000 people illegally crossed the border and were apprehended by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, making this an 11-year high. So rather than 76,000 people in 1 month, which our Democratic colleagues don't seem to think is a problem, let's say next month it is 150,000 or 300,000 or 600,000. As long as we have this attraction for people from other countries to come to the United States, and if they pay the fee to the criminal organizations that transport them

here, they will successfully make their way into the United States. They are going to keep coming.

It is clear this problem isn't going away, and it is overwhelming the communities along the border as well as the Federal Government's ability to deal with it.

I remember what the Director of Customs and Border Protection said. He said: When the Border Patrol is handing out diapers and juice boxes to children coming across the border, the drug cartels will exploit that and move their poison into the United States. I will just remind my colleagues that more than 70,000 Americans died of drug overdoses last year alone. A substantial amount of it was synthetic opioids in the form of fentanyl, but a lot of it had to do with heroin that had made its way from Mexico into the United States because 90 percent of the heroin that comes into the United States comes from Mexico. So while the Border Patrol is handing out diapers and juice boxes, the drug cartels are moving in heroin, fentanyl, and methamphetamine across the border into our Nation and getting rich in the process.

We know border security is complicated, and that it is not just about security, it is about facilitating legitimate trade, travel, and commerce. Last year alone, there was \$300 billion worth of commerce that took place just at Texas ports of entry with Mexico—\$300 billion. That supports an awful lot of American jobs.

The terrain in the 1,200-mile border between Texas and Mexico varies significantly. What works well in one sector does not work well in another. What I continue to hear from my constituents, including elected officials at the border, is that if this is the Border Patrol telling us what they need in order to succeed to do the job we have asked them to do, we are all in, but if this is just politics and elected officials in Washington trying to micromanage the solution along the border, we are skeptical. This is what they tell me, and I don't blame them.

I think we need to take action to adequately fund our border security missions, and I hope our discussions in the coming months will be more productive than they will be this year.

I will vote against the resolution of disapproval today and encourage my colleagues to instead ask my colleagues to focus their energy on reforming the legislation that got us into this situation to begin with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am here this afternoon to support the resolution that would terminate the President's unconstitutional emergency declaration. It is a declaration that would take money away from critical military construction projects to fund a costly and ineffective border wall.

Congress did not provide these funds for a border wall that President Trump

promised Mexico would pay for; rather, we specifically allocated these resources that are being talked about to be used by the President for the wall to ensure that our military is ready and capable and that our servicemembers receive the support they deserve.

The President's attempt to circumvent Congress by making the military pay for his border wall jeopardizes our national security and does a disservice to our men and women in uniform. That is why the House passed the legislation on the Senate floor today and why I introduced legislation with my colleagues in the Senate to terminate the emergency declaration.

The resources Congress has provided support military construction projects in New Hampshire and across the country. Those projects often provide necessary infrastructure improvements that enable our servicemembers to accomplish their mission.

Several of those projects that, I think, are potentially being reviewed for being added to the list of projects to have money taken from are at the Portsmouth Naval shipyard. It is one of the many installations that faces potential cuts in funding if this emergency declaration is executed. Congress has already approved funding for several projects at the shipyard and at our public shipyards around the country that support critical submarine maintenance, and any disruption to funding of those projects could lead to costly delays and to a reduction in military readiness because they would derail carefully laid plans to upgrade aging infrastructure. Delays in projects that support the shipyard's mission threaten to exacerbate the Navy's already high demand for submarine maintenance and the projected submarine shortfall in the coming years.

I recently sent a letter to President Trump and spoke with the leaders at DOD urging them to protect these important projects at the shipyard, but the only way to ensure that these projects move forward is to terminate the emergency declaration.

In addition to projects at the shipyard, the emergency declaration could also impact New Hampshire's National Guard readiness centers, which are in desperate need of modernization. A 2014 report from the Army National Guard ranked the condition of New Hampshire's National Guard facilities 51 out of 54 States and territories.

Our National Guard has been forced to shoulder an enormous burden since the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Servicemembers have often faced multiple deployments, and they still had to respond to national disasters at home and to other personal crises. The New Hampshire National Guard can't afford further delays to the readiness center improvements because of President Trump's emergency declaration.

These military construction projects in New Hampshire are at risk because President Trump wants to score political points by building a wall rather

than focusing on the border security proposals that actually work. I was disappointed to hear my colleague from Texas accusing Democrats of not supporting border security because, in fact, virtually everyone here has supported significant border security proposals in the past, including targeted fencing in vulnerable areas where we know fencing or barriers can make a difference. We have supported more Border Patrol agents, better surveillance and screening technologies, and increased security at the ports of entry.

Coming from a State where we have a huge challenge with the opioid epidemic, where we understand the impact of having cocaine and fentanyl and other drugs come across our border, I also know the best way to interdict those drugs is through the ports of entry. That is where most of them are coming from.

In a recent bipartisan budget agreement Congress provided, I supported, along with the majority of this Senate, nearly \$15 billion for Customs and Border Protection, including \$1.3 billion for physical infrastructure in vulnerable areas along the southern border. The reality at our borders is, the vast majority of drugs and contraband come through the ports of entry. They don't come through the areas between the ports of entry.

In the past 2 months alone, law enforcement officials have made the largest cocaine seizure in the past 25 years at Newark, NJ, and the largest fentanyl seizure ever at any port of entry in the U.S. in Arizona. Despite this reality, President Trump insists on having our military bear the burden to fulfill his campaign promise.

His insistence that the situation at the border requires the military to pay for his wall runs counter to what I have heard in the Senate Armed Services Committee from our military leaders. In a recent Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, General O'Shaughnessy, Commander of U.S. Northern Command, testified that the threats to our Nation on our southern border are not military in nature, and he has never advised the President that a border wall is necessary to support his mission. Just this morning, we heard testimony at our SASC hearing with Secretary Shanahan and Joint Chiefs Chairman Dunford that we have more troops on our southern border with Mexico than we have in all of Europe, on Europe's eastern border with Russia, and we have almost as many on our southern border, and one-quarter as many as we have on the DMZ on the border with North Korea. By any measure, North Korea and Russia pose a greater threat to our national security than Mexico. It is a policy that does not make sense. Yet we have more troops on the southern border now than we do in Eastern Europe and in Syria.

The fact is, the men and women at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and at the New Hampshire National Guard

and men and women serving in our military across this country should not be forced to sacrifice readiness for an unnecessary border wall that takes funding away from projects that this Congress has already approved that are going forward.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect Congress's constitutional authority and defend our national security by supporting the resolution to terminate President Trump's emergency declaration.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 90 minutes of debate, equally divided, remaining on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

LIBERIAN-AMERICANS

Mr. REED. Madam President, I come to the floor today to plead on behalf of Liberians who face the immediate threat of deportation from the only home many of them have known.

I have come to the floor many times over the last two decades to highlight the plight of Liberians, who, after fleeing civil wars, political turmoil, economic instability, and deadly disease, were given the ability to stay in the United States and work, pay taxes, and contribute to our country and local communities by successive Republican and Democratic administrations—that is, until last year, when this President terminated deferred enforced departures, DED, the most recent status offered to Liberians. I urge the President to reconsider his decision and reinstate DED by March 31 to save Liberians from being forced to leave their jobs, their families, and their homes.

Moreover, the Liberian community deserves a long-term solution. That is why I also urge my colleagues to take up S. 456, the Liberian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act, to end the perpetual limbo for Liberians here in the United States and ensure our national security interest in fostering Liberia's recovery. This bill provides legal status and a pathway to citizenship for qualifying Liberians. I have introduced similar legislation continuously since coming to the Senate and have worked to include its key objectives in comprehensive immigration reform bills that passed the Senate in years gone by, only to die in the House of Representatives.

I have been joined in this mission by countless advocates and many colleagues, including my Rhode Island colleague, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, as well as Senators KLOBUCHAR, SMITH, DURBIN, CARDIN, VAN HOLLEN, and others. I thank them for their support and urge the rest of our colleagues to join us in supporting the Liberians

who are hard at work enriching our communities.

Today, I met with several Liberians from Rhode Island. I hope my colleagues similarly meet with Liberians from their States so they can hear firsthand about what would be lost if these members of our communities are deported.

Beginning with its founding in the early 19th century by freed American slaves, our country has had deep ties with Liberia. It goes without saying that when Liberians faced tragedy, with their country engulfed by a civil war that would last from 1989 to 1997, claiming the lives of thousands, displacing more than half the country's population, halting food production, collapsing the economy, and destroying its infrastructure, that our country would open its arms.

By 1991, an estimated 14,000 Liberians had fled to the United States. In March of that year, the Attorney General under President Bush granted them the opportunity to register for temporary protected status, TPS.

Before the prospects for a safe return could be realized, Liberia plunged into a second civil war from 1999 to 2003. This horrific conflict ended with the departure from power of former President Charles Taylor, who is currently serving a 50-year prison sentence by the Special Court for Sierra Leone for war crimes.

In 2014, still poverty-stricken and struggling to recover, Liberia found itself plunged into an extensive outbreak of the Ebola virus. Ebola killed an estimated nearly 5,000 of the over 10,000 persons in Liberia who contracted the disease. The outbreak overwhelmed the country's already fragile healthcare system, infrastructure, and economy while exacerbating social tensions.

Throughout these tragic conflicts and challenges, Liberians who fled to the United States have been granted the ability to stay here either under TPS or DED while conditions remain unstable in Liberia. In order to participate, these Liberians had to submit to vigorous vetting, pay hefty fees, and stay out of trouble with the law.

While unable to access earned benefits available to American citizens, these statuses at least allowed Liberians to apply for work authorizations so they could join the workforce or start their own businesses, pay taxes, and raise families. Once again, they work, but they do not earn any of the benefits other Americans earn.

They have found themselves and their communities have found them to be some of the most responsible, hard-working, and decent people we see throughout our communities. Many of these individuals have American citizen children who attend American schools and serve in our military. These children have known no home other than America. They are Americans, and it would be a tragedy if their parents and grandparents were sud-

denly taken away, physically taken away and sent back to Liberia, because for all of them, since the early 1990s, America has been their home.

In the years since 1989, Liberians have become our neighbors and friends, pastors, soldiers, police officers, health workers, and many more professions. They are an important community that contributes a great deal of diversity and prosperity in States like Rhode Island, Minnesota, Idaho, and other places around the country. It would do our country no good and would be simply cruel to uproot these Liberians from their families, employers, and communities.

Moreover, deporting these Liberians would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and destabilizing to the already fragile West African region. We must pursue all possible efforts to ensure regional stability by fostering Liberia's continuous post-war and post-Ebola crisis recovery. We must also continue to build on our country's substantial foreign policy investments over the past years, including U.S. bilateral assistance and peacekeeping investments in the region.

Given Liberia's precarious condition and lack of resources, the sudden deportation of as many as 4,500 affected people to Liberia would overburden the country's limited infrastructure and ability to maintain peace and deliver essential services, all the while sabotaging the hopes for progress following the country's first democratic transition of power in years that occurred last year. Deporting this population would also cause Liberia economic harm by curtailing crucial private sector investment and socioeconomic assistance that Liberians in America have long provided in the form of remittances to their relatives in Liberia.

I again plead with the Trump administration to reinstate DED. Please don't separate and uproot hundreds of Liberian-American families from their jobs and homes and force them to return to a country that is unrecognizable for many of them. These Liberians are Americans in every sense of the word except for a piece of paper.

While discussions continue about the best path forward for Dreamers and TPS, Liberians cannot wait another month or another year. They have just over 2 weeks before their time may be up.

In my view, with each year that has passed since the first of these Liberians arrived, the case has grown stronger that they should have the option to adjust their status and remain in the communities where they have made their homes and raised their families.

We have long since reached the point where simple justice requires that Congress extend this option to these Liberians. So in addition to urging President Trump to reinstate DED, I also urge my colleagues to take up and pass the Liberian Refugee Immigration

Fairness Act and put an end to uncertainty for this population after decades of displacement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise, as colleagues of mine have earlier today, to talk about the President's emergency declaration. Before I do, I will just say that this declaration deals with budgetary matters at the end of the day, whether the President should be able to take \$6.1 billion this year and possibly more in future years from the Pentagon's budget to deal with a nonbudgetary emergency.

I want to acknowledge that today is the last day of my budget staffer, my right hand on all Federal budget matters for the last 6½ years, Ron Storhaug. I am going to miss him. I has done such a good job. My only good feeling is that he is staying right here in the Senate and moving to work with the senior Senator from Maryland.

I want to talk about the declaration and urge my colleagues to vote to reject what I believe is the President's unwise use of his power to raid the Pentagon's budget.

Is there an emergency at the border? There is a serious issue at the border—a whole series of serious issues, negative but also positive. Trade happens across all the borders of the country. But all the testimony before the Armed Services Committee, where I sit, says there is no military emergency at the border. We heard testimony from General O'Shaughnessy, who is the commander of what we call NORTHCOM—everything in the Americas north of Mexico's southern border. General O'Shaughnessy said there is no military emergency at the border between the United States and Mexico. We heard the same testimony this morning from Defense Secretary Shanahan and the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dunford. So there is no military emergency at the border.

Compared to other significant challenges we deal with—70,000 drug overdose deaths a year, climate change, 40,000 deaths a year from gun violence, including both homicides and suicides, homelessness, lack of medical care, military housing—it is hard to see why the border issue would be an emergency that would rise to the top of any list. I can certainly assert this: There are much higher priorities for Virginians.

While we could argue about whether it is an emergency, one thing I think is pretty clear—it is inarguably a Presidential power grab. The President is unhappy with congressional appropriations for the border, so he is declaring an emergency to take \$6.1 billion this year and possibly more in future years from the Pentagon's budget. This will establish a very dangerous precedent.

First, let's focus on the President's being unhappy. For all of this Presi-

dent's tenure up until January 3, he had two Republican Houses. There were two Republican Houses and a Republican President. Why should he be unhappy with the budget? He would have had the ability to convince Republican majorities to do what he wanted, but he could not. So he is unhappy with what Congress, the appropriating branch, has put on the table. We put billions of dollars on the table for the border, but he is unhappy with it, and so now he is going to declare an emergency.

It raises two important questions. Can a President just declare an emergency every time he is unhappy that Congress doesn't accept his budgetary proposals? Second, can the President use the declaration of a nonmilitary emergency to just tap a spigot into the Pentagon's budget? That is exactly what President Trump is trying to do in this case.

The President has declared an emergency that all agree is a nonmilitary emergency. The President said: I want to take \$6.1 billion from the Pentagon's budget to deal with this emergency.

He wants to take \$3.6 billion from military construction. Military construction are the funds we use to build facilities on our military bases across the United States and across the world or to rebuild facilities, like the airbase at Tyndall or the big sections of Camp Lejeune that were hit in hurricanes last year. That is what the MILCON budget is supposed to do.

This morning, I toured Fort Belvoir to visit with Army families living at Fort Belvoir in Fairfax County, VA. They shared with me atrocious stories about the condition of the housing they are living in. These are atrocious stories of rodent infestation, black mold, lead, and asbestos. I drove by one military house at Fort Belvoir that had a big warning sign on the door: "Poison." You could not enter it because of efforts at asbestos and lead remediation.

The families told me about the poor physical conditions of their properties. They told me about the fact that they couldn't get a response when they were trying to get help. Then they told me, tragically, about the illnesses of their children, hospitalizations, and having to move out of their homes and apartments. One mother of a 10-year-old talked about the fact that her 10-year-old daughter, because of mold in her military housing unit, missed 45 days of school in the last school year. Her daughter had to be absent for a quarter of the school year because of the poor physical conditions of military housing.

The MILCON budget is there to deal with issues like these. Yet the President wants to take \$3.6 billion out of the MILCON budget. The President wants to take \$2.5 billion out of the drug-interdiction budget within the Department of Defense. Press reports suggest that account only has about \$85 million available, so what they

would need to do is cannibalize other accounts to fill up that account to \$2.5 billion to then take out. Those are the important funds—military construction and drug interdiction—the President is proposing to raid.

I think it is important to notice this: The President's emergency declaration is not just about tapping the budget this year for \$6.1 billion. Earlier today, in an Armed Services hearing, I asked Secretary Shanahan: Doesn't this emergency declaration last until the President declares it is over? If we don't rebut the emergency, it will not just be fiscal year 2019; it will be fiscal year 2020 or 2021 and beyond. It will enable the President to tap a spigot into the MILCON budget and draw out monies this year, next year, and in future years. So it is \$6.1 billion that he is asking for this year, but unless Congress asserts its article I power to say, no, we are the appropriators, we will basically be allowing the President to tap into this fund in perpetuity, thereby affecting important military construction priorities that would be good for the military families and our Nation's defense.

Which military construction projects might be compromised by the President's use of this \$6.1 billion?

When the President declared the emergency, I wrote a letter to Secretary Shanahan on February 15 and asked: Can you give us a list of the projects that will be compromised by this \$6.1 billion raid on the Pentagon's budget? I have not received a response. That was 27 days ago.

This morning, before the committee, Secretary Shanahan was asked: Why haven't we received a list? If the President wants to take \$6.1 billion out of the Pentagon's budget, give us a list of the potential projects that could be affected.

I wrote a letter on the 15th, and staffers have been reaching out to the Pentagon. If you do not know precisely the projects, give us the universe—all unobligated MILCON projects on your priority list that could possibly be affected. Today, after not responding to the requests, Secretary Shanahan said that he will send us a list at the end of the day: I will send you a list, basically, after you vote this afternoon.

The vote that we will be casting this afternoon is about whether the President should be able to raid the Pentagon's budget for \$6.1 billion. For a month, we have been asking what projects might be affected, and they are now proposing to give us an answer to the question after the vote. They have had the list since the very day we asked them. They keep a list every day about unobligated MILCON projects, but the service secretaries are not allowed to share those lists with Congress until the Secretary of Defense allows them to, and he is going to allow us to see it today.

Everybody is voting to cannibalize the Pentagon's budget to the tune of \$6.1 billion. All of the Senators should

be interested in what projects might be affected in their own States that are necessary to the Nation's defense before they vote to give the President this power.

In conclusion, I hope, today, we will stand up against the President's power grab. We shouldn't let the President tap a spigot into the Pentagon's budget to deal with an emergency that all have agreed is a nonmilitary emergency. We shouldn't let him tap a spigot that is not just for this budgetary year but for future fiscal years, as well, which is the effect of the vote today.

We are the article I branch, and under that section of the Constitution, we set the spending priorities. Because he is unhappy with our work product, the President should not be able to overturn the spending priorities that we have established in our appropriations bills and raid the Pentagon's budget without telling us where the moneys will come from.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to talk a little bit about the emergency declaration by the President. It is a bad idea. I think everybody in this body knows it is a bad idea, and we will see how many people will vote to override that bad idea. It is a bad idea for a number of reasons.

The President says it is for this country's safety, but he is robbing from our military to build a wall on the southern border. Yet, I might add, most of the money that we allocated in the last fiscal year is still there—\$1.3 billion—plus the \$1.375 billion that was authorized by the conference committee, made up of a group of Democrats and Republicans from the House and the Senate, which means it was passed by both bodies. It was money that he received but to which he said "I don't like it" and declared an emergency declaration.

Look, Montana is no stranger to military service. We are home to the second-most veterans per capita of any State in the country. Every time our Nation is in need, Montanans step up to the plate and answer the call to serve. That is why, today, I rise to fight back against the President's declaration, for it will be shortchanging our troops in favor of a campaign promise to build a wall that he said Mexico would pay for.

The President's plan to raid our military resources would directly hurt Montana's military community and its men and women in uniform. The heart of the Air Force's Global Strike Command is located in Great Falls, MT, at Malmstrom Air Force Base. The 341st Missile Wing at Malmstrom is a critical component of our Nation's nuclear triad. It is our great deterrent against adversaries who would do us harm. As President Kennedy said, it is our ace in the hole.

Over the past few years, I have been fighting to secure the military con-

struction dollars on the Appropriations Committee to meet the needs of the Malmstrom Air Force Base. I led a bipartisan effort to deliver more than \$19 million to construct a new Tactical Response Force Alert Facility. That facility was a top priority for Malmstrom because the current facility is old, laden with asbestos and lead-based paint, and this has complicated efforts to secure the base's missile sites.

I also helped to secure some \$14.6 million for the construction of a missile maintenance dispatch facility. This facility will allow the base to more properly and efficiently store critical components and equipment for the missile field and to retrofit its hangar so we can ultimately house the replacement fleet for its Vietnam-era Hueys, which should be replaced in the next couple of years. Unfortunately, the construction of these facilities and of many others around the country is at risk because of the President's decision.

More alarmingly, Malmstrom is in critical need of a weapons generation facility, and I have been fighting for years to ensure that this project is included among the Air Force's top military construction priorities. Just yesterday, the Secretary of the Air Force confirmed that the funding for the facility has been included in the fiscal year 2020 Air Force budget request. This investment represents a significant step forward for Malmstrom Air Force Base, for the Air Force, and for our national security. It is important because this is where ICBM warheads are maintained and stored.

As a result of the deterioration of this facility, airmen and missileers must confront numerous safety and security challenges while carrying out their missions every day. Yet now we have to tell them that this critical project, which the Air Force has said it desperately needs and which it does desperately need, could very well get kicked down the road and down the list of priorities because the President would rather spend billions of the military construction money on the construction of his wall.

The same is true for other critical infrastructure investments at Malmstrom, including a new security forces compound, but the President doesn't care. He is more interested in robbing taxpayer funds to build an unnecessary wall on the southern border, but Congress has rejected the President's request on a bipartisan basis. His defiance of that rejection comes at the expense of my State's defense installations.

Great Falls is also home to the Montana Air National Guard. My older brother was in the Air Guard for 35 years, and I have seen their work up close. Since we entered the Middle East conflict 17 years ago, this country has used the Guard like never before. They have asked a lot of our citizen soldiers and airmen, and they have always delivered whether that be when they were deploying to war, fighting against

wildfires, or saving families from natural disasters.

In Montana, they have asked for little in return. They have asked for the construction of a new aircraft apron to park and store the Guard's C-130 fleet. Once again, we got to work, and we secured the money—\$9 million—to make sure that our C-130s would stay in good shape for years to come. Max Baucus and I fought hard to bring those C-130s to Montana, which is why I am so outraged that the President's emergency declaration puts this funding at risk. I know that nobody in this body takes the decision of sending young men and women to war lightly, but when those difficult decisions are made, we had better deploy them with the best and the safest equipment.

The debate today is clear: A vote against the President's disaster declaration is a vote to protect our equal branches of government, our system of checks and balances, and our Constitution. A vote for the President's power grab is a vote for Federal overreach and is a violation of our oath of office.

I hope my colleagues who vote for this plan are on the first plane back home to explain to their constituents why they are shirking their basic duties. I hope they explain to their communities—and there are many like Great Falls, MT—why they are ripping those investments out of their towns and out of our military. I hope they explain to our future leaders why it is OK to follow the Constitution only when it is expedient.

This disaster declaration undermines the bipartisan work that the Republicans and Democrats have done to rebuild our military. It sets a dangerous precedent that, no doubt, will be abused by future Presidents, and everybody in this body knows that.

We have an option here. We have the ability to stand with our troops and to stand with the Constitution and reject this declaration. It is critically important if we are going to have a strong military. I think we decided in the last Congress to make investments into our military that were much needed, and now the President is pulling those dollars out. It is nothing short of ridiculous.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

GM CLOSURES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I concur with the comments of my friend from Montana. I know what this President wants to potentially do to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and to the air bases in Springfield, in my hometown of Mansfield, in Youngstown, and in Toledo in my State and so much more.

Last week, we got yet another clear illustration of whose side President Trump is on. All week, we got news of favor after favor from the Trump administration in what it is doing for Wall Street. The White House looks

like a retreat for Wall Street executives except on the days it looks like a retreat for drug company executives.

Wall Street banks have complained to the President about the Volcker rule. That is the rule that stops the big banks from taking big risks with American families' money. Wall Street didn't like it, but it had passed this Congress a decade ago. The rules were being written far too slowly because of Wall Street's influence even during the Obama years, but because Wall Street didn't like it, the Trump administration agreed to rewrite them. The Wall Street banks complained that even the rewrite was not weak enough, so the administration reportedly is going to water it down even further.

Secretary Mnuchin, the Secretary of the Treasury—another Wall Street guy who was appointed by this President—announced he is going to go easier on shadow banks, and the Fed announced it would make it easier for big banks to pass the annual stress test. It is like this body and Senator MCCONNELL, who is down the hall, have forgotten what happened 10 years ago. It is this collective amnesia that has worked its virus through this body and through the administration so that people forget what happened 10 years ago with regard to our economy.

My wife and I live in Cleveland, OH—ZIP Code 44105. In the first half of 2007, that ZIP Code had more foreclosures than any ZIP Code in the United States. I see what happens when people lose their homes. I think about what happens to families who have to explain it to their children, who have to give away their pets, who have to move to new school districts—all the things that happen to families when their homes are foreclosed on or when they are evicted from their apartments. Yet none of these executives seem to mind. None of these executives have to have those conversations. Nobody in the Trump administration has to have those conversations with one's kids.

The Trump administration is weakening the stress test. It is weakening some of the capital. It is simply doing Wall Street's bidding over and over—and that was just last week. Of course, we know that comes after 2 years of this President's and this Congress's doing Wall Street's bidding.

To me, the one what was even more personal was how this administration decided to weaken the overtime rule. Here is how it works. If somebody is making \$40,000 a year and is working as a night manager at a restaurant, say, or at any kind of job in which one may manage a few people and is making \$35,000 or \$40,000 or \$45,000 a year, if the top people of the company give this gentleman or gentlewoman who is doing this job the title of management, then they don't have to pay him or her overtime.

They can work them 45, they can work them 50, they can work them 60 hours a week and pay them not a dime of overtime—nothing. They get a salary for 40 hours.

So you take a worker, you pay that worker \$45,000 a year, \$40,000 a year, the owners of the company classify them as management, and they can refuse to pay them for the extra 10 or 15 hours. That is 10 or 15 hours without pay or it is 10 or 15 hours away from family, away from raising your kids, and the administration, of course, sided with the companies. Of course, they sided with Wall Street. Of course, they betrayed workers. They never ever side with workers.

Look at Youngstown, OH, right now. This President stood by while General Motors closed the Chevy Cruze plant. It had been there 53 years—Lordstown, OH, a valley of about 400,000 people. This is 5,000 jobs. There are probably another 4,000 to 5,000 jobs for people who worked in the supply chain and made components that go into the Chevy Cruze. I asked the President personally—first, he didn't even know about the plant closing when I talked to him, even though by that time they had laid off about half of the workers. Then I asked him face-to-face, and I asked him on the phone to actually call the CEO of GM to make an appeal to say: Instead of using your huge tax cut that you got from the White House to build more jobs overseas and to do stock buybacks so the executives are getting richer, how about investing in this General Motors plant, how about retooling, which this company has done many times in the past?

I remember one of the best days, other than the birth of six of my grandchildren during my last term in the Senate, during that several years—I remember the best day of that last term was when President Obama, Secretary of Labor Perez, and I stood together in Columbus, OH, at Jeni's ice cream, and we announced that the Obama administration was going to update that salary threshold on the overtime rule. If you work extra hours, you get extra pay, you get time and a half under the law—under the law the way that President Obama did it.

The Obama rule would have meant that more than 4 million Americans—130,000 people just in my State, 130,000 people, if they work 10 hours, they get hundreds of dollars in overtime pay. If they are working 50 hours instead of 40, they literally would get—depending on their wage, of course—at least another \$100 in their pay.

Now, because of Trump and the Secretary of Labor in this administration—first because of some judges and now the President—those workers never got that raise.

Attorneys general around the country, Republican, far-right attorneys general, including one in the Presiding Officer's State, are always glad to do the bidding of their corporate sponsors. They are always glad to do the bidding of billionaires. They are always glad to do the bidding of the richest 1 percent in this country. They blocked it.

Now President Trump has come up with a new rule that leaves most of those workers behind.

Again, these aren't rich executives who are working. I am sure the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Texas, most of us work well over 40 hours in these jobs. We get paid a salary; it is a good salary. We shouldn't get paid overtime; neither should a corporate lawyer who is working more than 40 hours overtime, and neither should an executive nor should a doctor who works more than 40 hours get overtime. But these are workers who are making \$30,000 and \$35,000 and \$40,000 a year, and you classify them as management, so you refuse to pay them overtime. That is what this rule is about. It means that millions of ordinary workers are not getting the pay they have earned.

As if the richest 1 percent aren't doing well enough without this rule, President Trump again—President Trump again—betrayed workers. Again he stood with the billionaires. Again he stood with the largest corporations that ship jobs overseas.

It comes down to whose side you are on. Are you on Wall Street's side? Are you on the side of Senator MCCONNELL, who responds to every special interest in this country that wants something from this Senate? Are you on their side or are you going to be on the side of the American workers?

This President came to Youngstown. He promised to fight for American workers. He breaks that promise damn near every single day. He breaks it over and over and over.

If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. I wish President Trump would understand that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

H.J. RES. 46

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the vote that we will take later today on this floor regarding the President's national emergency declaration.

From the outset of this process, I have had two objectives. One is to support the President on the crisis at the border. I believe his plan to address that crisis is a good one, and we should support it. But, second is to do it in the right way, without setting a dangerous new precedent counter to a fundamental constitutional principle, without tying up the needed funds for the border in the courts, and without taking funds away from important military construction projects for our troops.

Unfortunately, despite a sincere effort by the administration as recently as this morning to try to work with me and other colleagues, including the Presiding Officer, we were not able to agree on a path forward that addresses those concerns that I just outlined.

I am going to lay out in a minute how I think we can better achieve the President's goals of strengthening our border security without invoking the national emergency and the funding he

seeks through that national emergency.

First, let me repeat what I have said on this floor many times and said consistently: I do believe we have a crisis at the border—a humanitarian crisis, a trafficking crisis, a drug crisis. According to Customs and Border Protection, in February—last month—76,000 illegal immigrants arrived at our southern border. That is an average of about 2,000 every day. Since October of last year, we have apprehended more than 268,000 people at the border. That is about a 100-percent increase over the same period last year. We have also seen a 300-percent increase in families arriving at the border compared to this time last year. By the way, the vast majority of those are from three countries in Central America.

This is a humanitarian crisis. The journey to the United States from these so-called Northern Triangle countries is incredibly dangerous, especially for women and for children. They face violence from gangs and traffickers and hunger and dehydration in the rough terrain. Many of them arrive at our border traumatized, hurt, sick, and often we don't have the resources to provide for those needs.

There is also a growing human trafficking crisis. Our lack of border security allows these smugglers—human smugglers—to move across the border unchecked. Increasingly, they are taking advantage of these flows of individuals to traffic women and children.

In particular, I will say the Border Patrol resources are spread thin trying to monitor these areas that do not have barriers.

Third, this is a drug crisis. The Drug Enforcement Agency has said that the southwest border “remains the primary entry point for heroin into the United States.” That is not a debatable point. I am told that with regard to Ohio, where we have been devastated by the opioid epidemic, over 90 percent of the heroin is coming across the southern border.

Fentanyl, the deadliest drug of all, which comes primarily from China and primarily through the U.S. mail system—50 times more powerful than heroin—is increasingly coming across the southern border too. Yesterday I learned from Customs and Border Protection that fentanyl seizures along the border between the ports of entry have increased by 400 percent between 2016 and 2018.

As we are finally beginning to make progress on the opioid crisis in my home State of Ohio and around the country, finally reducing the number of heroin and other opioid overdose deaths for the first time in 8 years, we are seeing a reduction in those deaths, but crystal meth and the devastation it causes is coming back—coming back with a vengeance. It is more pure than ever, more powerful than ever, and it is coming from Mexico.

Some of you may remember in your own communities the issue of crystal

meth labs being in people's houses and the environmental damage it caused and the crystal meth being cooked. That is not happening much anymore. Why? Because the pure crystal meth from Mexico is so much more powerful and less expensive; it is cheap.

Law enforcement tells me that on the streets of Columbus, OH, pure crystal meth is now plentiful and less expensive than marijuana—and far more dangerous. Where is this coming from? It is coming from Mexico.

Even with limited resources, in fiscal year 2018, Customs and Border Protection seized almost a half million pounds of marijuana and 11,000 pounds of methamphetamine between ports of entry. At the ports of entry, they seized over 1,700 pounds of fentanyl—by the way, that is enough to kill about 3 billion people—1,700 pounds of fentanyl, three flecks of which can kill you, 56,000 pounds of meth, and nearly 52,000 pounds of cocaine.

Frankly, that is the tip of the iceberg. Most of it is getting through. They are checking only a small percentage of shipments, meaning the vast majority of drugs are coming across our borders undetected. We need to do more.

There is no question we need stronger border security. Again, I support the plan the President has outlined, including the \$5.7 billion the President has requested for walls and other barriers.

That \$5.7 billion number, by the way, wasn't just picked out of thin air. It funds the top 10 priorities of the Customs and Border Protection Border Security Improvement Plan. The experts have given us a plan, and the President's \$5.7 billion simply funds what the experts have said.

This plan, by the way, the expert's border security plan, has been embraced by this Congress in the last two appropriations bills. They pointed to that plan and said: This is the path forward. These are the experts. It is not controversial.

By the way, the experts have recommended not that we build a wall from sea to shining sea—it has been mischaracterized as that—but 234 miles of barriers, walls, and other fencing at places where people cross the border most frequently, primarily in the State of Texas, primarily in the urban areas—places where it will make the most difference.

Funding for these types of barriers has been included in the budget requests from previous administrations, of course. Previous administrations have built hundreds of miles of fencing—over 500 miles.

It has also been included in appropriations bills passed by Congress during the last two appropriation cycles by both Republicans and Democrats. Why is it that this administration can't build the barriers that other administrations have and that Congress in the past has supported?

Of course it is not just about more physical barriers, and the President's

plan also recognizes that. It calls for more Border Patrol agents, more technology, more surveillance, more drones, more cameras, more screening at our ports of entry, more technology to stop this illegal flow of drugs. That is also a significant part of the plan.

But erecting more barriers and fencing in key areas along the border will help stem the tide. It will ease the burden on our Border Security personnel and allow them to focus their resources more effectively.

It is time to listen to the experts and give them what they need to carry out their important mission, but we have to do that in the right way.

As we all learned in high school, our government has a system of checks and balances. It gives some powers to the President; it gives some powers to Congress. Our Constitution explicitly gives the U.S. Congress what is called the power of the purse.

Congress, not the President, has the sole authority to determine how to spend taxpayer money, and that is appropriate. After all, we are here to represent the people. We are most accountable to the taxpayers. Once we appropriate the money for a specific purpose, then it is the President and the executive branch that are responsible for administering those programs.

We had our spending fight here in Congress. I thought we should give the President the full amount of money he requested for barriers, and I voted that way. At the end of the day, Congress decided to give him only some, not all, of the funds he requested.

Under current law and current congressional approval and authorities, without declaring a national emergency, President Trump can actually access additional funds that get him to the \$5.7 billion he requested. As the Wall Street Journal said in a recent editorial opposing a national emergency, “The President doesn't need to invoke a national emergency to build his wall along the southern border.”

Declaring a national emergency to access different funds sets a dangerous new precedent. The use of national emergency powers to circumvent Congress's explicit decision on funding is unprecedented. No President has ever used what is called the National Emergencies Act in this way. As a result, it opens the door for future Presidents to implement just about any policy they want and to take funding from other areas Congress has already decided on without Congress's approval.

Once a President declares an emergency, he or she has access to a lot of power. Some would say nearly unlimited power. A future President could seize industries or could control means of communication. Think of the internet. A future President may well say that climate change is a national emergency and use emergency authorities to implement the Green New Deal. By the way, according to a new study by Douglas Holtz-Eakin at the American Action Forum, the proposed policies in the Green New Deal would cost

between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over the next 10 years when added up together. Obviously, that is not sustainable. It is an astounding price tag. In fact, as Senator ALEXANDER said on the floor earlier today, future Presidents could actually use this emergency authority to tear down the very wall we are now constructing, and some Democrats running for President have said that is what they intend to do. That is what they want to do.

The President is using the National Emergencies Act to take funds away from a particular area of spending. It is called military construction funds. Only twice before have Presidents declared a national emergency in order to transfer military construction funds away from congressionally designated projects into other priorities. In both of those situations, we were at war, and the Secretary of Defense transferred the funds to support the war effort, and Congress did not object. Although there is a crisis at our southern border, we are not in wartime, and there are funds available to address border security.

The President wants to do more to address the crisis at the border, and I do, too, and he can do more. The President has available to him enough funds, right now, to begin building all the barriers he has requested without resorting to national emergency funds. I support his using those funds to get to the full \$5.7 billion he requested for barriers on the southern border.

Here is how we could access it without using the national emergency. First would be the \$1.375 billion appropriated by this Congress for the barriers. By the way, that is the most that has ever been appropriated in a fiscal year, ever, for the purpose of barriers. Second, he can access, as he intends to do, \$601 million from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund. He could do that without a national emergency. Third, he could access funding through the DOD counter-drug account. He has said that he would like to access about \$2.5 billion from that account, but he could actually access, under our laws that we have passed here—and we have given him authority to access—up to \$4 billion. This adds up, as we can see, to over \$5.7 billion—almost \$6 billion—which is at the President's disposal without moving to the national emergency that he has invoked. My hope is that the President will take this approach.

I think using those funds is a better way to accomplish our border security goals. Precisely because the President does not need to declare a national emergency, these funds are far more certain. The \$3.6 billion the President takes from the military construction projects is uncertain because these funds are likely to be tied up in constitutional litigation for months, probably years. By the way, the President has rightly acknowledged that.

Under the National Emergencies Act, Congress has given the President flexi-

bility to address significant threats to our Nation's well-being, and we want him to have that flexibility. It was critical for President Bush to act quickly and decisively in the days after the 9/11 attacks. But short of that type of situation, it is imperative for the President to honor Congress's constitutional role to make policy and appropriate money. A national emergency declaration is a tool to be used cautiously and sparingly. That is why I co-sponsored legislation, authored by Senator MIKE LEE, to amend the National Emergencies Act to ensure that Congress does have more control over these decisions in the future.

So in my view, the best resolution here is for the President to use that nearly \$6 billion in funding that he has at his disposal to implement his plan, and, then, ask Congress for additional funding during the next appropriations cycle, which, by the way, begins on October 1 of this year.

This approach, again, has three distinct advantages. One, it would not set the dangerous precedent we discussed today. Second, the funds could actually get to the border because they will not be tied up in litigation. Third, it would fully protect important military construction projects in Ohio and around the country—including, by the way, funding for the National Air and Space Intelligence Center, or NASIC, at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; an automated, multipurpose machine gun range at Camp James A. Garfield; a fire station replacement at Mansfield Lahm Airport; a small arms range at Rickenbacker International Airport, and a main gate relocation project at Youngstown Air Reserve Station. All of those are things in the current fiscal year Military Construction appropriations bill that benefit Ohio. I am a strong supporter and advocate for Ohio's military facilities and our research institutions, and I will continue to work to ensure that our key military construction projects at these strategic facilities can continue to move forward.

I have worked on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. I have had the honor of being a Senator and a Congressman on this side, and I have worked for two White Houses. In fact, I was Associate Counsel to President Bush 41 in his White House Counsel's office. I know how hard it can be for the executive branch, the President, and Congress to find the balance that our Founders intended between the executive branch and the legislative branch, but our Founders drew a clear line on at least one thing: Congress, closest to the people, would have the power of the purse.

When President Obama bypassed Congress and took executive action to create new immigration policy back in 2012, I spoke out. I criticized him because of the constitutionality issue. I said I agreed with President Obama that our immigration system was—and, by the way, still is—broken. I agreed we needed to work together to

fix it, but, I said that it doesn't mean that a President can ignore Congress, substitute his own judgment for the will of the people, and make up new laws on his own. That is what I said President Obama did. I believed it was wrong then.

I believe the President's use of the national emergency declaration to access already approved military construction project funding is wrong now. I support his goals. President Trump is right that we have a crisis, and I support his plans to secure the border, and he can fully fund it in a more reliable way. By the way, anyone who cares about getting that money to the border to build walls ought to want that certainty.

Each one of us in this body has sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. So today I will vote to support the disapproval resolution that is before us.

I know the President has the votes to pursue his approach. Even if the disapproval resolution passes, he can veto it, and his veto will be sustained. I know that, but I continue to hope that the President uses the funds he has available to him without creating a bad precedent, having some of the needed funds tied up in the courts, and taking money from important military projects.

President Trump is right about the crisis at the border, and the approach I outlined today would enable him to accomplish his policy objectives on the border and honor our Constitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to President Trump's so-called emergency declaration of a crisis and invasion on our southern border, an attempt to misappropriate funds to build the President's border wall. The President's actions here are an affront to the constitutional separation of powers, our checks and balances, and the congressional power of the purse to set appropriation levels.

The very nature of how President Trump decided, finally, to declare a so-called emergency at our southern border shows that he, too, knows that there is no real national emergency at our southern border. President Trump himself admitted, in announcing this so-called emergency in the Rose Garden:

I could do the wall over a longer period of time. I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster.

It doesn't sound like a national emergency. We know that a medieval border wall would be a tremendously wasteful expenditure of resources, as opposed to smarter border security technology that would enhance screening at our ports of entry and specifically target transnational criminal operations smuggling contraband into the United States.

The Constitution gives Congress, not the President, the power of the purse.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 provides that “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.”

Article I, section 8, clause 1 provides that “the Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”

Additionally, the presentment clause of the Constitution requires that the President either approve or veto a bill, and it does not give him the power to change the text of a law or appropriation levels or to cast a line item veto for certain provisions.

The Supreme Court held in the line-item veto case of “Clinton v. City of New York” in 1998:

There is no provision in the Constitution that authorizes the President to enact, to amend or to repeal statutes. . . . Our first President understood the text of the Presentment Clause as requiring that he either “approve all the parts of a bill, or reject it in toto.”

The courts have regularly upheld the authority of Congress by statute—and not the President by fiat—to set funding levels. As the Supreme Court said in *Hooe v. United States*, in 1910, “it is for Congress, proceeding under the Constitution, to say what amount may be drawn from the Treasury in pursuit of appropriations.”

The Ninth Circuit held in *United States v. McIntosh*, in 2016, that if the executive branch spends money in violation of appropriations law, “it would be drawing funds from the Treasury without authorization by statute, and thus violating the Appropriations Clause.”

The Supreme Court held in the *Office of Personnel Management v. Richmond*, in 1990, that “any exercise of a power granted by the Constitution to one or the other branches of Government is limited by the valid reservation of congressional control over funds in the Treasury.”

Beyond the legal challenges in court to the President’s emergency declaration, Congress has a responsibility to act, as well, and rein in the President’s abuse of power in order to maintain the proper separation of powers and checks and balances under our Constitution.

Former Republican Members of Congress recently wrote a powerful open letter to the current Republican Members of Congress on this issue. Signatories include former Members John Danforth, Mickey Edwards, Chuck Hagel, Jim Kolbe, Olympia Snowe, and Richard Lugar. Let me quote:

Our oath is to put the country and its Constitution above everything, including party politics or loyalty to a president. . . . That is why we are coming together to urge those of you who are now charged with upholding the authority of the first branch of government to resist efforts to surrender those powers to a president.

We offer two arguments against allowing a president—any president, regardless of party—to circumvent congressional authority. One is the constitutional placing of all lawmaking power in the hands of the people’s representatives. . . . The power of the

purse rests with Congress. . . . If you allow a president to ignore Congress, it will be not your authority but that of your constituents that is deprived of the protections of true representative government.

Let me just add that, in addition to what was said in that letter, we have made appropriations here. We expect those appropriations to be carried out. We are the representatives of the people. In my own State of Maryland, we have many military construction contracts on many of the military installations that could be put at jeopardy. Maryland is the proud home of major military installations, including Pax River, Indian Head, Andrews, Fort Detrick, Fort Meade, and the APG, or the Aberdeen Proving Ground. It is our responsibility to make those appropriations. If you let this emergency power go, that action could be compromised by the President of the United States, denying the people of this country their representative government.

Let me continue the letter from our former Republican colleagues. The letter continues:

The second argument goes directly to the question each of you must face: how much are you willing to undermine both the Constitution and the Congress in order to advance a policy outcome that by all legitimate means is not achievable? The current issue—a wall on our southern border—has gone through the process put in place by the Constitution. It has been proposed by the President, it has been debated by Congress, and the representatives of the people allocated funding at a level deemed appropriate by Congress. We understand that there are many Members of Congress who disagree with the final funding compromise reached by a bipartisan group of legislators.

And it was approved overwhelmingly by Congress.

To you, we ask this question: what will you do when a president of another party uses the precedent you are establishing to impose policies to which you are unalterably opposed? There is no way around this difficulty: what powers are ceded to a president whose policies you support may also be used by presidents whose policies you abhor.

The letter then concludes:

We who have served where you serve now call on you to honor your oath of office and to protect the Constitution and the responsibilities it vested in Congress. We ask that you pass a joint resolution terminating the emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

Congress should therefore take all necessary action to overturn this unlawful Presidential declaration on border security under the National Emergencies Act or other authorities. Instead of trying to raid funds that have been designated for critical military construction and environmental projects, the President should work with Congress to enact comprehensive reform.

The Senate should vote to uphold the Constitution and its legislative prerogatives, including the power of the purse, and to cancel the President’s emergency declaration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, during the recent government shutdown, there were a lot of budget issues that were negotiated. It was a wide-ranging bill of over 1,000 pages, when it was all said and done, but the most contentious number in all of the negotiations circled around a barrier on our southern border in the highest drug trafficking corridor in the country.

The President requested \$5.7 billion to build a barrier fence in 10 locations that the Customs and Border Patrol had identified as the top 10 points of illegal drugs entering our country. That study had been requested by Congress before they fulfilled that study of identifying the highest profiled drug trafficking corridors. They brought that back to Congress. The President then requested funding to build fencing in those areas of the highest trafficking areas.

His request was not for a 2,000-mile-long wall. It was only to replace some of the sections of the 650-mile-long barrier that already exists—areas that were old and ineffective—or to put new fencing in high drug trafficking areas.

In a highly partisan debate, Congress eventually appropriated \$1.375 billion to DHS for the construction of additional barriers. It is not even close to what the President and what Customs and Border Patrol said they needed to protect the Nation and members of law enforcement.

During those negotiations, the President announced he would declare a national emergency if he didn’t get the funds needed to secure the Nation. At that point, there were two options for people who don’t want the President to secure our border. One was to include language in that appropriations bill before it was passed to prevent the President from declaring an emergency action and using any of the funds for that. The second one was to wait until after the bill was passed and declare a disapproval resolution to stop the President after the bill had already passed.

Those who oppose border security chose the second option—to fight the President after passage, which brings us to today.

After signing the funding bill to reopen the government, to deal with the humanitarian crisis, and the flow of illegal narcotics coming into our country, the President declared a national emergency in two areas. He has over 100 authorities; he declared it in two.

One was this. He wanted to replace some of the National Guard members with members of the Reserve. You have to declare a national emergency to call up the Reserve members. So his first request was to call up some of the Reserves to swap out some of the Guard members who were already serving at the border.

The second one was that in one of the accounts that deal with military construction, if needed, he wanted to tap into some of those funds. He was also very clear. There are four accounts

they would have access to. Three of them don't need an emergency declaration. Let me run through those.

The first is the \$1.375 billion Congress allocated in the government shutdown, ending debate. There is no question that \$1.375 billion has been approved by Congress.

There is a second fund where there is \$600 million. It is in the Treasury Asset Forfeiture Fund. That fund specifically notes that those funds can be used for any reason for Federal law enforcement. It is very clear. It has wide discretion—any use for Federal law enforcement. There is no legal question that it can be used by Customs and Border Patrol or to do construction of any kind of barrier.

There is a third fund that already exists within the Department of Defense. There are \$4 billion set aside in this fund, and it can be used for wide-ranging issues dealing with counternarcotics. There is no question the President can act on anything dealing with counternarcotics with that fund.

In fact, in that fund itself, there is specific language already included in that—and this is up to \$4 billion—saying it can be used for construction of roads, fences, and installation of lighting to block drug smuggling corridors across international boundaries of the United States.

Let me run through this. There is up to \$4 billion the President can ask for that he doesn't have to ask for emergency authority at all on. That is counternarcotics, counterdrug smuggling. There are \$600 million that have been allocated that the President can use because it deals with law enforcement. There is \$1.375 billion that Congress also allocated. There is no legal question on any of those.

At the tail end of that, the White House has also said, after all three of those funds are expended—which, by the way, those three funds exceed the \$5.7 billion the President says he needs—the President's request is, if we go through all of those, and we are not able to close that section down, at some future point, he wants to be able to access this other fund.

They have also made it very clear it would be past October. That would not even be in this fiscal year. So really the debate about funding is next year's issue, what is called the 2808 funding on military construction.

That leads us again to this. An emergency declaration really has two questions in it. Is it an emergency, and does the President have statutory authority to take this action? Those are the only two questions on the table.

Is it an emergency is in dispute. There are some folks who would say: I don't think what is going on at the border is an emergency. There are some folks—some in this Chamber and some in the other Chamber—who want to abolish ICE, dismantle a wall, and open the borders. Thankfully, that is a small group of people who do not see our national security as important.

For the vast majority of people, they do see an importance in Congress working on national security and securing our borders. Then we have the argument about how serious is this.

I have had folks who have said to me: It is really not that bad because we have individuals coming but not as high of a number as what it used to be. Twenty years ago, we even had more people crossing the border illegally.

That is not the question that is in front of us. The request from Customs and Border Patrol is specifically for the 10 areas with the highest drug trafficking along all of our southern border. That is the request.

The question is, Do we have an emergency dealing with illegal drugs crossing our border after the Customs and Border Patrol has said to us that we need barriers to slow down the flow of illegal drugs? Are they right or are they wrong?

Among those areas, right now the Rio Grande Valley sector is the highest area for movement of illegal drugs crossing into our country. It is 16 percent of the border miles, but it is 40 percent of the illegal border and illegal drug trafficking coming in.

Last year, just in that one sector, 550 pounds of methamphetamine were seized. This is not at the port of entry. This is between ports of entry, in that open area that doesn't have a fence. There were 550 pounds of methamphetamine seized. There were 1,500 pounds of cocaine and 64,000 pounds of marijuana that were seized in that one section without a fence.

The question is, Is that an emergency?

Last year, 70,000 Americans died from overdoses from drugs that came from and through Mexico—70,000. If we had any—any—issue in America where 70,000 people died, I can assure you this Congress would stand up and say we have an emergency, but, for some reason, there is a dispute on whether it is important we stop the flow of illegal drugs coming from Mexico into the United States. I don't think that should be in dispute.

To give an example of how fast this is changing and how much of an emergency this is, people would say: This has been going on for years. Why is it different now? Just in the last 2 years, between ports of entry—again, not at the ports of entry but in that open area where there is no barrier. Last year, our Customs and Border Patrol seized 388 pounds of fentanyl. That may not sound like much, but only a couple of grains of it—as in a couple of grains of sand—is enough to kill a person.

Fentanyl is highly addictive and an exceptionally powerful drug. It is 100 times more powerful than morphine. It is being laced into heroin and laced into cocaine. It is a mass killer.

Last year, almost 25,000 people in the country died from an overdose of fentanyl. Knowing it only takes two or three grains to be too much to kill a person, 388 pounds of it were seized between ports of entry along our border.

To tell you how it has accelerated, in 2 years, that is a 269-percent increase of fentanyl being captured between ports of entry.

Yes, we have an emergency. Yes, we have people dying in this country due to overdoses from fentanyl, heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamine, and the problem is not static. The problem is accelerating.

Last year, we had one of the highest—highest—rates of cocaine being picked up between ports of entry that has ever existed in our country.

Last year, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol seized a total of 11,000 pounds of methamphetamine coming across that border. That is the highest year ever of that drug coming across our border.

Undeniably, there is an emergency. The question is, Do we agree or disagree that when the statute says a President has the ability to do a construction, it means he can also construct a barrier? I believe it does.

We have those two questions. Is it an emergency, and does the statutory authority exist?

Interestingly enough, there are some of my friends who are adding a third question. Should the President have that authority?

That is a different question, and I understand that question. Interestingly enough, just a few hours ago, the President of the United States tweeted out—as he is infamous for doing—if Congress wants to discuss should a President have this authority in the future, I am open to discussing that, but that is not pertaining to today.

I think that is an interesting question we should address as a nation—what and how broad should an Executive authority be for a President—but the debate we have today is plain and simple. Is it an emergency, and, under current law, does the President have statutory authority?

My answer to both of those questions is yes.

I hope we continue to do drug interdiction, continue to work through the issues that need to be addressed, continue to do recovery, and continue to help people who are fighting through addiction because we need a healthy nation and also a secure Nation.

For those 10 areas that are the highest drug trafficking areas in the entire country, I hope we close those doors, and I hope we protect lives in the days ahead.

I am going to choose to oppose a resolution of disapproval today that says the President doesn't have the authority to protect the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, significant, the very first clause of the very first section of the very first article of the Constitution consists of the words "all

legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and the House of Representatives.’

The Founding Fathers wasted no time in getting right to the heart of the matter, which is to say that the legislative powers within the Federal Government—that is, the power to make law within that Federal system—would themselves be exercised only by the branch of that government most accountable to the people at the most regular routine intervals.

This system of government, of course, involved three branches—one that would make the law, one that would enforce the law, and one that would interpret the law. That system of government relied, necessarily, and quite appropriately, on the fact that each branch of government would operate within its domain and would jealously guard the powers reserved to it, neither exceeding the powers granted it, nor accepting a diminution of those powers.

It is with that topic in mind that I rise today, reluctantly, in support of the resolution before us. When I speak—and some of my colleagues might even say nag—about our constitutional framework, when I insist that every word, every clause, and every principle does, in fact, matter, that we take oaths to support and defend the Constitution of the United States—we do so, in fact, right here on these very steps in this very Chamber when we start each term of office—we are dutybound to adhere both to the letter and to the spirit of that document, and we should do everything we can to avoid straying from it.

When I say some of these things, I am sometimes accused by some of naive. I am told the old “Schoolhouse Rock” version of how a bill becomes a law works in theory, sounds nice in theory, but it is somehow passe in a vast, diverse, continental nation including about 230 million people today. I am told that given the responsibilities of the United States as now a vast, global, and economic power and Congress’s inability to get things done, we have no choice but to accept and even encourage a system of government in which we are relegated to the backseat, to the backseat of the very things we were supposed to be doing in the first place, which is passing law, which is setting policy within the Federal Government.

This faux sophisticated analysis gets things exactly backward. It is the advocates of Executive overreach and judicial supremacy who are naive. They believe that given our Nation’s size and diversity, only centralized government can rise above partisan, ideological, regional, practical differences, and unite us behind one policy, but this function now strangling this city and strangling this body, toxifying our political discourse, is directly related to this relentless march toward centralization. We think, somehow, that by pulling

power into Washington and within Washington to the less-accountable branches of the government—that is, to the other two branches that are not this branch—we are governing. No, that is not governing. It is ruling.

With centralization, we empower and enrich the political and corporate classes at the expense of the working and middle classes. Centralization is not unity. It is surrender—surrender to exactly the kind of monarchical and abusive sort of government our Founding Fathers were trying to protect us from.

Political elites often reassure us and reassure each other that these deviations from constitutional norms are somehow victimless endeavors. No one cares about the process, they insist, but the Constitution is all process. That is the whole point is process. The Constitution doesn’t resolve our political differences. It lays out the processes by which we are to resolve them. Brushing that process aside does not override our disagreement. It intensifies them. It escalates them—ratcheting up our politics into an all-consuming war of outrage and contempt.

My Democratic colleagues, some of them, at least, would have us believe this vote is about President Trump and President Trump alone. It is not. It is about much more than him. It is about much more than them. It is liberal elites’ cult-like zeal for centralized power and their furious entitlement to wielding it that has led us to this very vote.

Now, I am not sure the Democratic Party cares immensely, as an institution, about Presidential overreach. I will leave that to them to decide and to exhibit. Some simply believe that abuse of constitutional power should be a one-way street.

In many instances, we have had Members of this body support previous Presidents of both political parties in engaging in acts of overreach. The real source of outrage here is not constitutionally mandated procedure but simply that we, as an institution, have voluntarily surrendered—we have relinquished our legislative power.

In this instance, this happens to be an exercise of power in an area in which many on the other side of the political aisle happen to disagree. To make clear, a border fence—a border barrier is a policy I support wholeheartedly and unequivocally. I agree with the need to secure our border. I agree with the President that there is a crisis unfolding on our border endangering men and women and children and endangering many of those who were most affected by the communities who are themselves in the direct path of these caravans. I support a border wall, and I encourage full congressional funding for it.

I think it is a tragedy and really something of an outrage that we haven’t done that as a Congress. I support workplace enforcement of immi-

gration laws. I support a biometric entry-exit system. I support the President’s new “Remain in Mexico” policy that would keep asylum seekers south of the border while they await processing if they come from a noncontiguous country. I support the President’s calling up military Reservists to support border agents in their dangerous and underappreciated work.

I support the President’s invocation of 10 USC section 284(b)(7), which unequivocally authorizes him, in certain instances, relevant here and present here, to authorize funding for the construction of a fence along international boundaries as a means of combating the illegal international drug trade.

I support the President’s use of up to \$601 million from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund and \$2.5 billion from the 284 fund I mentioned a minute ago, and I support the administration’s work, on a diplomatic level, with Mexico to reduce the flow of migrants to the United States. I have supported all of these things in this administration, and I have for years—during this administration and prior to that—and I will continue to support these policies.

An emergency declaration, in accordance with the National Emergencies Act, in this instance, is different. The White House is asserting authority to spend money on projects and priorities in a manner not themselves directly authorized by Congress. Congress directly refused a request to appropriate the specific amount of funds we are dealing with.

At the end of the day, it is not the White House, it is not this President, it is not other Presidents who are at fault for this; it is, in fact, Congress. Congress was the institution that chose voluntarily to relinquish this power. Congress, as an institution, adopted and enacted legislation that was so broad as to take basically all the guardrails off the legislative process.

Congress, as an institution, in 1976, adopted the National Emergencies Act and said the President may declare an emergency with almost no standards, and then, once a President declares an emergency, there are some estimated 128 different provisions of law that can be looped in and made effective as a result of the declaration of that emergency.

At the time Congress did this, Congress left its foot in the door, saying that Congress unilaterally could veto the President’s actions by passing a concurrent resolution not itself subject to Presidential veto. For reasons having to do with a subsequent Supreme Court ruling that occurred 7 years after the enactment of the National Emergencies Act in 1983, a case called *INS v. Chadha*—a case, coincidentally, argued by my late father. If he were here today, perhaps I would half-jokingly acknowledge that maybe he is in some ways to blame for this.

After the Supreme Court concluded in *INS v. Chadha* that the legislative veto was unconstitutional, Congress

went through and systematically removed, from about 450 statutes, the legislative veto provisions, replaced them with resolutions of disapproval, replaced them with a procedural mechanism whereby Congress may signal its disapproval, but that disapproval is still subject to signature or veto by the President.

This is where we have a problem because that converts, effectively, legislative power by handing it over to the Executive and then leaves the Congress without an opportunity to signal how it feels about this beyond adopting a resolution of disapproval, which is itself subject to a Presidential veto.

That is why I am concerned about this. I have concerns about this legal framework. This is not about the President. This is not about my disagreement with or disapproval of the President or his approach to border security or his desire to build a barrier along our southern border. I think all those things need to happen.

This law is wrong. It is not President Trump's fault. It is Congress's. We need to change it. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reform the National Emergencies Act. We need to get this done. This is an issue that is neither Republican nor Democratic, neither liberal nor conservative. It is simply an American issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have up to 5 minutes to make comments on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I was talking with my staff, in advance of the President issuing the emergency order, and I told them I wanted to put together an op-ed to really express two things; one, my concern with the manner in which funds were being appropriated but also that there is a real crisis we have to address. In fact, I am very sympathetic to what the President did, and the only question is how he went about doing it.

I received a lot of feedback over the past few weeks, but what it allowed me to do was to engage in a discussion with some of my colleagues here and with the White House over the past couple of weeks that have been very productive.

My main concern with this Executive action is future potential abuses. I have a concern with the Executive action the President took, the emergency order, and that is why I voiced it, but I am sympathetic to what he was trying to do.

I think we can view this as an opportunity—I thought we could view this as an opportunity where maybe we could have a discussion about the National Emergencies Act and potentially make a real difference.

So today, I come to the floor to say that I do not intend to vote for the resolution of disapproval, and here is why. A lot has changed over the last 3 weeks—a discussion with the Vice President and a number of senior administration officials, a lot of collaboration with my colleague from Utah. There is serious discussion about changing the National Emergencies Act in a way that will have Congress speak on emergency actions in the future.

The White House has been very gracious and I should say very patient, given my initial position, in working with us and as late as today having the President make a statement that he is willing to work with us. I suspect that we will hear more from the President.

We also heard today from Leader MCCONNELL. I was trying to remember—I don't know whether it has been done before—Leader MCCONNELL took to the floor this morning and said that he encourages this discussion through the regular order and working on a bipartisan basis to move a measure forward through the Homeland Security Committee and to this floor for a vote. I, for one, am going to work on that and hopefully get consensus on a bipartisan basis after the temperatures have cooled and we can move on.

In the meantime, I think we have to recognize that we have a crisis at the border, with 76,000 people crossing illegally in February alone. We have narcotics flooding our country, poisoning our children and adults of all ages. A lot of it has to do with the porous border and the seemingly unending and spiraling-out-of-control crossings.

One of the challenges that I have to communicate to my constituents, and I am sure everyone does, is how do I reconcile—first, I should say that my colleagues on this side of the aisle who will vote for the resolution of disapproval I think to a person also recognize that there is a crisis. I respect them for their decision; it is just not a decision that I can take.

Over the course of the next few months, I look forward to working with the administration to talk about boundaries that we are very close to getting agreement on and making changes to the National Emergencies Act that will make sense.

The fact that this President is prepared to transfer power back to the article I branch—by his statements, either publicly or through his administration—is extraordinary. That we have a leader, with a Republican down the street, willing to move this through the regular order is extraordinary.

For those reasons, I will be voting against the resolution of disapproval, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I am voting against the resolution to end the national emergency. Make no mistake: Our Nation is facing

a prolonged and worsening security and humanitarian crisis on our southern border. Lethal drugs are flooding across the border at an alarming rate. Just last year, enough fentanyl to kill 88 million Americans was seized by border patrol agents between our ports of entry. We are also witnessing unprecedented levels of illegal immigration and are on track for the highest level of illegal immigration in more than a decade. That means more human trafficking, more forced labor, and more exploitation of people along the dangerous journey to the United States. Failures by Congress to adequately address our immigration and border security issues have only exacerbated this crisis.

Here is just a sample of the data from our Federal authorities. The total volume of illegal immigration is increasing. Illegal immigration is on pace to exceed the highest level in more than 10 years. There has been a 338 percent increase in family units from the Northern Triangle apprehended thus far in fiscal year 2019 compared with same period in fiscal year 2018. There was 54 percent increase in unaccompanied minors apprehended thus far in fiscal year 2019 compared with same period in fiscal year 2018.

Additionally, drug seizures are increasing between ports of entry. In fiscal year 2018, U.S. Border Patrol intercepted 388 pounds of fentanyl between our ports of entry. That is enough to kill 88 million Americans; that is right, 88 million Americans. Fentanyl seizures increased 73 percent between fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018. Heroin seizures also increased 22 percent between fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018. Methamphetamine seizures increased 38 percent between fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018.

As I have said repeatedly, even though the President is using the authority given to him by Congress, I share my colleagues' concerns that too much authority has been delegated to the executive branch. In 1976, Congress gave the President the authority to declare national emergencies, so we shouldn't be surprised when he seeks to use it, just as others have done. For this reason, I will continue working to pass meaningful legislation, like the ARTICLE ONE Act, to reclaim congressional power from the executive branch and improve congressional oversight of the National Emergency Act. I encourage my colleagues to join in this effort, which takes real action, as opposed to symbolic show votes that don't address the root of the problem.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the President often claims that he knows how to make deals, but when it comes to the border, he seems uninterested in a good deal, a deal to provide effective border security, and he is hurting our military in the process. This week's vote to repeal the President's national emergency is a vote to restore sanity to our border security debate and restore Congress's constitutional power of the purse.

We all remember Donald Trump's idea that we need a 2,000-mile concrete wall from sea to shining sea and his claim that Mexico would pay for it. He said it some 200 times on the campaign trail and in the Oval Office. In December, after asking and failing to receive funding from Congress for this wall, the President said, "I am proud to shut down the government for border security."

What followed was the 35-day Trump shutdown, the longest government shutdown in U.S. history. It cost our country \$11 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office. After the President finally agreed to reopen the government, Congress provided funding to the Department of Homeland Security for smart and effective border security measures, including technology and additional Customs personnel. We did this because the President's own administration has stated that the vast majority of lethal narcotics that cross our southern border come through legal ports of entry.

But within hours of signing this bill, President Donald Trump announced that it wasn't enough. The President went on television to announce that he was declaring a national emergency over the border, and he announced that he was taking \$6.5 billion from our military to build it.

Presidents of both parties have declared national emergencies. Each time, it was done in response to a specific crisis, in order to unlock certain statutory authorities. President George W. Bush declared a national emergency after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In the 1970s, President Carter declared a national emergency as it pertained to Iran. Presidents of both parties have declared and updated emergencies relating to instability in Syria.

What Presidents did in those situations varied—sometimes levying sanctions, sometimes seizing assets—but each time, it was accepted on a bipartisan basis as necessary, legitimate, and in defense of our national interests. What President Trump did was different. For the last 2 years, he has struggled to fulfill a campaign promise, so when he didn't get his way, he created a fake crisis and declared a phony emergency.

The good news is that the American people aren't buying it. A poll conducted earlier this month by Quinnipiac University found that 66 percent of voters oppose the President's end-run around Congress and oppose his fake emergency declaration.

Newspapers around the country have concluded the same thing. The Tampa Bay Times editorial board said it clearly a few days after the President's announcement, "Border wall is no emergency." In their words, "It is not a national emergency just because President Donald Trump didn't get his way."

West Virginia's Herald Dispatch newspaper concludes much the same, urging the President to "take a real-

istic look at whether the wall is needed or if it's simply an unnecessary quest to satisfy his ego." That is common sense, but then common sense seems to be in short supply in this White House.

Not only is the President declaring a fake emergency, but he is using that crisis to take money. The President has told us that he will take \$6.5 billion that Congress gave to our troops and spend it instead on a wall on the southern border. He is proposing to delay or cancel \$3.6 billion in military construction projects—projects that our military told Congress it needed less than a year ago—and divert it to his wall.

Last Friday, Senator SCHATZ and I sent a letter to Acting Secretary of Defense Patrick Shanahan demanding to know which projects have been deemed, due to political interference, as less important than the President's wall. There are almost 400 military projects at risk. They cover 43 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and more than a dozen foreign countries, including strong U.S. allies like Japan and the United Kingdom.

The President will have to cancel or postpone approximately 20 percent of these projects for his wall. What are we talking about?—\$800 million for essential training facilities like National Guard Readiness Centers, simulators, and firing ranges in Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, and Montana, to name a few; \$1.4 billion worth of maintenance-related projects, such as aircraft hangars, and vehicle maintenance shops in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and elsewhere; \$1 billion worth of projects for medical and dental care facilities, schools for military families, military barracks and dining facilities in Arizona, Missouri, Texas, and beyond.

For instance, the Marine Corps needs a new rifle range at Parris Island, SC. This base trains 20,000 new Marine recruits every year. Also on the list is new training center at Fort Bragg, NC, to provide top-notch training and prevent injuries among our special operations forces. They are using old warehouse right now. Are we really going to tell our military that their needs are being put on hold so the President can fulfill his campaign promise to build a wall? I hope those aren't our priorities.

In addition, the President also announced that he would take \$2.5 billion in other military funds for his wall. The Pentagon tells me that they may take some of this money from excess military pay and pensions. Meanwhile, each of the military services—Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines—have met with me to discuss a long list of urgent, last-minute needs, but with \$2.5 billion being diverted for the wall, none of those leaders were able to say whether or not they would get the funding they need.

Last year, Hurricane Florence damaged 800 buildings at Camp Lejeune, New River, and Cherry Point, causing \$3.6 billion in damage from wind and flood waters. A similar hurricane lev-

eled Tyndall Air Force Base, in Florida. Both of them could use billions right now for repairs.

I am also told that the Navy needs hundreds of millions of additional dollars for unexpected ship maintenance. We can't afford not to make sure our sailors are safe on deployment. The National Guard has 2,100 personnel on the border, but it is starting to run low on its pay account. Unless DOD finds \$150–300 million this year, the Guard will have to cut short its summer trainings in all 50 States to pay for this.

My subcommittee has identified almost \$5 billion in military priorities that need attention now, but after the President takes \$2.5 billion to pay for his border wall, which priorities will get cut?

This week, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate should join the House in rejecting the President's phony emergency declaration, and the Senate should reject any effort by the President to take money from our troops to build the wall.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the resolution of disapproval before us that would terminate President Trump's phony national emergency.

President Trump's national emergency declaration, which he attempts to justify using falsehoods about immigration and the Southern border, presents a serious threat to the separation of powers and the rule of law.

First I would like to speak about how there really isn't an emergency at the border, then I would like to get into the constitutional problems with the President's actions.

While illegal border crossings do occur, all of the numbers refute President Trump's claim that there is a crisis at the border. Those claims simply don't hold up.

Unauthorized border crossings have been at their lowest levels in years.

In 2000, border agencies reported more than 1.6 million apprehensions.

In 2017, the agency reported just 303,916 apprehensions, one-fifth of the level just two decades ago.

It is clear that investments in border security have worked. Those include additional border patrol agents, fencing in urban areas, ground sensors, drones, and increased use of E-Verify.

In addition, since 2014, two-thirds of undocumented immigrants have come to the United States legally but then overstayed their visas, more than 500,000 per year. A border wall would do nothing to curb visa overstays.

Dangerous criminals aren't overrunning our country.

Immigrants commit fewer crimes than native-born citizens. Data collected in Texas show the arrest rate for undocumented immigrants in 2015 was 40 percent lower than for the native-born population.

Additionally, many immigrants are actually legally seeking asylum through the process already in place. There are often families with young

children fleeing persecution and violence in Central America who have a legal right to petition our government for asylum.

Under current law, they can apply for asylum by presenting themselves at a U.S. port of entry. Unfortunately, by focusing on a border wall instead of investing in modernizing entry points, President Trump's policies force many of these families to turn themselves into Border Patrol in between ports and ask for asylum or wait for long periods in Mexico in dangerous conditions.

The timing of the President's declaration also undercuts his claim that this is an emergency.

President Trump kicked off his Presidential campaign nearly 4 years ago by claiming that immigrants were bringing drugs and crime to the United States. Despite this, he decided to wait until more than halfway through his term to declare his emergency and only then after Congress refused to give him the money he wanted.

If there were truly an emergency, the President should have declared it on day 1. He did not.

Trump also emphatically rejected a bill that would have given him \$25 billion for a border wall in exchange for providing Dreamers a path to citizenship. Clearly, there was no emergency then either.

But the most clear statement that there is no emergency came from President Trump himself, who after declaring the emergency, said this in a Rose Garden speech: "I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster."

We shouldn't judge the President's attempt to divert appropriated funds to his border wall through a partisan lens, but rather view it as a radical departure from our constitutional separation of powers.

Through its appropriations clause, the Constitution provides Congress, not the President, with the power of the purse. Congress decides how to spend taxpayer dollars.

By providing Congress with this power, our Founding Fathers imposed a key check on the President, a check that President Trump is trying to do away with.

Congress exercised its power of the purse last month in a spending bill to keep the government open by including \$1.35 billion for border barriers, rather than the \$6 billion the President sought for a border wall.

The Constitution gave the President two options at that point: sign the bill or veto it. President Trump tried to create a third path, saying he would sign the bill but still divert additional Federal dollars to the wall, his so-called emergency.

In essence, the President decided to violate the Constitution so he could more quickly fulfill a campaign promise to build his border wall.

One of the ironies of President Trump's decision to divert funds to a

border wall that won't stop drugs or crossings is the pots of money from which he is drawing.

First, the White House said it would pull \$2.5 billion from a counter-narcotics program that is used to support international law enforcement interdiction and apprehension efforts, as well as to fund National Guard support for State drug law enforcement operations, including in California.

Second, the White House said it would take another \$3.5 billion from military construction projects.

These are programs that actually help improve our national security, and the President wants to take billions of dollars from them to build a wall—incredible.

The long-term danger here is that President Trump will set a precedent that a Commander in Chief can interpret the Nation's laws and the Constitution any way he wants. This can't be allowed to stand.

The National Emergencies Act of 1976 does allow the President to reprogram funds appropriated by Congress in case of a national emergency, like a hurricane or earthquake, but it is clear that the law was never intended to be used to explicitly overrule the will of Congress, which is how President Trump wants to use it.

During the Korean war, the Supreme Court struck down a similar attempt by President Truman to use emergency powers to seize privately owned steel mills, an action inconsistent with laws passed by Congress.

Even if there were an emergency—which there isn't—President Trump still wouldn't have the authority to reprogram Federal funds in this context.

Specifically, the statute that President Trump relies on, 10 U.S.C. §2808, allows the President, in a national emergency that "requires the use of the armed forces," to spend unobligated military construction funds for military construction projects "that are necessary to support . . . use of the armed forces."

The situation at the border does not "require the use of the armed forces," and it is unclear how the wall would be "necessary to support" them.

If anything, the President's use of the military at the border to enforce the law raises additional questions under the Posse Comitatus Act, which has prohibited the use of the Armed Forces for domestic law enforcement for well over a century.

In sum, President Trump is relying on an incredibly frail legal argument to justify this blatant power grab. It is incumbent upon Congress to hold this President accountable as he attempts to seize one of our most important powers.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval and cancel President Trump's phony emergency.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. We have 1 minute remaining, I think. I ask unanimous consent to speak in leader time.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Today, the Senate will vote on the resolution to terminate the President's declaration of a national emergency.

Let me begin with a quotation.

Revelations of how power has been abused by high government officials must give rise to concern about the potential exercise, unchecked by the Congress or the American people, of this extraordinary power. The National Emergencies Act would end this threat and ensure that the powers now in the hands of the Executive will be utilized only in a time of genuine emergency and then only under safeguards providing for congressional review.

Let me repeat that. "[T]he powers now in the hands of the Executive will be utilized only in a time of genuine emergency." That is from the special committee report on the National Emergencies Act, which was passed decades ago.

The bottom line is very simple. We all know the other arguments—that this is not an emergency. The President himself said so. He said he didn't have to do this if he didn't want to. In previous emergencies, it was either apparent, like 9/11, or it was a disease or some other immediate disaster, and there was a long explanation as to why. We have gotten no explanation as to why this is an emergency.

The second reason, of course, is the money that might be taken away from the military—our brave men and women in uniform not getting the dollars they need—for this wall.

The third, of course, is that the President couldn't get his way through Congress even when we had 2 years of Republican leadership in the House, Senate, and White House, couldn't get his way this time, and is now simply going around Congress to declare an emergency.

But those reasons pale for the most important reason. This is a momentous day. The balance of power that the Founding Fathers put in place, so exquisitely designed, has served this Nation extremely well for over two centuries. That balance of power was in large part motivated by the fear of an overreaching Executive. The patriots had just fought King George. They knew what it was like to have an Executive who would go too far, and they put in precautions to make sure that didn't happen.

Today, we are being asked, in a way that we haven't been asked in decades, maybe even longer, to change that balance of power. And make no mistake about it—it will set an awful precedent for the future, no matter who is President. It will change it. If a President can invoke an emergency because he didn't get his way or she didn't get her way, without real cause, without a real emergency, woe is our Republic in many ways—the ways the Founding Fathers feared.

I know this is a very difficult vote for my friends on the other side of the

aisle—much more difficult than ours. We all know that the President is extremely popular in the Republican Party for maybe a few good reasons—I would say mostly bad, but he is. We know that he has been vindictive, contemptuous, calling out people who oppose him. So it is not an easy vote. I take my hat off to those Members on the other side of the aisle who have let principle rise above party, who understand what the Constitution requires this afternoon and have agreed to vote against this emergency.

I would plead with those others who haven't made up their minds to look at this moment in history. This is not an immediate moment. You can be for the wall or against the wall, you can think that what we are doing at the southern border is inadequate, but that issue pales before the issue before us; that is, how far an Executive can reach when Congress does not want to do what that Executive wants.

This is a crucial moment. This is a moment historians will look back on. This could be a moment that changes the fundamental balance of power in our government. So I would ask my colleagues—I would really plead with my colleagues. I understand the politics are difficult—much harder for you than for me—but our Nation, our Constitution, the beauty of this government demands that we rise to the occasion this afternoon. Please join us in rejecting this emergency and keeping our government with the same balance of power that has served us so well for two centuries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time has expired.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Alexander	Feinstein	Moran
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Bennet	Harris	Murphy
Blumenthal	Hassan	Murray
Blunt	Heinrich	Paul
Booker	Hirono	Peters
Brown	Jones	Portman
Cantwell	Kaine	Reed
Cardin	King	Romney
Carper	Klobuchar	Rosen
Casey	Leahy	Rubio
Collins	Lee	Sanders
Coons	Manchin	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Markey	Schumer
Duckworth	Menendez	Shaheen
Durbin	Merkley	Sinema

Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Toomey

Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren

Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—41

Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Braun
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Coryn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Enzi

Ernst
Fischer
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Hawley
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
McConnell

McSally
Perdue
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Young

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth 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 legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James E. Risch, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, Pat Roberts, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CREATE A GREEN NEW DEAL—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

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 legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

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 legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt, Susan M. Collins, Lisa Murkowski.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

The Senator from Nebraska.

NEBRASKA'S BOMB CYCLONE

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I would first like to address the harsh

and very inclement weather that is sweeping across the State of Nebraska.

My prayers are with the Nebraskans who have been affected by the damaging storm.

This massive storm they are calling a bomb cyclone has brought blizzard conditions, hurricane force winds, and dangerous floods to Nebraska. Some people have had to evacuate their homes. Others have been working tirelessly for the safety of their livestock.

I thank our emergency responders, the State, and local officials who are helping the citizens of our State during this time.

I want all Nebraskans to know that my office stands ready to assist you in any possible way.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES
SERGEANT CORY RYAN MRACEK

Mr. President, I rise to continue my tributes to the current generation of men and women who have lost their lives in Iraq and in Afghanistan while defending our freedom. Each of these Nebraska heroes has a special story to tell.

I recall today the life and service of SGT Cory Mracek, who was a native of Hay Springs, NE.

Though Cory spent most of his life in Hay Springs, he was born in Chadron, NE. Both of his parents, Pat and Jim, were born and raised in Nebraska as well.

As a young child, Cory was always trying to have a good time. He was often found either laughing or trying to make others laugh. Cory talked a lot, starting at age 1. Pat, his mother, fondly remembers that Cory was a curious child, and when they would go into stores, Cory would always touch different items because he wanted to know more about them. He was an easygoing kid, and he loved watching Sesame Street on a regular basis.

Cory was close to his grandfather, and they would often go places together and spend time together. Both of Cory's younger sisters, Stacy and Heather, came into the world when he was a young child, and he had a very close relationship with both of them. As is often the case with siblings, though, they sometimes quarreled.

Like many kids his age, Cory was fascinated by "Star Wars" and "The Simpsons." The original "Star Wars" movies came out when Cory was young, and he had all kinds of "Star Wars" figurines and action figures around the house.

Cory attended several small schools in northwest Nebraska before enrolling in Hay Springs High School. Around the time Cory started high school, Michael Jordan was changing the sport of basketball all over the world. The Chicago Bulls' legend became Cory's sports hero. His bedroom was covered with Michael Jordan posters, basketball cards, and memorabilia.

During his high school years, Cory became involved in many extra-curricular activities. Fishing was one of his favorites, and he would often go

to nearby Walgren Lake, southwest of Hay Springs.

In high school, Cory was also involved in basketball and football, where he played fullback.

Pat vividly remembers when she worked in the eastern part of Nebraska one week so that Cory could attend Tom Osborne's Big Red Football School for 3 days. This was a popular football camp that many teenage boys in Nebraska participated in over the years.

At Hay Springs High, Cory wasn't too fond of actually going to school, but he was more than capable. He scored a 30 on his ACT, and his armed services vocational aptitude battery score was also exceptionally high.

After graduating from Hay Springs High School, Cory attended Chadron State College, just down the road from where he grew up. While at Chadron State, Cory had a hard time finding a good job. With his high marks on the test, Cory decided to enlist in the Nebraska Army National Guard. He graduated from basic training at Fort Sill, OK, in 1996.

After 1 year, Cory transferred to the Active Army because it provided him with a year-round job. Cory's military occupation specialty was 13-bravo or cannon crewmember for artillery, and he was stationed at Fort Campbell in Kentucky.

Immediately after joining the Active Army, Cory was deployed to South Korea for 1 year. He enjoyed his time in Korea, and he participated in the tradition of the Manchu Mile, a daunting, 24-mile march in full combat gear across Korea's mountainous terrain.

Cory was also involved in the honor guard.

In January of 2001, Cory returned home to Nebraska and transitioned back to the National Guard. Months later, the September 11 terrorist attacks changed our Nation and the world. The events of that fateful day ignited deep patriotism within Cory. While he and his parents were outside their home holding up candles in memory of the lives lost in the 9/11 attacks, Cory told his mom that he was going to transition back to the Active Army to serve his country.

In early 2002, Cory transitioned back to the Active Army from the Nebraska National Guard. Cory then deployed to Korea for a second time—this time for 15 months, serving near the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea.

When he returned from Korea, Cory was assigned to the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg and completed airborne school in November of 2003. Shortly after, Cory received notice that he was deploying to Iraq. Cory arrived in Iraq for his deployment in January of 2004. Pat had already sent care packages over for Cory so they would be there when he arrived.

On the morning of January 27, 2004, Pat instant-messaged with Cory to

catch up and see how things were going. Later that same day, Cory and his reconnaissance platoon were performing a mission near Iskandariyah, Iraq. This particular area of Iraq saw major combat activity and sectarian violence from 2003 to 2007. During Cory's reconnaissance mission that day, his platoon came across an IED. Cory and two other U.S. servicemembers were killed by that explosion.

On Wednesday, February 4, 2004, at the Chadron State College gymnasium, more than 600 family members, friends, and military officials gathered to celebrate and honor the life, service, and sacrifice of SGT Cory Mracek. He was eulogized by many, including his two sisters, Stacy and Heather.

He was laid to rest at the Gordon City Cemetery next to his grandfather. The funeral procession from Chadron to Gordon was a short drive by western Nebraska standards—46 miles. From Chadron to Hay Springs to Rushville, people lined the streets to pay their respects, wave American flags, and salute Cory.

For quite some time, Cory's parents thought about the best way to memorialize him. Eventually, Pat came up with the perfect tribute: renaming the local Chadron, NE, post office after Cory. Pat had previously worked at the post office for 10 years, and she asked GEN Roger Lempke, Retired, who is now a member of my staff, how we could make this happen.

I had the privilege of working alongside former U.S. Senator Mike Johanns on legislation to rename the Chadron Post Office the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office." The bill was passed by Congress, and it was signed into law on November 2014.

To this day, Cory's mother, Pat, remains heavily involved in many veteran and military organizations. She is the president of Nebraska Gold Star Mothers and the cochair of the Honor and Remember Nebraska Chapter.

Both Pat and Cory's father, Jim, would like our Nation to remember how happy Cory was. He liked to laugh, have fun, and enjoy life.

I join Nebraskans and Americans across our country in saluting Cory's willingness to serve and the sacrifices he and his family made to keep us free, and I am honored to tell his story.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning, something rather amazing and wonderful happened in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives this morning passed a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the full report by Special

Counsel Robert Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress. The vote was 420 to 0. Not a single Member of the House, Democratic or Republican, voted no.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the record of the vote, including all 190 Republicans who voted yes, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL VOTE RESULTS FOR ROLL CALL 125

(Democrats in roman; Republicans in italic; Independents underlined>)

H. Con. Res. 24: Yea-and-Nay, 14-Mar-2019, 10:30 AM.

Question: On Agreeing to the Resolution.
Bill Title: Expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

	Yeas	Nays	Pres	NV
Democratic	230			4
Republican	190		4	3
Independent				
Totals	420		4	7

YEAS 420

Abraham	Golden	Ocasio-Cortez
Adams	Gomez	Olson
Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TK)	Palazzo
Allen	Gooden	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Palmer
Amodei	Granger	Panetta
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Pappas
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pascrell
Axne	Graves (MO)	Payne
Babin	Green (TN)	Pence
Bacon	Green (TX)	Perlmutter
Baird	Griffith	Perry
Balderson	Grijalva	Peters
Banks	Grothman	Peterson
Barr	Guest	Phillips
Barragan	Guthrie	Pingree
Bass	Haaland	Pocan
Beatty	Hagedorn	Porter
Bera	Harder (CA)	Posey
Bergman	Harris	Pressley
Beyer	Hartzler	Price (NC)
Biggs	Hayes	Quigley
Bilirakis	Heck	Raskin
Bishop (GA)	Hern, Kevin	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler
Blumenauer	Hice (GA)	Rice (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Richmond
Bost	Hill (AR)	Riggleman
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hill (CA)	Roby
Brady	Himes	Rodgers (WA)
Brindisi	Holding	Roe, David P.
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Horn, Kendra S.	Rogers (KY)
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Rooney (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Houlahan	Rose (NY)
Buchanan	Hoyer	Rose, John W.
Buck	Hudson	Rouda
Bucshon	Huffman	Rouzer
Budd	Huizenga	Roy
Burchett	Hunter	Roybal-Allard
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Ruiz
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Jayapal	Rush
Byrne	Jeffries	Rutherford
Calvert	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Carbajal	Johnson (LA)	Sánchez
Cárdenas	Johnson (OH)	Sarbanes
Carson (IN)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Johnson (TX)	Scanlon
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Joyce (OH)	Schiff
Case	Joyce (PA)	Schneider
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Schrader
Castor (FL)	Katko	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Keating	Scott (VA)
Chabot	Kelly (IL)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Scott, David
Chu, Judy	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cicilline	Kennedy	Serrano
Cisneros	Khanna	Sewell (AL)

YEAS 420—Continued

Clark (MA)	Kildee	Shalala
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sherman
Clay	Kim	Sherrill
Cline	Kind	Shimkus
Cloud	King (IA)	Simpson
Clyburn	King (NY)	Sires
Cohen	Kinzinger	Slotkin
Cole	Kirkpatrick	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	Krishnamoorthi	Smith (NE)
Collins (NY)	Kuster (NH)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (WA)
Conaway	LaHood	Smucker
Connolly	LaMalfa	Soto
Cook	Lamb	Spanberger
Cooper	Lamborn	Spano
Correa	Langevin	Speier
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Stanton
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Stauber
Cox (CA)	Latta	Stefanik
Craig	Lawrence	Steil
Crawford	Lawson (FL)	Steube
Crenshaw	Lee (CA)	Stevens
Crist	Lee (NV)	Stewart
Crow	Lesko	Stivers
Cuellar	Levin (CA)	Suozzi
Cummings	Levin (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Cunningham	Lewis	Takano
Curtis	Lieu, Ted	Taylor
Davidson (KS)	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Davidson (OH)	Loeb sack	Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA)	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Danny K.	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Lowenthal	Timmons
Dean	Lowe	Tipton
DeFazio	Lucas	Titus
DeGette	Luettkemeyer	Tlaib
DeLauro	Lujan	Tonko
DeBene	Luria	Torres (CA)
Delgado	Lynch	Torres Small (NM)
Demings	Malinowski	Trahan
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Trone
DesJarlais	Maloney, Sean	Turner
Deutch	Marchant	Underwood
Diaz-Balart	Mast	Upton
Dingell	Matsui	Van Drew
Doggett	McAdams	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	McBath	Veasey
Duffy	McCarthy	Vela
Duncan	McCaul	Velázquez
Dunn	McClintock	Visclosky
Emmer	McCollum	Wagner
Engel	McGovern	Walberg
Escobar	McHenry	Walden
Eshoo	McKinley	Walker
Espallat	McNerney	Walorski
Estes	Meadows	Waltz
Evans	Meeks	Wasserman Schultz
Ferguson	Meng	Waters
Finkenaer	Meuser	Watkins
Fitzpatrick	Miller	Watson Coleman
Fleischmann	Mitchell	Weber (TX)
Fletcher	Mooleenaar	Webster (FL)
Flores	Mooney (WV)	Welch
Fortenberry	Moore	Wenstrup
Foster	Morelle	Westerman
Fox (NC)	Moulton	Wexton
Frankel	Mucarsel-Powell	Wild
Fudge	Mullin	Williams
Fulcher	Murphy	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Napolitano	Wittman
Gallego	Neal	Womack
Garamendi	Neguse	Woodall
Garcia (IL)	Newhouse	Wright
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Yarmuth
Gianforte	Norman	Yoho
Gibbs	Nunes	Young
Gohmert	O'Halleran	Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 4

Amash	Gosar
Gaetz	Massie

NOT VOTING 7

Cleaver	Marshall	Schweikert
Hastings	McEachin	
Loifgren	Ratcliffe	

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, why did every Republican vote for this? That is because there is no good reason that the special counsel's report should not be made public. The American people are

overwhelmingly for making the report public. They have a right to see it. No one should stand in the way of that. In fact, in the House, no one did. The only reason to not make this report public would be to cover up what is in it. What a shame that would be.

The Senate should pass this resolution with the same unanimity that the House did. The special counsel has been investigating one of the greatest affronts to our democracy—the deliberate interference by a foreign power in our elections. The American people have an undeniable right to see the results of that investigation for themselves, and so this resolution should pass.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Robert Mueller be made available to the public and to Congress, which is at the desk; further, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will try to be very brief as far as where I am coming from here.

We were told that Mueller may be imminently fired. The President said some things that were at times disturbing about the investigation. I was asked many times, let's make sure we protect Mueller and let him do his job. So I first introduced the Special Counsel Independence Protection Act on August 3, 2017, with Republicans and Democrats.

To my good friend from New York, I think Mueller is just about done.

To all those who are worried about Mueller not being able to do his job, he has. He is about to tell us what he found.

There is a regulation that determines what is disclosed and how it is disclosed. I have all the confidence that Mr. BARR will be as transparent as possible. That regulation is specific. You can look at it for yourself. I would like to know as much as possible and share it with the public. However, I have also been consistent in trying to find balance here.

In February of 2018, I called for a special counsel to look at the abuses, potentially, by the Department of Justice and the FBI regarding the Clinton email investigation and the handling of the FISA warrant process against Mr. CARTER Page, someone associated with the Trump campaign.

So since 2018, I have asked a simple thing. If this stuff about Page and Strzok and Ohr doesn't bother you, then that bothers me. Were there two

systems of justice in 2016—one for the Democratic candidate and one for the Republican candidate, where the Republican candidate's campaign had a FISA warrant issued against somebody associated with it based on a document that was known to be unreliable, politically charged, on four different occasions? That should bother every American.

Rather than my telling you whether it happened or not, why don't we appoint a Mueller-like figure to look at how the Clinton email investigation ended up the way it did, what the tarmac meeting was all about between Loretta Lynch and Bill Clinton?

I can quickly say to my colleagues, if the shoe were on the other foot, if the Republican Party hired a foreign agent to go to Russia to investigate dirt on Hillary Clinton, gave it to the Justice Department, and it was used on four separate occasions to get a warrant against somebody working with or associated with the Clinton campaign, all hell would pay.

If a member of the Justice Department told the investigators: Before you get the warrant, the person who is involved in collecting this information hates Clinton; if there were exchanges between an FBI agent and a Department of Justice lawyer talking about getting an insurance policy to make sure that Hillary Clinton is never elected and how much they hated Trump, it would be front-page news all over the world.

I don't know what happened between Trump and Russia, but we are about to find out, and we will see if there is something there, and we will use a process to disclose it to the public.

But I ask the Democratic leader to modify his request and allow my amendment at the desk to make a simple change—and every Republican will be with me, if you wonder about how Republicans vote in the House—that this resolution be modified calling for the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to investigate Department of Justice misconduct in the handling of the Clinton email investigation and in the handling of the FISA warrant process as it relates to warrants obtained on Carter Page and to publicly release the results of those investigations—be agreed to consistent with law. I ask that the resolution be modified in accordance with this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed in my good friend from South Carolina. This amendment appears to be a pretext for blocking this very simple, noncontroversial resolution. Four hundred-twenty Members of the House voted for it. Congressman JIM JORDAN, a friend of the President's, voted for it. Congressman DEVIN NUNES, a friend of the President's, voted for it.

This resolution should pass the Senate in the blink of an eye. I have abso-

lutely no idea why a Member of this body would object to this basic level of transparency, whatever their concern on other issues.

My friend from South Carolina says the report ought to be made public. Let's not stand in the way for other issues. He is chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He can deal with that separately but not block this resolution.

So let the American people know that the Republican majority in the Senate—at least for now—is blocking a resolution that the Mueller report should be made public. I hope my friend from South Carolina and all of my Republican colleagues take time over the recess to think about this. We are going to be back here asking for consent again when the Senate is back in session, and my Republican colleagues ought to think long and hard before they block this resolution again.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. GRAHAM. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I thank Senator SCHUMER. I appreciate getting this done quickly.

I will just say, there are a lot of Americans, including JIM JORDAN, who believe that what happened in 2016 with the Clinton email investigation and the FISA warrant against Carter Page showed corruption at the highest level of the government. I agree that there are more than smoking guns here. There is overwhelming evidence that somebody outside the political system should look into. I can't find anybody much on the other side who seems to give a damn about that.

Mueller, I get. Mueller has been allowed to do his job. We are going to find out what he found pretty soon, as much as we can, consistent with the law. But I am not going to give up on the idea that we are just going to look at one problem of 2016. I have been talking to myself for the most part; now I have a forum.

I will introduce a resolution asking you to do a simple thing. Ask somebody outside of politics—a special counsel—to look into how in the world the system got so off track, to use a document prepared by foreign agent, paid for by the Democratic Party, collected in Russia, to obtain a warrant against an American citizen that is garbage to this day? How in the world could the investigation get so off track that the two people in charge of it openly talked about making sure that there was an insurance policy against Trump if he won and openly espoused support for Clinton. How do you interview Clinton the way she was interviewed? Any American out there who did what Secretary Clinton did you would see in jail now.

The question I want to know is, Does anybody other than me believe that? I

don't ask you to believe me. We let Mueller look at all things Trump related to collusion and otherwise. Somebody needs to look at what happened on the other side and find out if the FBI and the DOJ had two systems—one supporting the person they wanted to win and one out to get the person they wanted to lose.

Some of these people have been fired for lying, and it is now time to have a special counsel look at all things 2016, not just Trump.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

2019 IDITAROD

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor today to talk about a sporting event—an event that captures the attention of people not only in my State of Alaska but around the country and around the globe. I am talking about the “Last Great Race on Earth.” It is a pretty fancy, big, and impressive title for what really happens—the ultimate challenge with man, woman, and dogs—a 1,100-mile sled dog race from Anchorage to Nome, up north.

I will share with you all a picture that was taken at 3:39 a.m. on Wednesday morning, March 13. Obviously, it is the middle of the night. I know everybody thinks that it is always dark in Alaska this time of year, but it is not. This is at 3:39 a.m. on Wednesday, March 13. It is pitch dark. You can't really see it in this picture, but the snow is coming down. The wind is blowing. It is pretty dang cold. Temperatures are down in the teens, but you have some wind blowing. So it gets your attention.

What you are seeing here is Front Street in Nome, AK. At 3:30 in the morning, the street is packed. It is lined with hundreds of people who are cheering loudly. These are people from all over the country—fans, friends, and family who have come from across Alaska and flown into Nome. Some of them chartered an aircraft coming out of the YK Delta. They flew into Nome, a community of about 4,000 people, to witness this moment—to witness the moment that Pete Kaiser, born and raised in Bethel, AK, came into town with eight dogs in harness and came down the street to cross the finish line and claim victory as the 2019 Iditarod champion. He was just 12 minutes ahead of the defending champion, Joar Leifseth Ulsom, who is originally from Norway but who now lives with us in Alaska. This is probably one of the closest Iditarod races we have in some time.

Jessie Royer, of Fairbanks, a friend of my family and a great lady, came in at third place.

When you talk about the “Last Great Race” of 1,100 miles across extraordinary terrain, Pete Kaiser took 9 days, 12 hours, and 38 minutes to complete this—9 days, 12 hours, and 38 minutes.

Think about how you cover 1,100 miles on the back of a dog sled. Typically, with dogs, when you are moving

really fast, you are moving along at about 10 miles an hour, but you are going over some incredible terrain, and you are doing this not just between 8 and 5, but you are running the trail over the course of days and weeks.

Here is Pete Kaiser. He has just crossed the finish line. He has his hands thrown up in the air in celebration. He hugged his family. He wiped the tears from his face. It is one of those moments that he will always, always remember. The feeling is probably hard to fathom, but for Pete, a young man who grew up in Western Alaska, somebody who is often referred to as an encyclopedia of racing knowledge, somebody who is known in his community for his hard work and dedication, somebody who has now won the Kuskokwim 300 four times in a row—a race qualifier for the Iditarod—and for his family and his extended family who supported him, who cheered him along the way, and for so many in the community of Bethel who joined together, who chartered an aircraft to get there in time to see him finish and celebrate this achievement, this truly is a victory that is an accomplishment and an extraordinary highlight to a remarkable career.

So the excitement that comes when you are finishing a grueling race like this and when you and your team come across the line is something that you really have to experience to understand. There is fatigue, but there is great excitement with the accomplishment.

It is not just the accomplishment of the musher, because the musher would still be sitting back in Willow were it not for these extraordinary animals, which truly, truly live to run. They live to do this race and others like it.

Nothing beats the finish here. I don't have very many opportunities where I can actually be at the finish because you never quite know when it will be. Usually, race winners come in between 8, 9, or 10 days. So if you are starting on a Sunday, usually we finish during the week when we are back here working. So I haven't had the opportunity to be on that end, but I have had multiple opportunities—in fact, this is an opportunity that I do not miss—to be at the front end and to be at the start of the Iditarod.

So just 9 days prior, this is me and Pete Kaiser at the start of the Iditarod. He is looking pretty fresh in this picture. He probably didn't look quite so fresh after 9 days on the trail.

We gathered in downtown Anchorage with 52 mushers—that is how many mushers ran this year—and all of their teams. With the rules change this year, there were 14 dogs to a team at the start. But you are in downtown Anchorage, and you not only have your teams who are going to be moving you through the first day of the ceremonial start but you have your other dogs. So you have dogs, you have mushers, you have people, and you have kids. It is like a carnival atmosphere.

This year I had an opportunity to do something I have never done before, and that was to drive the tag sled of one of our four-time champions, Jeff King.

During the ceremonial start, you go from Anchorage to Campbell Creek Airstrip. It is an 11-mile portion of the trail. I can say that I did 1 percent of the Iditarod by driving on the back of this tag sled. I didn't have the dogs directly in front of me, but I still had to operate the brake on the sled. I still had to lean into the curves and still had the opportunity to experience just the majesty of the dogs in front of you and the way the mushers communicate with their team.

The Iditarod is a race like none other, and it is perhaps made so because of the challenge of the terrain that this race goes through. The journey that led the mushers through these valleys and across these mountain ranges is hard. It is challenging. The weather is not unlike the terrain. It was up, and it was down. We had areas along the trail where it was raining, and then we had areas where we had freezing temperatures. You had wind. You had snow. You had ice. So when you think about how much work it is to get through the burlled arch, it is really a tremendous accomplishment to be able to say that you have completed this race.

As we speak, there are still dozens more mushers and their teams that are out along that trail working to complete it.

You might think that this is something where there is a significant prize, and that is what motivates people. Well, if you are successful and you finish the Iditarod, you will be able to claim \$1,149. Your dogs are going to eat up that money pretty quickly. Most of this is so much for the love of mushing and the love of the animals.

People always ask: Well, how hard is it? What kind of challenges do the mushers encounter along the way?

It is everything from encounters with animals, whether it is a moose along the trail—and we have seen some bad outcomes from that—to just physical obstructions along the trail.

Richie Diehl of Aniak ran smack into a tree—literally, smack into a tree. He hit his face on the trail near Nikolai. He said he was kind of cruising along and he had his head turned. It was still dark. He looked forward and, bam, he ran into a tree.

He probably could have ducked if he noticed it, but he didn't, and then he was kind of knocked off. He did an all-out sprint to chase his team down and dove to catch his sled. He lined up the dog team, again got everybody organized, grabbed some toilet paper, some wet wipes, and started mushing down the trail as he wiped the bleeding off his skin. You are just not stopping. You are not stopping for yourself. For your dogs, if your dogs are injured, you absolutely stop.

Anja Radano of Talkeetna fell in a large hole in the ice crossing the infa-

mous Dalzell ice hole. While she is making her way across the frozen river, her sled slipped into the hole. She falls into the water, and she injured her ribs and her legs. She had been having a little bit of a struggle along the trail, but she said she would not have been able to get out of the waterhole there without the help of her dog team.

Then there is Linwood Fiedler, who was on his way to Nikolai, and his entire dog team got separated from the sled when his biner broke, but, fortunately for him, there was a fellow musher coming up, Mats Pettersson, who shows up on the trail shortly after. He helped him get his whole team, and potentially—potentially—saved the lives of these dogs.

You have trail conditions that are hard this year, and part of the trail, quite honestly, because of the warmer weather we have seen, they were what we call tusset, which is just mounds of hard, matted grass in just kind of a bumper strip all the way going through. It is very hard on sleds. There were a couple of mushers who took 30 hours to go through this one stretch, and they ultimately decided enough and scratched.

You have the terrain. You also have the fact that you are going all out for days on end, and limited sleep has its effect. We heard some comments from Lance Mackey, who is a four-time Iditarod champ. He was talking about how he was imagining things on the trail, a little bit of a hallucination, seeing and hearing things that aren't there, thinking he was hearing people say, "Go, Lance," as he was making the run between Rohn and Nikolai. You have to do all you can to keep yourself awake because you are in the back of a sled.

Remember, you are not sitting down. This is not all comfy and cozy for 1,100 miles. You are standing on the back of the sled. Oftentimes, you are running along or walking along behind. You are helping your dogs move through. You have to constantly replenish yourself and your dogs, and that means taking trail snacks and drinking nonstop.

There is always a question about what everybody eats. Aliy Zirkle, who has come in fourth, attributes her diet to rolled oat bars made out of peanut butter, banana, sesame seeds, and other things because they are easy, and they don't get frozen. You have to think about things like how do I eat while I am still moving and things don't get frozen.

They do have an opportunity to get some good meals. They get wined and dined, if you will, when they get to a checkpoint. When you are in a village, you have the kids come out, and everybody is looking for autographs. They want to say hello to them. They want to find out what position everybody is in, but they also, oftentimes, get a warm meal like a stew, but before the humans eat—before the mushers eat, the dogs have to eat. The dogs have to

be cared for. The dogs have to be taken care of first because life on the trail is taking care of the dogs. They are making sure they have a warm and a comfortable place to rest, are fed, and they are watered. They are checked out by the veterinarians.

This is one thing that is pretty interesting. People think, well, you are just going into a town. A lot of these places, it is not a town. It is not like you can just go to a tap and fill up your dog bowls for water for your dogs. Now, your dogs have been on the trail for several hours. They are thirsty. They have been eating snow along the way, but they are thirsty. They need to be hydrated.

If you are out on the trail and you have 14 or 15 dogs, what do you do? You melt snow or you melt ice. Where is the stove? Well, you have your little camp stove that you have in the back of your sled. Think about it. You are sleep-deprived, you are hungry, you are tired, but you have to take care of your dogs first. You put your straw down to bed them down. You check their feet, and you put dry booties on them. You melt the water. You have to then heat up the dog food that has been dropped along the way in places where you know your team is going to be stopping. You could be working with your dogs for a good hour before you can even start thinking about yourself and how you satisfy your hunger, your thirst, your sleep.

It is a pretty amazing race. Again, I am just in awe of the animals. I am in awe of the mushers. I am also in awe of the many, many, many, many people who come to be volunteers for it, this race. Most people have no idea what it takes to pull off a race like this, but I am told there are more volunteers who help us at this race than any other organized race like this in the country.

What we have is a volunteer Air Force, if you will. Those stashes of food I talked about, those don't get there by accident. There is no road to drive them by, so you have pilots who will volunteer to take whatever it is, straw for bedding or big coolers and containers of food, to the various checkpoints. They will drop them off so they are pre-positioned out there, but those guys, they are all volunteers.

At the banquet in Nome, at the end of this week, the people who put on the banquet are volunteers not necessarily from Nome but from all over the country. The last time I was up there, I went back in the kitchen to say thank you to the men and women who were working there. They all had their little nametags, and they say where they are from. There is a whole group who was from a little town in Florida. They had all taken a week's vacation from their work to come up and just be there for the Iditarod, to welcome the mushers coming in.

I asked: What do you do here as a volunteer? They said: We are in charge of rolls and butter. Ok. But this is how much of a commitment they have made

to this race. They have been doing it for years. They are a group who just comes up from Florida, they cash in their miles, they take leave from work, and this is where they take their vacation because they realize this is such an extraordinary happening. You have volunteers from all over the country, from Canada, and the communities along the trails.

The veterinarians. There are 50 veterinarians along the trail because at the checkpoints, the dogs must be checked by the vets. We are going to take care of those animals and make sure—so you have veterinarians; you have dog handlers; and you have vet techs who come from across the Nation. They are there volunteering their time to be at this extraordinary event.

Again, the pilots who fly to drop the supplies are volunteers. They act as race judges. They aid in the event of an injury or a lost dog. The list goes on and on and on in terms of those who volunteer. Ultimately, it simply could not happen were it not for the volunteers who put the extra mile in to make it happen.

So today we are celebrating and acknowledging the efforts of all those who pitched in to help, the fans who cheered on the teams throughout the race, the communities that served as hosts along the way, and all the mushers and all their teams who put their hearts and put their souls into this really tough but incredible expedition.

We, in Alaska, are all congratulating Pete Kaiser on his win. He is the only musher from the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta since the inaugural Iditarod back in 1973. He is the first Yup'ik Iditarod champion in the history of the Iditarod race. He is an incredibly humble man. He is a great role model. He is an inspiration to his community, and I know they are all exceptionally proud.

After he won, Pete said he hoped his victory would be celebrated not just by the Yup'ik people within his region but by all Native people throughout Alaska.

So, Pete, I think, we are here to tell you that today, Alaskans in the western part of the State, all over the State, including as far away as Washington, DC, are all celebrating and recognizing you and your extraordinary canine athletes.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SUNSHINE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we are celebrating an important week in our system of self-government. This week is known as Sunshine Week. For the last 14 years, advocacy groups,

good government watchdogs, and media organizations have joined forces to observe the importance of transparency and freedom of information. With transparency and freedom of information, there is more accountability in government. As a long-time champion of an open, accessible government, I speak today in support of those enduring principles.

Sunshine Week coincides each year with March 16. That is the day one of the Nation's Founding Fathers and fourth President of the United States was born. That person was James Madison, widely known as the Father of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

From his writings in the Federalist Papers, it might be said that he was the architect who framed our system of checks and balances. Madison believed all powers of the government are derived of, by, and for the people. That is what brings me to the floor today.

The public has a right to know what their government is doing and how their government is spending the taxpayers' dollars. What is more, the American people owe a debt of gratitude to our fellow citizens who bravely come forward, often at great professional risk, to report wrongdoing in government. We ought to expect that out of government employees or any fellow citizen who knows something is wrong.

I am here today to talk about a ray of sunlight coming from the Defense Department. More specifically, I want to alert you about the whistleblower hotline managed by the inspector general. Once in a while, good news comes out of that Department.

I spend a lot of time on government oversight. Congressional oversight is part of our constitutional assignment to protect the power of the purse and to ensure that the laws we pass are faithfully executed.

My sights are set quite often on the Pentagon when it comes to oversight. The U.S. military is the strongest and mightiest in the world. Our men and women in uniform put their lives on the line to protect our sacred freedoms. Each of us should be fighting tooth and nail to make sure that they have the resources they need. I am not, however, talking about writing blank checks; I am talking about making sure that defense dollars are spent wisely.

The Pentagon shoulders a strategic and vital mission for America but is by no means infallible—not by a long shot. As with almost any bureaucracy or corporate organization, its workplace culture dictates that each individual should go along to get along, and that is not how it should be. Institutional foot-dragging at the Pentagon, for example, has hampered efforts to root out sexual misconduct. You read about it too often. A systemic bookkeeping system has plagued the Department of Defense for decades.

Nevertheless, I keep pressing the Pentagon to fix this fiscal mess. Every

dollar lost to waste, fraud, and abuse is a dollar that could be put to better use for our men and women in uniform for better housing, as just one example.

I learned long ago that one of the best ways to expose wrongdoing is by listening to whistleblowers. Whistleblowers are the ones who have their noses and ears to the ground day in and day out. They are patriots doing their job in reporting wrongdoing. These patriots know the difference between right and wrong. So when their good conscience compels them to come forward, we should hear them out, and we need to encourage others to do the same.

Whistleblowers within the Defense Department help weed out improper payments, procurements, fraud, and other unethical schemes and misbehaviors that come at taxpayers' expense and the expense of military preparedness.

As cofounder and cochairman of the Whistleblower Protection Caucus, I lead efforts from Capitol Hill to strengthen protections and raise awareness for what is often an uphill battle for whistleblowers. In the rigid command of the U.S. military, the civilian workforce and uniformed members of the military are trained to follow protocol and to respect the chain of command. Instead of receiving a pat on the back for exposing wrongdoing, too many of these whistleblowers face retribution and reprisal. I often say they are treated like skunks at a picnic.

That brings me to the DOD whistleblower hotline, a vital conduit for whistleblower complaints. Once again, there is some good news about DOD and whistleblowers and trying to improve things there in a November IG report. It shows the huge backlog of tips has been reduced. You could say that it is a glimmer of hope in an otherwise swamp of secrecy.

You see, the report also exposes the bad news. The playbook of Federal authority—defend, delay, and deny—is alive and kicking. From fiscal years 2013 to 2018, the Office of the Inspector General found the number of reports tripled. It also showed the number of reprisal complaints doubled.

The report found that 350 Defense Department officials, most of them in the branches of the Armed Forces, retaliated against and sought to intimidate 195 whistleblowers. I can't speak about 195 cases, but I will bet, in many cases, many higher-ups in the chain of command would be embarrassed, and that is why it wasn't reported, and that is why these folks were retaliated against. This tells me also that higher-ups who are accused of retaliating against whistleblowers are going unpunished.

Consider, about 85 percent of the people who reported wrongdoing and faced professional punishment or personal embarrassment are still waiting for any remedy according to this inspector general report.

This sends a very unsubtle signal to whistleblowers: Blow the whistle at your own risk. When the top dogs who dish out retribution go unpunished, and some are even promoted, the message to the rank and file is loud and clear: Blow the whistle at your own risk.

Nearly 2 years ago, I came to the floor of the Senate to sound the alarm on this very subject. At that time I shared statistics from a 2016 IG report. It listed 406 hotline cases that had been open for more than 2 years. Nobody is in a hurry to do anything about wrongdoing in the Defense Department when things like that can accumulate. More than half of those 406 cases—246 cases to be exact—had been open for more than 1,000 days, and some had been lying around for 4 years. So back when I gave that speech a couple of years ago, I noted that the IG's office wasn't moving the needle, despite increases in personnel and money in the IG's office. The workforce-to-workload ratio was mismatched. Cases were adding up, and the corrosive workplace culture within the IG was a festering sore. Allegations of tampering with investigations and whitewashing cases were tarnishing the reputation of the premier whistleblower oversight unit at the Pentagon. Congressional watchdogs, like myself, should not have to watch the Pentagon watchdogs to keep oversight on track.

As I said, there is some good news. Things seemed to turn the corner when Acting Inspector General Fine recognized the antics of a bureaucracy run amuck.

I am glad to see a ray of sunlight coming from the IG's office. However, we still aren't out of the woods.

I want to thank those in the IG's office who are toiling to reduce this hotline backlog; however, the DOD needs to step up and face the music. DOD needs to own these failures in letting retaliators off the hook.

Failing to hold these folks accountable is a huge slap in the face to those in the Department who are performing their responsibilities every day with dedication and excellence, being patriotic people, blowing the whistle, and pointing out waste, fraud, and abuse.

It also happens to be a slap in the face of the taxpayers. It is telling these patriotic whistleblowers: Thanks but no thanks. Feel free to disclose your report, but we may press the mute button after processing the claim.

Make no mistake about it—the hotline becomes meaningless if whistleblowers lack confidence in the system. They will stop calling and stop reporting waste, fraud, and abuse.

My advice to Inspector General Fine is this: Put some mustard on it, and add some hot sauce while you are at it. Get down to the brass tacks, and recommend disciplinary action against those who retaliate against patriotic people pointing out waste, fraud, and abuse.

In closing, I would like to share a tip with the Department of Defense. This

U.S. Senator will continue shining the spotlight on waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon—and, of course, elsewhere—and I will continue advocating for whistleblowers with every tool at my disposal.

As an Iowa farmer, I know what a load of manure smells like. I am also very aware of why farmers make hay when the sun shines, and that is a very good lesson for good government. Sunshine helps hold government accountable to the American people, and that is why we celebrate Sunshine Week this week and every year now for, I think, 14 years—because Sunshine Week promotes openness and transparency in government.

That is why the Congress passed the Physician Payments Sunshine Act in 2010. This law establishes a mandatory national disclosure program in which drug and medical device manufacturers report payments to prescribers in teaching hospitals. However, it appears that some parties may not be disclosing this information.

That is why, in addition to what I told you about overseeing things in the Defense Department, it is necessary to call out HHS and CMS to be forthcoming about whether opportunities exist for us to work together to strengthen the law where all these things aren't being reported as they should be. Sunshine is the best disinfectant.

FREE TRADE

Mr. President, lastly, I would like to talk about free trade for a minute. I am calling on the administration to promptly remove the section 232 tariffs on steel and aluminum imports from Canada and Mexico. This will help clear the path for the United States-Mexico-Canadian Agreement to be ratified in all three countries. These tariffs and their retaliation are having a negative impact on Americans. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement is supposed to be a free-trade agreement, but we don't have free trade with these tariffs in place.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance, I look forward to helping the President with this important task. And a little bit of advice for the President would come this way: I think he imposed tariffs on Mexican and Canadian steel and aluminum because he didn't think they were going to negotiate and said that is why he put the tariffs on. Obviously they negotiated in good faith because the President said he has a very good agreement. I happen to agree that he has a very good agreement. So wouldn't you think, then, that the tariffs ought to come off?

Somebody down at the White House recently told me: Well, you can't conflate the tariffs on aluminum and steel with the USMCA agreement. Well, don't tell me you can't conflate them when you conflate them when you say to the other side: If you don't negotiate, we are going to put these tariffs on.

I think there is a clear path to getting this done.

The President is concerned about the transshipment of steel from China, through Canada, into the United States, which obviously wouldn't be fair. They are concerned, as well, about surges in exports to the United States.

I think he would find Prime Minister Trudeau very open to receiving assurances that if the House of Commons in Canada moves ahead with approval of it, these tariffs would go off. At the same time, I think they will get assurances from the Canadian Government that they will make sure transshipment from China, through Canada, to the United States won't happen and that surges in exports won't happen as well.

If we can get the Canadian Government to approve this agreement, it seems to me it is going to be a lot easier to get through the Congress of the United States. And I think that just as soon as Mexico changes some labor laws they promised they would change to make labor more fair and less unfair to the American worker, I think the Mexican Senate will approve this agreement. But time is a factor here because Canada has to get this all done before they adjourn in June for their October elections.

It seems to me that when the President says he has a good agreement—and there is a certain amount of anxiety out there about all these trade negotiations that are going on—we could get this thing settled pretty fast and reduce that anxiety, and we could make sure we enhance our economy more than the fine policies of this President, through taxes and through deregulation, have already improved the economy and keep it growing.

I would ask the President to consider moving this as fast as he can and get off of this business of negotiating trade and tariffs for quotas because that is not much better for the United States and not much better even for the Canadians, and it isn't going to satisfy the Canadians that they can move ahead before their election.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, Democrats have put forward proposals claiming that it is the duty of the Federal Government to create a so-called Green New Deal.

My colleagues have listed a variety of goals, like net-zero greenhouse gas emissions within a decade, good jobs for all, and a sustainable environment and infrastructure, but they haven't proposed any specific policy changes or a roadmap of how to reach these goals. The reason for that is clear. As the resolution's authors have said, these proposals would require a massive Federal Government takeover and reorganization of our country as a whole. We are learning that what it would take to accomplish these goals is unrealistic. We should call the Green New Deal exactly what it is—an attack on what should

be the limited role of the Federal Government in our lives.

I want to address Nebraskans directly, and I want to analyze a few details that are part of this resolution's attack on rural America, which is an attack on Nebraska because our State's economy and the well-being of all Nebraska families is reliant on a strong agricultural economy.

One section of the resolution speaks to our Nation's agriculture sector. Properly managing our environment is important, and Nebraska's agricultural producers who feed and fuel our world know better than anyone about conservation and stewardship. This is a serious issue, and it deserves a serious and a sensible approach.

The early fact sheets that came out describing the Green New Deal offered mind-boggling proposals, like eliminating cows. This idea was so ridiculous that the Democrats balked and distanced themselves from this concept. In fact, while the Nebraska Democratic Party announced their support for the Green New Deal, Nebraska's Democratic Party chairman recently apologized to fellow Nebraskans for the anti-agriculture ideas that are included in it.

Tom Vilsack, a former Iowa Governor and former Secretary of Agriculture in the Obama administration, was spot-on with his comments about the greatness of American agriculture during a congressional hearing in 2016. He pointed this out:

Every one of us that's not a farmer, is not a farmer because we have farmers. We delegate the responsibility of feeding our families to a relatively small percentage of this country. Eighty-five percent of what's grown in this country, it's raised by 2- to 300,000 people. It is an incredible freedom that we take for granted . . . and rather than being criticized, we ought to be celebrating these people . . . and we don't do it enough.

I could not agree more. Nebraska farmers and ranchers feed a hungry world. Our soybeans, dairy, wheat, pork, eggs, and potatoes reach family dinner tables around the globe.

Nebraska is known as the Beef State. We are the No. 1 exporter of beef in the Nation. In 2017, Nebraska exported well over \$1 billion in beef products. Our beef producers are known around the globe as the best at what they do.

Here are some facts.

Fact: According to a recent USDA report, beef production accounts for only 3.3 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions in the United States.

Fact: According to a Smithsonian article published in 2016, wetlands account for nearly 22 percent of global methane emissions. I would suggest to you that no one wants to eliminate wetlands.

Nebraska ag producers care for our land and our water, and our cattle producers already have elevated levels of water regulations. For example, our feedlots must maintain a livestock waste control facility permit from the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality. Existing and new live-

stock operations must be inspected by the DEQ to determine if a waste control facility construction permit is required. Our producers also need a national pollutant discharge elimination system permit if their livestock facility has the potential to discharge into surface waters.

As I said, Nebraska is the Beef State, but we are also the Cornhuskers, and the two go hand-in-hand. Nebraska is a top producer of corn, and that corn is fed to livestock and establishes Nebraska as the No. 1 cattle on feed State in the Nation. Our producers do this while conserving our natural resources—our land and our water.

Consider this: The Omaha-based Lindsay Corporation recently developed a tool that connects to the center pivot irrigation system and remotely controls the water based on the irrigation prescription for each individual field. The company estimated that since the tool was launched, it has saved over 21 billion gallons of water, over 34 million kilowatt hours of energy, and over 57 million pounds of carbon dioxide emissions globally.

Nebraska also has a unique system of 23 natural resources districts. The districts are managed by locally elected boards. The boards have tax levy authority to support conservation efforts tailored to each of the district's unique needs. Through this process, we regulate our groundwater more than any other State, and it is an effective use because our local communities are the ones in control. No other State in the country has this advanced form of ground and surface water management. Because of the adoption of more efficient irrigation systems by our corn and soybean producers, water applied in three natural resources districts in Nebraska has decreased significantly, conserving our water.

Nebraska's producers also take good care of our soil. Our natural resources districts can require landowners to manage soil erosion on their land and connect them with cost-sharing programs to help implement effective soil management practices. The use of planned grazing on our ranches—my family's ranch included—improves the amount and the diversity of grass available to cattle, and cattle improve the overall health of that rangeland.

The Natural Resources and Conservation Service estimated that soil erosion and planned or, as some call it, rotational grazing practices have saved over \$80 million in annual damages from flooding or erosion. Additionally, with the adoption of no-till farming practices in row crop production, combined with cover crops like millet and rye, we have vastly improved the health of our soil.

The bottom line is this: Ag producers are conservationists who utilize proven practices to manage our land and water resources.

As more facts have come out, we have learned that the cost alone of the Green New Deal is astounding. One estimate by the American Action Forum

found that if the deal were fully enacted, it would cost anywhere from \$51 trillion to \$93 trillion over the next 10 years—\$93 trillion. That is a staggering expense that our families, our businesses, and our economy simply cannot afford.

One of the main goals of the Green New Deal is a mandate to move our country to 100 percent renewable energy and achieve carbon neutrality within the next decade. The American Action Forum's estimate warns that households would shoulder this weight with up to a nearly \$4,000 increase in their yearly electric bills, and if our country relied on foreign energy, those rates would skyrocket even higher.

Higher electricity bills are a concern for me, and they are a concern for Nebraska families, but my colleagues across the aisle don't seem fazed. Recall that in 2009, former President Obama said he was willing to have the average household pay nearly \$1,600 per year to reduce carbon emissions by 15 percent. Hard-working families said then that they could not afford that. So how can people now afford up to spending \$4,000 a year?

Attempting to move to all renewable energy would also mean shutting down every nuclear, coal, and natural gas plant. According to some estimates, this would cost Nebraskans and the American people \$7 trillion by 2030. If we eliminated the use of natural resources like gas, oil, and coal production, the United States would rely on other countries to supply our energy.

The United States leads all G20 countries with the best record of carbon dioxide emissions reduction in recent years. From 2005 to 2017, the United States reduced carbon dioxide emissions by 862 million tons—a 14-percent cut. Comparatively, in the same timeframe, India increased its carbon emissions by 1.3 billion tons, and China raised its emissions by 4 billion tons—a 70-percent increase. Though China is moving toward plants with higher efficiency, China already accounts for nearly half of the global coal consumption.

The Green New Deal misses a crucial point: The United States is already making voluntary changes to lead the world in reducing carbon dioxide emissions. A line from the 16-page resolution reads that the Green New Deal would include "overhauling transportation systems in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions."

A background document released by the Green New Deal's author called for a plan to build out high-speed rail and replace every combustion engine vehicle at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary. As chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee's Transportation and Safety Subcommittee, I welcome all commonsense, bipartisan proposals to improve our infrastructure so that we can provide the safe and efficient movement of our people and our goods.

Yet the Green New Deal is a far cry from a commonsense proposal. The call to replace every combustion engine wouldn't just hurt our Nation's infrastructure; it would mean scrapping our personal cars and the commercial trucking industry. It would mean eradicating planes and air travel altogether. Don't forget that we are a Nation of vastness. Light rail is not feasible. It is not feasible in many parts of our country, and people in sparsely populated areas have a right to receive services, participate in commerce, and have transportation options that meet their unique needs.

In closing, as the activists continue to push their wish lists, I am going to continue to focus on addressing those regulations that make life difficult for families and businesses in Nebraska. Excessive regulations cause our ag producers to focus on mountains of paperwork instead of on ways to innovate and implement new practices so they can continue being good stewards of our land. The key to finding realistic solutions in addressing carbon dioxide emissions lies in the hands of America's innovators, not in the heavy hand of the Federal Government through an economic takeover.

In moving forward, I am going to work on updating the aging infrastructure that our citizens rely on in their everyday lives. I am going to fight for policies that will help to promote economic growth and help families across this country provide for their loved ones, and I will continue to highlight the good work our farmers and ranchers are doing to protect our air, water, land, and wildlife.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the need to vigorously protect the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are a vital natural resource not only for my home State of Michigan but for the entire Nation. In addition to providing drinking water for nearly 40 million people, the Great Lakes serve as an economic engine for our entire country. This freshwater system is associated with adding nearly \$6 trillion to the U.S. GDP while supporting millions of jobs. It accounts for more than 50 percent of all U.S.-Canadian border trade and facilitates the shipping of over 200 million tons of cargo every year.

But ask Michiganders what the Great Lakes mean to them, and they will tell you that they are a great deal more than simply a source of commerce; the Great Lakes literally define our State. They not only define our borders but who we are among the States. We are, in fact, the Great Lakes State. We love to spend our summers on or near the lakes and, in the process, form the family memories that we hold for a lifetime. It is no exaggeration to say that for Michiganders, the Great Lakes are part of who we are. It is in our DNA.

Over the years, Democrats and Republicans alike have understood the importance of maintaining the vitality of the Great Lakes. That is why, in 2004, President George W. Bush signed an Executive order to promote a Great Lakes regional collaboration.

Then, in 2010, President Obama built on his predecessor's leadership. In his very first budget request, President Obama called for the funding for what would later be known as the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. The GLRI today remains a bipartisan success story because it provides a platform for Federal Agencies and States to come together to address the biggest threats to our lakes.

Let me give you a few examples of the positive impact that the GLRI has had in my home State of Michigan.

In Deer Lake, near Ishpeming in the Upper Peninsula, GLRI funds were used to successfully eliminate mercury runoff that had contaminated local wildlife. Over just a few years, these funds were used to restore the natural habitat, and as a result, Deer Lake was no longer considered a Federal area of concern.

Thanks to the support of the GLRI, sufficient improvements were made to prevent runoff at the Gloede Drain in the Clinton Township of Macomb County, reducing flooding and soil erosion in an area that many Michiganders call home.

In Detroit, 30 steel mills, oil refineries, chemical manufacturers, and other plants discharged pollutants into the Detroit River for decades. However, with the implementation of \$89 million worth of GLRI waterway cleanup projects, the water quality has improved, and Detroit now has a thriving and vibrant downtown RiverWalk that has become an economic engine for small businesses.

There is no question the GLRI is a proven success and has been vital to Michigan's environment and to Michigan's economy. Yet, despite this success, President Trump, once again, is willing to risk the health, safety, and vitality of one of the world's largest freshwater systems by proposing a 90-percent cut—yes, a 90-percent cut—to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. Unfortunately, this is not the first time. Since taking office, President Trump has tried to eliminate the funding to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative each and every year he has been in office, and each and every year, Congress has united in a bipartisan way to ensure that this critical program remains funded.

Let me be clear. Slashing GLRI funding would have an immediate and catastrophic impact on the future of the Great Lakes and on both the nearly 10 million Michiganders whom I represent as well as our entire country.

I again ask my Senate colleagues for their support. The Great Lakes are not just a Michigan priority; they are not just a regional priority—they are truly a national priority. Fully funding the

Great Lakes Restoration Initiative should never be a partisan issue—it is simply the right thing to do—and, together, we can protect the Great Lakes for this generation and future generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 67; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Coast Guard Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203(a):

To be captain

Alexander C. Foons

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 97, 104, and 106.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of William I. Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024. (Reappointment); Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024; and Arthur R. Traynor III, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring August 30, 2022.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in

order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Althen, Rajkovich, and Traynor nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 91 and 96.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2023, and Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring April 10, 2021.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hood and Harper nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 59.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald W. Washington, of Texas, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action;

that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Washington nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 63, 64 and 66.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024; Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2022; and Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hellreich, Mandell, and Ramer nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO CLIFF KELLEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 1963, Leonard and Phil Chess, brothers and

owners of the legendary Chess Records, bought WHFC-AM 1450 with the goal of promoting their company. They renamed the station WVON—Voice of the Negro. This tiny station with just 1,000 watts of power became a broadcast hit, giving a voice to marginalized communities in the Chicagoland area. Much of their airwaves were filled with music, but politics wasn't far behind.

WVON hosted legends like Robert Kennedy, Jackie Robinson, and Reverend Martin Luther King. King used this station as his bully pulpit to organize around housing and job discrimination. It was Reverend Jesse Jackson that called into the station to report of King's assassination. When riots happened on Chicago's West Side, it was the disc jockeys of WVON that went out with loudspeakers on trucks to calm things down. WVON is a station of history and eventually became more than the Voice of the Negro, it became the Voice of the Nation.

For the last 25 years, my friend Cliff Kelley has been a true voice of the Nation as host on WVON. He has been the "Governor of Talk Radio" and formed a bond with listeners that is rare. At the end of this month, he will be stepping down from his daily show, but he will continue hosting his weekly American Heroes show for veterans. Cliff will serve as a community ambassador and a regular fill-in host.

Cliff is a native of Chicago's South Side and a graduate of Englewood High School, Roosevelt University, and John Marshall Law School. Before hosting his show, Cliff served 16 years as a former 20th Ward Chicago alderman. He championed racial equality, was an elected school board member, and a pioneer for LGBTQ rights. He fought for LGBTQ rights long before it was popular.

Cliff continued as a voice of conscience and community as well as a radio personality. He covered stories that weren't in the papers. His show helped launch countless people's careers, including Senators, Governors, congressmen, business leaders, and a President. A former colleague you may remember guest hosted his show quite a few times when Cliff went on vacation. He was a State Senator at the time, but Barack Obama always had time for Cliff's show as a guest or a host.

Luckily for us, Cliff's voice is still going to be heard today. We honor Cliff's decades of daily radio work, but we know that, as long as there are battles for justice to be waged, Cliff Kelley will lead the fight.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipu-

lates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-04 concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Spain for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$107 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Spain.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$89.6 million.
Other \$17.4 million.
Total \$107.0 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Eight (8) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Personnel (AAVP-7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS).

Two (2) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Command (AAVC-7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS).

One (1) Assault Amphibious Vehicle, Recovery (AAVR-7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS).

Non-MDE: Also included are Enhanced Armor Applique Kits (EAAK), spare and repair parts, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, training and training material, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (SP-P-LHO).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.
(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 14, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Spain—Assault Amphibious Vehicles

The Government of Spain has requested to buy eight (8) Assault Amphibious Vehicles,

Personnel (AAVP-7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS); two (2) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Command (AAVC-7A 1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS); and one (1) Assault Amphibious Vehicle, Recovery (AAVR-7A1) Reliability, Availability, Maintainability/Rebuilt to Standard (RAM/RS). Also included are Enhanced Armor Applique Kits (EAAK), spare and repair parts, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, training and training material, U.S. Government and contractor technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$107 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally which is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist Spain in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed addition of these eleven (11) vehicles to Spain's fleet will afford more flexibility and maintain Spain's expeditionary capability to counter regional threats and continue to enhance stability in the region. Spain currently operates 19 Assault Amphibious Vehicles (AAVs) and is proficient at using them to their fullest capability. Spain will have no difficulty absorbing these additional vehicles.

The proposed sale of this equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be BAE Systems, York, Pennsylvania, and Anniston, Alabama. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representative in Spain.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The vulnerability to countermeasure information for Assault Amphibious Vehicles is considered classified SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that the Government of Spain can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Spain.

NOMINATION OF GENERAL JOHN ABIZAID

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to correct the record concerning statements the Senate majority leader made yesterday morning,

in which he claimed that GEN John Abizaid's nomination to be Ambassador to Saudi Arabia "is being held up."

Allow me to ease the majority leader's concerns. Far from being "held up," the Foreign Relations Committee, with my full support, has been extremely diligent in taking up General Abizaid's nomination; he appeared on the very first committee nominations hearing of the 116th Congress, and his nomination is advancing through the regular committee process expeditiously. I look forward to his approval by the committee and, hopefully, a speedy confirmation. As with all nominees, his final confirmation is under the control of the majority leader.

I am concerned that the majority leader has an inaccurate view of the nominations situation facing the Foreign Relations Committee. He stated yesterday that "if we want to solve problems in the Middle East, through diplomacy, we'll need to confirm diplomats." Unfortunately, we cannot confirm diplomats that we do not have.

It took 23 months before the Trump administration bothered to nominate General Abizaid, leaving a gaping hole in our diplomatic posture to Saudi Arabia and the region. It is possible that this failure of leadership is the result of the President believing that his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, is capable of doing this job from the White House.

Regardless of the reason, Saudi Arabia is not an isolated example. It took even longer, over 2 years, before the Trump administration nominated a candidate to be U.S. Ambassador to Turkey. We are now 26 months into the Trump administration, and we still lack ambassadorial nominees to critical countries like Egypt, Pakistan, and our close ally, Jordan. This failure is a reckless abdication of a constitutional responsibility that is essential to projecting American power abroad. There is only one person responsible for this failure: President Trump; yet the majority leader appears to be curiously oblivious to that fact.

Let me be clear: When the committee has received nominations, we have worked with efficiency and diligence to vet and advance those nominations. I have devoted my time and staff resources to ensure this because of my strong belief that the State Department, USAID, and other foreign affairs agencies must be appropriately staffed. We cannot promote our foreign policy, protect American citizens, and advocate for American businesses without a robust diplomatic corps. In the 115th Congress, the committee reported 169 nominations. I reject any assertion that we have not done our part to ensure that the State Department is appropriately staffed.

All too often, however, the committee has received nominations late or not at all.

There is, unfortunately, there is another severe problem that we cannot ignore with regard to this administration's nominees. Delays in advancing

Trump political nominees is largely due to poor vetting by this administration. When the President nominates and renominates individuals with restraining orders for threats of violence, who engaged in incidents that should, frankly, mean they never should have been nominated, or made material omissions, sometimes on a repeated basis, in their nomination materials, the Foreign Relations Committee must do our due diligence on behalf of the American people. Someone has to. My staff and I have had to spend significant additional time on vetting because of the White House's negligence or incompetence.

The United States and our allies continue to face tremendous challenges around the world. We must continue to lead on the international stage and work in collaboration with international partners to achieve our shared security goals, but to have our diplomats in place, they must be nominated in a timely fashion and vetted properly. Despite the majority leader's confusion on this issue, that is the real hold-up here.

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to express a concern over the Rubio amendment to the Sanders-Lee joint resolution, S.J. Res. 7, which was passed by voice vote in yesterday's debate.

The Rubio amendment attempts to make clear that nothing in the joint resolution is intended or may be interpreted to affect any intelligence or counterintelligence activity or investigations relating to threats in or from Yemen, which involves the collection, analysis, or sharing of intelligence with any coalition partner.

I do not believe that it was the intention of the authors of S.J. Res. 7 to restrict these intelligence activities per se. I believe it was Senator RUBIO's intention to make sure that that legitimate intelligence activities, as specified, were not affected.

However, my concern springs from the full implications of what "sharing intelligence" means. I assume it is meant to share useful intelligence the United States may acquire about the intentions, activities, characteristics, and other information about, for example, the Houthis or Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. That is entirely appropriate.

But if the intelligence being shared is actually information that allows Saudi Arabia or other members of the Saudi-led coalition to specifically target and conduct military operations, such as airstrikes, against specific sites in Yemen, then that would get perilously close to the U.S. being directly involved in hostilities in Yemen, including under the War Powers Resolution.

Section 8 of the War Powers Resolution considers U.S. Armed Forces to be "introduced into hostilities" if, among other activities, members of the U.S.

Armed Forces "coordinate" the activities of foreign forces. Arguably, enabling Saudi forces to target specific sites in Yemen could constitute "coordination" under the War Powers definition.

Why is this important? It is important, first, to preserve the scope of application of the War Powers Resolution, which the Congress enacted to rein in the power of the executive branch to make war anywhere under any circumstances.

Second, the more direct assistance U.S. Armed Forces provide to the Saudi-led coalition, the closer they are associated with the actions of those countries. That could lead to shared liability in those activities if and when those activities lead, inadvertently or otherwise, to atrocities on the ground in Yemen.

Again, I do not believe that it was the intention of the author of this amendment to create the legal space for this to occur. I would advise the Department of Defense and the appropriate intelligence agencies to be mindful of this issue and be cautious about what intelligence information is shared and for what purposes it is used.

H.R. 269

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
March 14, 2019.

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

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL, I am requesting to be consulted before the Senate enters into any unanimous consent agreements or time limitations regarding H.R. 269, the Over-the-Counter Drug Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act. I further request that this legislation not be incorporated into any larger legislative vehicles that the Senate as a whole may consider until the concerns I describe below are fully addressed.

This legislation streamlines the outdated over-the-counter (OTC) drug approval process at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)—a process originally developed in 1972. Specifically, the legislation allows the FDA to approve OTC versions of prescription drugs administratively, rather than going through the lengthy notice-and-comment-rulemaking procedures under the Administrative Procedure Act. The legislation also encourages more innovation and investment in the OTC space by providing an 18-month market-exclusivity component that rewards a return on investment for new OTC drugs. The 18-month market exclusivity period is crucial to creating a thriving OTC drug market; however, H.R. 269 does not contain adequate oversight mechanisms to ensure that this exclusivity provision is not abused by some OTC drug manufacturers after the reforms of H.R. 269 are implemented by the FDA.

Although the legislation encourages more innovation and investment in the OTC space, it does not include any conditions under which an OTC drug manufacturer would forfeit eligibility for the 18-month exclusivity

period. For example, there is no “failure to market” provision for OTC drug approvals in the legislation similar to the provisions applying to generic drugs under Hatch-Waxman to prevent OTC drug manufacturers, who can otherwise enter the market, from refraining to do so (a practice called exclusivity parking).

Anti-competitive behavior—like exclusivity parking—has disrupted the generic drug industry. In fact, exclusivity parking has become common in the context of patent litigation settlement agreements where proprietary drug manufacturers pay generic drug manufacturers to delay entering the market, allowing proprietary drug manufacturers to charge higher prices for long periods of time (i.e. pay-for-delay settlements). The Federal Trade Commission has estimated that this behavior costs consumers \$3.5 billion per year as a result of higher brand-name drug prices. And even though the process for obtaining OTC drug approval under H.R. 269 is more straightforward than that for obtaining market approval for a generic drug—anti-competitive behavior (e.g., exclusivity parking) may creep into the OTC drug space if Congress fails to include sufficient oversight mechanisms in the legislation to ensure adequate accountability and effective competition.

Modernizing the OTC drug approval process under H.R. 269 will benefit consumers and advance the public health; however, H.R. 269 as currently drafted does not give the FDA the necessary oversight tools to ensure accountability in the OTC space. Including a “failure to launch” provision in H.R. 269—that is, a mechanism that gives an OTC drug manufacturer a reasonable amount of time to bring an FDA approved OTC product to market—will protect the incentive to innovate and invest, while also providing adequate accountability. Indeed, to ensure effective competition in the OTC space, Congress must provide the FDA with the necessary oversight tools to prevent abuse of the OTC regulatory approval process under the reforms of H.R. 269.

Thank you for protecting my rights as a Senator to weigh in on this legislation, which has not gone through regular order during my time as a member of the Committee to which this legislation has been referred to in the 116th congress.

Sincerely,

MIKE BRAUN,
United States Senator.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I congratulate the American Legion on its 100-year anniversary.

On March 15, 1919, the first American Legion caucus was held. Later that year, Congress established the American Legion as a federally chartered corporation with purposes that include “to cement the ties and comradeship born of service; and to consecrate the efforts of its members to mutual helpfulness and service to their country.” The original membership to the American Legion was extended to those who served in the Armed Forces during World War I, which had ended a few months before the organization was started. Over the past 100 years, its membership has grown to nearly 2 million, with more than 12,000 posts.

I recently joined fellow Senators in cosponsoring S. 504, the Let Everyone

Get Involved in Opportunities for National Service, or LEGION, Act, which would enable the American Legion to establish its own membership criteria instead of requiring an act of Congress to change eligibility requirements. In this legislation, we recognize the American Legion “provides invaluable services to its members and supports the community of veterans who sacrificed in service of the United States,” and it “has aided, assisted, and comforted the families of the men and women who were called to serve or volunteered to serve . . .”

I join many others across our country, including local posts, in recognizing the American Legion’s century of representation of American veterans. In Idaho alone, there are approximately 9,750 Idaho members of the American Legion as of 2018.

Thank you to the American Legion and its membership for your outstanding service to our country and America’s veterans. Congratulations on 100 years of achievements on their behalf. I look forward to our continued work ahead to ensure veterans have access to the highest quality services worthy of their remarkable dedication to our Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF FUELCELL ENERGY

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize FuelCell Energy as it celebrates 50 years of dedication to the research and delivery of clean, affordable fuel cell solutions.

Founded in 1969 by Dr. Bernard Baker as the Energy Research Corporation, the company has grown exponentially over the past half century. Starting as a highly regarded research company focused on electrochemical battery and fuel cell technologies, FuelCell Energy is now a worldwide leader in its field.

The Danbury, CT, based company provides efficient commercial fuel cell solutions for the supply, recovery, and storage of energy. Fifty years of tireless commitment, diligent effort, and creative innovation has resulted in SureSource power plants located in three continents. These power plants have produced over 8.7 million megawatt-hours of ultraclean power.

FuelCell Energy invests its work in all steps of the process: recognizing a need, developing a solution, and then implementing a solution in an economic and sustainable manner. The breadth of their successes and the critical level of forward progress in the realm of clean energy are truly impressive. Thanks to their remarkable efforts, FuelCell Energy enables universities, commercial enterprises, government entities, and other industries the opportunity to make clean choices in a more affordable and accessible way than ever before.

As they mark this important anniversary, the company continues to

look toward the future, searching for even more effective options that will benefit our planet and its people. Though there is still more progress to be made, FuelCell Energy stands at the forefront of past innovation and future possibility.

Devoted to creating energy solutions that will make it easier for more and more industries to use clean power, FuelCell Energy is a positive model for modernization and advancement in this vital field. I applaud the accomplishments of FuelCell Energy’s visionary leaders and highly skilled and dedicated workers and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating FuelCell Energy on 50 years of excellence.●

REMEMBERING EUBA HARRIS- WINTON

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the contributions of Euba Harris-Winton to Fort Smith and the State of Arkansas. She passed away on Monday, March 11, at the age of 95 and leaves behind a large, loving family and countless Arkansans whom she helped and inspired throughout her life.

Euba was born on June 26, 1923, to Rev. Daniel Haven Edward Harris and Martha T. Hill Harris in Cotton Plant, AR. Her school years were spent in Fort Smith where she attended Howard Elementary School and Lincoln High School. After attending Westark Community College and Philander Smith College, she returned to Fort Smith to raise a family with her husband, Ellsworth Daniel Winton. They had 10 children: five girls and five boys.

She was a devout member of the United Methodist Church, and her great faith and passion for service led her to become the executive director of the Mallalieu Community Development Center in 1970. The center’s mission was to strengthen the outreach ministry of the church. As part of that mission, she worked on efforts to fight poverty, improve substandard housing, increase educational opportunities, and personally provide help to anyone who asked. She led the organization for 25 years and improved the lives of countless Arkansans in the process.

Throughout her life, she met with leaders at all levels of government to advocate for others and served on numerous boards and councils. In an article in the Lincoln Echo several years ago, Bennie Mae Ware Gunn remarked that, “Euba is known and respected for being both relentless and resourceful in her pursuit of justice and opportunities for others. However, she is also known for her sensitivity and compassion.”

That is certainly true of my experience with her and that of so many others she influenced or helped over the years. I was honored to know Mrs. Euba and will personally miss her example, kindness, advice, and willingness to help others.

She was a rare individual who never stopped fighting to improve the world

around her and was an inspiration to us all. I know her legacy lives on through her extended family and in every person she touched with her compassion, strength, and wisdom.●

RECOGNIZING NORTHSIDE HIGH SCHOOL'S DUAL BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONSHIPS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and congratulate my alma mater, Northside High School in Fort Smith, AR, on winning 6A State championships in both boys and girls basketball this year.

The high school basketball season was as exciting as ever in the Natural State, but folks in my hometown of Fort Smith were especially enthusiastic when tournament time came around because both the boys' and girls' teams had advanced to postseason play. Both squads have won multiple State titles, and the fans were eager to add another this season.

Both the boys' and girls' teams advanced through their respective tournaments and made it to the finals, overcoming challenges from talented teams from across Arkansas. The championship games were incredibly competitive, and each came down to the wire.

The Lady Bears faced off against Bentonville in their State title game. Led by Jersey Wolfenbarger's 21-point effort, including the game-winning basket as time expired, the team ended the contest on a 7-0 run to claim the school's seventh girls basketball State championship since 1999. Each of those titles was won under the direction of coach Rickey Smith. The team ended the season ranked 17th in the Nation in USA Today's high school rankings.

Not to be outdone, the Northside Grizzlies boys' team also had a memorable championship game that included a half-court basket to end the first half. Facing off against Bryant High School, Northside led for most of the contest. After Bryant tied the game late in the fourth quarter, Northside came up with a three-point basket and held onto the lead until the end of regulation. Junior center Jaylen Williams' play—he scored 20 points and grabbed 16 rebounds—earned him the MVP designation. The championship was the 11th in school history. The Grizzlies were led by coach Eric Burnett who believed his team was built for a good run in the tournament because of the difficulty of its nonconference schedule. This was their third consecutive championship game appearance, having won a championship in 2017 as well.

Needless to say, it was a very special day in Hot Springs, where the title games were played, and in the Fort Smith community, as each team brought home State championships in the same year for the second time since 2007.

As a former Northside Grizzly and someone with family roots in Fort Smith, I am proud that both the Griz-

zly and Lady Bears basketball teams earned the highest achievement possible in our State. To do so in the same year is an even greater testament to the dedication and passion of the players, coaches, student body, administrators, and the fans of these terrific teams.

Congratulations again to the Grizzly and Lady Bears squads on this tremendous accomplishment, and I look forward to celebrating with them, Northside High School, and the Fort Smith community in the near future.●

TRIBUTE TO COURTNEY NOBLE

● Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a great Ohioan, Courtney Noble, for her heroic actions this past December.

Ms. Noble works as a direct support professional for New Avenues To Independence, Inc.—NATI—in Mentor, OH. NATI is a social service organization that provides support and aid for people with disabilities and special needs in the greater Cleveland area.

On the morning of December 20, 2018, Ms. Noble was the only one on duty while tending to three male residents in the Heisley group home. As she was helping the residents get ready for their day, she heard popping and crackling and sounds coming from the garage. When she opened the garage door, she discovered that a fire had started and was rapidly growing out of control. Without hesitation, Ms. Noble sprang into action. She immediately evacuated all three residents from the house, one of whom was in a wheelchair.

Throughout the whole situation, Ms. Noble's biggest concern was the safety and well-being of her residents. Even as her car was engulfed in flames, she calmly escorted the three men to safety at a nearby child daycare center and called 911.

Thank you, Courtney Noble, for your courageous actions and for all the work you do as a caregiver. It is because of your quick thinking and fearlessness that three Ohioans are alive today. I am sure that my Senate colleagues will join me in honoring Ms. Courtney Noble for her exemplary acts.●

TRIBUTE TO SEAN O'DONNELL AND IVANNA FRITZ

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Sean O'Donnell and Ivanna Fritz of Flathead County for their recent induction into the Montana Forensic Educations Association Coaches Hall of Fame.

Sean O'Donnell, a lifelong Montanan has spent the majority of his life in Kalispell, MT. Mr. O'Donnell attended Carrol College in Helena, MT, and it was here that Sean fell in love with coaching high school speech and debate. After graduation, he went back to Kalispell to teach and went on to join the Flathead coaching staff in 1992. Over the past 22 years, Mr. O'Donnell

has gone on to win 10 State championships, as well as winning Class AA coach of the year twice.

Ivanna Fritz, from eastern Montana, fell in love with speech and debate in college, which she took as a requirement for a communication degree. Ms. Fritz then went on to coach high school speech in debate, joining the Flathead coaching staff in 1995, until taking up a teaching position at Glacier High School in 2007, where she teaches and coaches today. Ivanna has won a total of 13 State championships, along with winning Class AA coach of the year.

I congratulate Sean O'Donnell and Ivanna Fritz, for their remarkable journey of 20 years of teaching and coaching in Flathead County. I look forward to seeing their continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. CURTIS JONES, JR.

● Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate one of my constituents, Dr. Curtis Jones, Jr., on being named the 2019 National Superintendent of the Year. Dr. Jones is an outstanding public servant, and I am honored to commend him in the Senate today.

A native of Barnesville, GA, Dr. Jones is the son of a schoolteacher and a preacher. Prior to becoming an educator himself, Dr. Jones graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and served over 20 years in the Army, retiring as lieutenant colonel. Upon retirement from the Army, Dr. Jones began his career in education as a JROTC instructor before becoming a high school principal, assistant superintendent, and later superintendent of Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Dr. Jones joined his current school district, Bibb County Schools, as superintendent in 2015. Under Dr. Jones' leadership, the school district has been completely turned around, and the graduation rate has increased by more than 20 percent. Dr. Jones has brought the Macon-Bibb County community together for a common cause, and it has been a joy to see the school district's progress as a result of his leadership and service to those students.

Throughout this entire process, Dr. Jones has repeatedly recognized the teachers, principals, and students in his school district for their contribution to this award. He has also attributed his success to the love and support of his family. Dr. Jones has truly made his State and country proud, and I congratulate him and his family on this high honor.●

TRIBUTE TO RICK BLOCKER

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a lifelong champion of the American labor movement, Mr. Rick Blocker, president of the Metro Detroit AFL-CIO, on the occasion of his retirement. As a member of the

U.S. Senate, it is both my privilege and honor to recognize Mr. Blocker for his lifetime of service and contributions that have strengthened our community and State.

Rick Blocker has been a tireless advocate for his brothers and sisters in labor throughout his career. From 1987 to 2013, he served as the secretary-treasurer and executive assistant to the president of the United Food and Commercial Workers, UFCW, Local Union 876 in Madison Heights, MI. In this role, he was responsible for managing the finances and expenditures of the over 19,000 members of Local 876. Rick also served as a trustee for the Michigan UFCW Unions and Employers Health and Welfare Fund where he maintained membership services, helped develop community programs, and assisted in contract negotiations.

Since 2013, Rick has served as president of the Metro-Detroit AFL-CIO. The Metro Detroit AFL-CIO is comprised of approximately 120 affiliated labor organizations that represent nearly 70,000 members. In this capacity, Rick serves as the lead voice of these affiliates and members to the public and the State AFL-CIO, representing the interests of working people throughout the region. Through his work, Rick continually advocates for economic and social justice and the betterment of workers lives, not just in metro Detroit, but across the State of Michigan.

Rick has spent his career and life in support of his community, organized labor, civil rights, and faith. Throughout his life, he has been involved with many organizations, including the Trade Union Leadership Council, the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, the Coalition of Labor Women, is a founding member of the Change to Win Federation, a life member of the NAACP, and a trustee and executive director of New Bethel Baptist Church in Detroit. Rick also serves on Detroit Mayor Mike Duggan's Mayor's Workforce Development Board, with the mission to strive toward successful delivery of workforce programs across the city of Detroit.

Rick has spent his career in service to others, his community, and his brother and sisters in labor. I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring my friend, Mr. Rick Blocker, for his leadership in furthering the causes of the organized labor movement and for his many other contributions to the metro Detroit region. I wish Rick and his family health and happiness in the years ahead.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME ON MARCH 13, 2019

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 1. An act to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1617. An act to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. HOLDING of North Carolina.

The message also announced that pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: Mr. ZELDIN of New York and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

At 1:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 3:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

The joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1. An act to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big

money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1617. An act to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-589. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reauthorization of Dairy Forward Pricing" ((7 CFR Part 1145) (Docket No. AMS-DA-18-0097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-590. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Termination of Assessments" ((7 CFR Part 1208) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0093)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-591. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Include Frozen Mangos" ((7 CFR Part 1206) (Docket No. AMS-SC-17-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-592. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, the biennial report to Congress on strategic and critical materials requirements for the National Defense Stockpile (OSS-2019-0207); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-593. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ongoing Data Collection of Centrally Cleared Transactions in the United States Repurchase Agreement Market" (RIN1505-AC58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-594. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "SPR Standard Sales Provisions" (RIN1901-AB29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-595. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Emission Reduction Credits" (FRL No. 9990-74-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-596. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts: High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes" (FRL No. 9990-94-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-597. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Designation for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard; Arkansas' Redesignation of the Independence County Area" (FRL No. 9990-00-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-598. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendment to Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds from Consumer Products" (FRL No. 9990-86-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-599. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Serious Area Plan for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS Correction" (FRL No. 9990-89-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-600. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; San Joaquin Valley, California; Correction" (FRL No. 9990-90-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-601. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Programs Revision" (FRL No. 9990-04-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-602. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Trispot Darter" (RIN1018-BC16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-603. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Scarlet Macaw" (RIN1018-BC81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-604. A communication from the Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of

a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing Deseret Milkvetch (*Astragalus Deserticus*) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants" (RIN1018-BB41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-605. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Candy Darter" (RIN1018-BC44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-606. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on mining activities as required by the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-607. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2017 FAIR Act inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-608. A communication from the Assistant Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loan Guaranty: Revisions to VA-Guaranteed or Insured Cash-out Home Refinance Loans" (RIN2900-AQ42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-609. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments" ((33 CFR Parts 100, 110, 147 and 165) (Docket No. USCG-2018-1049)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-610. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Regulated Navigation Areas, Safety Zone, Security Zones, and Special Local Regulations Within District 7" ((33 CFR Parts 100 and 165) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0231)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-611. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mill Basin, Brooklyn, NY" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2018-1032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-612. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Gulfport Grand Prix, Boca Ciego Bay, Gulfport, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0059)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-613. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0128)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-614. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Firestone Grand Prix of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Florida" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-615. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Chicago Harbor, Navy Pier Southwest, Chicago, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0713)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-616. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Cumberland River, Kentucky" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0127)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-617. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Oregon Inlet, Dare County, NC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2018-1065)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-618. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Port Gibson, MS" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0126)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-15. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to constitutional conventions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 94, A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States (Rept. No. 116-8).

Report to accompany S. 310, A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act (Rept. No. 116-9).

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 Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KING):

S. 792. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 793. A bill to establish and strengthen projects that defray the cost of related instruction associated with pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 795. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 796. A bill for the relief of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 797. A bill for the relief of Shirley Constantino Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 798. A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 799. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to clarify that the Security and Exchange Commission may seek disgorgement and restitution as a result of a violation of the securities laws, to establish the statute of limitations for disgorgement and equitable actions brought by the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ERNST, Mr. KAINE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JONES, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 800. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 801. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission with access to certain drug payment information, including certain rebate information; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 802. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. THUNE, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 804. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and fossilized ivory products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 805. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 806. A bill to prohibit the collection of data or information generated on the internet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 807. A bill to require recipients of Federal funds to disclose information relating to programs, projects, or activities carried out using the Federal funds; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 808. A bill to ensure that certain incidents involving a covered employee that are reported to the title IX coordinator at an eligible institution of higher education have been reviewed by the president of the institution and not less than 1 additional member of the institution's board of trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 810. A bill to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 811. A bill to provide for additional supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, for border security and disaster relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 812. A bill to modify the minimum allocation requirement for the emergency solutions grants program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 813. A bill for the relief of Vichai Sae Tung (also known as Chai Chaowasaree); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 814. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes outpatient self-management training

services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BURR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 815. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 816. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 818. A bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in logging operations from child labor laws; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 819. A bill to modernize the reporting requirement under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ERNST, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BURR, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 820. A bill to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 821. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain member banks from using discount window lending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 822. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 823. A bill to require information sharing with respect to the ownership of election service providers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 824. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 825. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require all States to take steps to ensure domestic ownership and control of election service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 826. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 827. A bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 828. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil-, gas-, and methane hydrate-related seismic activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas of the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 829. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to award cooperative agreements to improve care for individuals with advanced illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 830. A bill to amend the Federal Work-Study program to permit institutions of higher education to use their Federal work-study allocations for full-time, off-campus cooperative education and work-based learning; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 831. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue final rules relating to listing the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes and Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 832. A bill to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 833. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to participant votes on the suspension of benefits under multiemployer plans in critical and declining status; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 834. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the national strategy for combating and eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 835. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by

the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the retirement income account rules relating to church controlled organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to decrease the distance away from home required for a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces to be eligible for the above-the-line deduction for travel expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 838. A bill to protect integrity, fairness, and objectivity in decisions regarding access to classified information, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 839. A bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 840. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 841. A bill to enhance the ability of Federal agencies to deliver relocation management services to the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 842. A bill to improve the mapping of wireless broadband coverage; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 843. A bill to provide high-skilled non-immigrant visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. LEE, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 844. A bill to allow for expedited approval of generic prescription drugs and temporary importation of prescription drugs in the case of marginally competitive drug markets and drug shortages; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 845. A bill to establish as United States policy that, pending confirmation of the Russian Federation's continued compliance with the New START Treaty, the United States should extend the Treaty through 2026; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 846. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 847. A bill to prohibit certain entities from using facial recognition technology to identify or track an end user without obtaining the affirmative consent of the end user, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 848. A bill to establish digital services in State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 849. A bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the lost crew members of the U.S.S. Frank E. Evans killed on June 3, 1969; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 850. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 851. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 852. A bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 109. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 110. A resolution keeping guns out of classrooms; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms.

HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 111. A resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 112. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. Res. 113. A resolution designating March 25, 2019, as "National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 114. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 21, 2019, as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 115. A resolution recognizing the REALTORS Land Institute on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. Res. 116. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day on March 19, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 117. A resolution designating March 22, 2019, as "National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 118. A resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2019, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 119. A resolution supporting the goals of World Tuberculosis Day to raise awareness about tuberculosis; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 105

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 105, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 164, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancement in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 317

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing coordinated care for children with complex medical conditions through a health home.

S. 342

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 342, a bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve and encourage innovation in international education, and for other purposes.

S. 380

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to in-

crease the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

S. 436

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 436, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the development of public transportation operations safety risk reduction programs, and for other purposes.

S. 506

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 506, a bill to support State, Tribal, and local efforts to remove access to firearms from individuals who are a danger to themselves or others pursuant to court orders for this purpose.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 548

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 548, a bill to reauthorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program.

S. 590

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 642, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to award grants to organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members and former members of the Armed Forces who are separated, retired, or discharged from the Armed Forces, and spouses of such members, and for other purposes.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 679

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 679, a bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefit paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

S. 693

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 693, a bill to amend

title 36, United States Code, to require that the POW/MIA flag be displayed on all days that the flag of the United States is displayed on certain Federal property.

S. 716

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 716, a bill to impose sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to combat corruption, money laundering, and impunity in Guatemala, and for other purposes.

S. 726

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 753

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 764

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 764, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 99

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 99, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization.

S. RES. 100

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 100, a resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing private im-

migration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent resident status to Adilene Martinez, who is originally from Mexico but has been living in California for over 20 years. I believe she merits Congress' special consideration for this extraordinary form of relief.

Adilene, age 30, was brought to the United States by her parents Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno and Micaela Lopez Martinez. When Jose came to the United States from Mexico, he began working as a busboy in restaurants in San Francisco, California. In 1990, he started working as a cook at Palio D'Asti, an award-winning Italian restaurant in San Francisco.

Jose and his wife, Micaela, call San Francisco home. Micaela is a homemaker and part-time housekeeper. They have three daughters, two of whom are United States citizens. Their oldest daughter, Adilene, is undocumented and is currently working at the San Francisco Opera House. Adilene attempted to legalize her status through several channels with her family, but the current green card backlog for relatives from Mexico is very long.

In 2002, the Martinez family applied for political asylum. Their application was denied. An immigration judge denied their subsequent application for cancellation of removal. The Martinez family has become an integral part of their community in California. They are active in their faith community. They volunteer with community-based organizations and are, in turn, supported by their community. When I first introduced this bill, I received dozens of letters of support from their fellow parishioners, teachers, and members of their community.

The Martinez family truly exemplifies the American dream. Jose worked his way through the restaurant industry to become a chef and an indispensable employee at a renowned restaurant. With great dedication, Micaela has worked hard to raise three daughters who are advancing their education and look forward to continuing the pursuit of their goals.

I believe that Adilene's continued presence in the United States would allow them to continue making significant contributions to their community in California. I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

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. 794

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR JOSE ALBERTO MARTINEZ MORENO, MICAELA LOPEZ MARTINEZ, AND ADILENE MARTINEZ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela

Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez shall each be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, or Adilene Martinez enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, or Adilene Martinez shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully in the United States and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the applications for issuance of immigrant visas or the applications for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of immigrant visas or permanent resident status to Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by three, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 795. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Alfredo Plascencia Lopez, a Mexican national who lives in the San Bruno area of California.

I offer legislation on his behalf because I believe that, without it, this hardworking man, wife who is a lawful permanent resident, and children would face extreme hardship. His children would either face separation from their father or be forced to leave the only country they know and give up the education they are pursuing in the United States.

Alfredo and his wife, Maria, have been in the United States for over 20 years. They worked for years to adjust their status through appropriate legal channels, but poor legal representation ruined their opportunities.

The Plascencias’ lawyer refused to return their calls or otherwise communicate with them in any way. He also failed to forward crucial immigration documents. Because of the poor representation they received, Alfredo only became aware that they had been ordered to leave the United States 15 days prior to his scheduled deportation.

Alfredo was shocked to learn of his attorney’s malfeasance, but he acted quickly to secure legitimate counsel and filed the appropriate paperwork to delay his deportation and determine if any other legal action could be taken.

Together, Alfredo and Maria have used their professional successes, with the assistance of private bills, to realize many of the goals dreamed of by all Americans. They have worked hard, and saved up to buy their home.

Their oldest child, Christina, is 28 years old and is currently a paralegal. Erika, age 24, serves in the United States Air Force and hopes to one day become a police officer. Danny, age 24, currently attends the University of California and volunteers at his local homeless shelter in the soup kitchen. Daisy, age 17, and Juan Pablo, age 13, are all in school and plan on attending college.

Allowing Alfredo to remain in the United States is necessary to enable his family to continue thriving in the United States. His children are dedicated to pursuing their education and being productive members of their community. I do not believe that Alfredo should be separated from his family. I am reintroducing this legislation to protect the best interest of Alfredo’s U.S. citizen children and his wife, who is a lawful permanent resident. I believe that Alfredo will continue to make positive contributions to his community in California and this country. I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this bill.

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. 795

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALFREDO PLASCENCIA LOPEZ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Alfredo Plascencia Lopez shall be eligible for the issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of that Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Alfredo Plascencia Lopez enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Alfredo Plascencia Lopez shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigra-

tion and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of immigrant visas or the application for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of immigrant visas or permanent residence to Alfredo Plascencia Lopez, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez under section 202(e) of that Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 796. A bill for the relief of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to reintroduce private relief legislation in the 116th Congress on behalf of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian. The Mkoian family has been living in Fresno, California, for over 20 years. I continue to believe this family deserves Congress’ special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

The Mkoian family is originally from Armenia. They decided to leave Armenia for the United States in the early 1990s, following several incidents in which the family experienced harassment, vandalism and threats to their well-being.

In Armenia, Ruben worked as a police sergeant on vehicle licensing. At one point, he was offered a bribe to register stolen vehicles, which he refused and reported to his superior, the police chief. He later learned that a co-worker had registered the vehicles at the request of the same chief.

After Ruben reported the bribe offer to illegally register vehicles and said he’d call the police, his family store was vandalized and he received threatening phone calls telling him to keep quiet. A bottle of gasoline was thrown into his family’s residence, burning it to the ground. In April 1992, several men entered the family store and assaulted Ruben, hospitalizing him for 22 days.

Ruben, Asmik, and their son Arthur, who was 3 years old at the time, left Armenia and entered the United States on visitor visas. They applied for political asylum that same year on the

grounds that they would be subject to physical attacks if returned to Armenia. It took 16 years for their case to be finalized, with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals denying their asylum case in January 2008.

At this time, Ruben and Asmik have exhausted every option to obtain immigration relief in the United States. It would be a terrible shame to remove this family from the United States and to separate them from their son Arsen, who is 20 years old and a U.S. citizen. The Mkoians have worked hard to build a place for their family in California and are an integral part of their community.

The family attends St. Paul Armenian Apostolic Church in Fresno. They do charity work to send medical equipment to Armenia. Ruben works as a driver for Uber. He previously worked as a manager at a car wash in Fresno and as a truck driver for a California trucking company that described him as “trustworthy,” “knowledgeable,” and an asset to the company. Asmik has worked as a medical assistant the past 6 years at the Fresno Shield Medical Center.

Reflecting their contributions to their community, Representatives George Radanovich (R-CA) and JIM COSTA (D-CA) strongly supported this family’s ability to remain in the United States. When I first introduced a private bill for the Mkoian family, I received more than 200 letters of support and dozens of calls of support from friends and community members, attesting to the positive impact that this family has had in Fresno, California.

I believe that this case warrants our compassion. I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this private legislation on behalf of the Mkoian family.

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. 796

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR RUBEN MKOIAN AND ASMİK KARAPETIAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian shall each be eligible for the issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Ruben Mkoian or Asmik Karapetian enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Ruben Mkoian or Asmik Karapetian, as appropriate, shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully in the United States and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for the issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon granting an immigrant visa or permanent resident status to Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by two, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Ruben Mkoian and Asmik Karapetian under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 797. A bill for the relief of Shirley Constantino Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing a bill for the private relief of Shirley Constantino Tan. Ms. Tan is a Filipina national living in Pacifica, California. She is the proud mother of 20-year-old U.S. citizen twin boys, Jashley and Joriene, and the spouse of Jay Mercado, a naturalized U.S. citizen.

I believe Ms. Tan merits Congress’ special consideration for this extraordinary form of relief because her removal from the United States would cause undue hardship for her and her family. She faces deportation to the Philippines, which would separate her from her family and jeopardize her safety.

Ms. Tan experienced horrific violence in the Philippines before she left to come to the United States. When she was only 14 years old, her cousin murdered her mother and her sister and shot Shirley in the head. While the cousin who committed the murders was eventually prosecuted, he received a short jail sentence. Fearing for her safety, Ms. Tan fled the Philippines just before her cousin was due to be released from jail. She entered the United States legally on a visitor’s visa in 1989.

Ms. Tan’s current deportation order is the result of negligent counsel. She applied for asylum in 1995. While her case appeal was pending at the Board of Immigration Appeals, her attorney failed to submit a brief to support her case. As a result, the case was dismissed, and the Board of Immigration Appeals granted Shirley voluntary departure from the United States.

Ms. Tan never received notice that the Board of Immigration Appeals granted her voluntary departure. Her attorney moved offices, did not receive the order, and ultimately never informed her of the order. As a result, Ms. Tan did not depart the United States and the grant of voluntary departure automatically led to a removal order. She learned about the deportation order for the first time on January 28, 2009, when Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents took her into immigration custody.

Because of her attorney’s negligent actions, Ms. Tan was denied the opportunity to present her case in immigration proceedings. She later filed a complaint with the State Bar of California against her former attorney. She is not the first person to file such a complaint against this attorney.

On February 4, 2015, Ms. Tan’s spouse, Jay, a U.S. Citizen, filed an approved spousal petition on her behalf. On August 20, 2015, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services denied her application due to the fact that she still had a final order or removal. Ms. Tan must go back to the immigration court and ask for the court to terminate her case and then reapply for her green card. Ms. Tan is now again facing the threat of deportation while she seeks to close her case before an immigration court.

In addition to the hardship that would come to Ms. Tan if she is deported, her deportation would cause serious hardship to her two United States citizen children, Jashley and Joriene.

Joriene is a junior at Stanford University and is pre-Med, majoring in Human Biology. In addition to his studies, Joriene is involved in Stanford’s Filipino-American Student Union. Jashley is a junior at Chapman University, majoring in Business Administration. Ms. Tan no longer runs her in-home daycare and is a homemaker.

If Ms. Tan were forced to leave the United States, her family has expressed that they would go with her to the Philippines or try to find a third country where the entire family could relocate. This would mean that Jashley and Joriene would have to leave behind their education and the only home they know in the United States.

I do not believe it is in our Nation’s best interest to force this family, with two United States citizen children, to make the choice between being separated and relocating to a country where they may face safety concerns or other serious hardships.

Ms. Tan and her family are involved in their community in Pacifica and own their own home. The family attends Good Shepherd Catholic Church, volunteering at the church and the Mother Theresa of Calcutta’s Daughters of Charity. Ms. Tan has the support of dozens of members of her community who have shared with me the family’s spirit of commitment to their community.

Enactment of the legislation I am introducing on behalf of Ms. Tan today will enable this entire family to continue their lives in California and make positive contributions to their community. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 797

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR SHIRLEY CONSTANTINO TAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Shirley Constantino Tan shall be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Shirley Constantino Tan enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), she shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBER.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Shirley Constantino Tan, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Shirley Constantino Tan under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Shirley Constantino Tan under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 798. A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today, I offer private immigration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent resident status to Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian

Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola. The Arreolas are Mexican nationals living in the Fresno area of California.

Esidronio and Maria Elena have lived in the United States for over 20 years. Two of their 5 children, Nayely and Cindy also stand to benefit from this legislation. The other 3 Arreola children, Robert, age 27, Daniel, age 22, and Saray, age 22, are United States citizens. The story of the Arreola family is compelling and I believe they merit Congress’ special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

The Arreolas are facing deportation in part because of grievous errors committed by their previous counsel, who has since been disbarred. In fact, the attorney’s conduct was so egregious that it compelled an immigration judge to write to the Executive Office of Immigration Review seeking the attorney’s disbarment for his actions in his clients’ immigration cases.

Esidronio came to the United States in 1986 and was an agricultural migrant worker in the fields of California for several years. As a migrant worker at that time, he would have been eligible for permanent residence through the Seasonal Agricultural Workers (SAW) program, had he known about it.

Maria Elena was living in the United States at the time she became pregnant with her daughter Cindy. She returned to Mexico to give birth because she wanted to avoid any immigration issues.

Because of the length of time that the Arreolas were in the United States, it is likely that they would have qualified for suspension of deportation, which would have allowed them to remain in the United States legally. However, the poor legal representation they received foreclosed this opportunity.

One of the most compelling reasons for my introduction of this private bill is the devastating impact the deportation of Esidronio and Maria Elena would have on their children—3 of whom are American citizens—and the other 2 who have lived in the United States since they were toddlers. America is the only country the Arreola children have ever known.

Nayely, the oldest, was the first in her family to graduate from high school and the first to graduate college. She recently received her Masters in Business Administration from Fresno Pacific University, a regionally ranked university, and now works in the admissions office. Nayely is married and has a young son named Elijah Ace Carlos.

At a young age, Nayely demonstrated a strong commitment to the ideals of citizenship in her adopted country. She worked hard to achieve her full potential both through her academic endeavors and community service. As the Associate Dean of Enrollment Services at Fresno Pacific University States in a letter of support, “[T]he leaders of

Fresno Pacific University saw in Nayely, a young person who will become exemplary of all that is good in the American dream.’

In high school, Nayely was a member of Advancement Via Individual Determination, AVID, college preparatory program in which students commit to determining their own futures through attaining a college degree. Nayely was also President of the Key Club, a community service organization. Perhaps the greatest hardship to Nayely’s U.S. citizen husband and child, if she were forced to return to Mexico, would be her lost opportunity to realize her dreams and contribute further to her community and to this country.

Nayely’s sister, Cindy, is also married and has a 7-year-old daughter and a 5-year-old son. Neither Nayely nor Cindy is eligible to automatically adjust their status based on their marriages because of their initial unlawful entry.

The Arreolas also have other family who are United States citizens or lawful permanent residents of this country. Maria Elena has 3 brothers who are American citizens, and Esidronio has a sister who is an American citizen. They have no immediate family in Mexico.

According to immigration authorities, this family has never had any problems with law enforcement. I am told that they have filed their taxes for every year from 1990 to the present. They have always worked hard to support themselves.

As I mentioned, Esidronio was previously employed as a farm worker, but now has his own business in California repairing electronics. His business has been successful enough to enable him to purchase a home for his family. He and his wife are active in their church community and in their children’s education.

It is clear to me that this family has embraced the American dream. Enactment of the legislation I have reintroduced today will enable the Arreolas to continue to make significant contributions to their community as well as the United States. I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

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. 798

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ESIDRONIO ARREOLA-SAUCEDO, MARIA ELENA COBIAN ARREOLA, NAYELY ARREOLA CARLOS, AND CINDY Jael ARREOLA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola shall each be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon

filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola enter the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully in the United States and shall be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the applications for issuance of immigrant visas or the applications for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of immigrant visas or permanent residence to Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by four, during the current or next following fiscal year—

(1) the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of birth of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 822. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 822

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 “Cameras in the Courtroom Act”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“§ 678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings

“The Supreme Court shall permit television coverage of all open sessions of the

Court unless the Court decides, by a vote of the majority of justices, that allowing such coverage in a particular case would constitute a violation of the due process rights of 1 or more of the parties before the Court.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings.”.

By Mr. KAINÉ (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 839. A bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President. In today’s economy, approximately 80 percent of jobs require some form of postsecondary education or training beyond the high school level. The National Skills Coalition estimates that nearly half of all job openings between now and 2022 will be middle skill jobs that require post high school training, but not a four-year degree. While the number of students pursuing postsecondary education is growing, the supply of skilled workers still falls short of industry demand. According to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics 7.3 million U.S. jobs are currently vacant in part because of a shortage of qualified workers.

Our Federal higher education policy must be modernized to meet the needs of students and employers. Under current law, Pell Grants—needs-based grants for low-income and working students—can only be awarded to students attending programs that are over 600 clock hours or at least 15 weeks in length. These grants cannot be used to offset the cost of targeted, short-term training programs offered at community and technical colleges that help students obtain employer-recognized credentials. When it comes to higher education, Federal policies need to support the demands of the changing labor market by increasing access to career pathways that align with industry demand. According to the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, shorter-term educational investments pay off—the average postsecondary certificate holder has 30 percent higher lifetime earnings than individuals with only a high school diploma.

Today, I am pleased to introduce with my colleague, Senator PORTMAN, the Jumpstart Our Businesses by Supporting Students or JOBS Act. The JOBS Act would close the skills gap by extending Pell Grant eligibility to high-quality, short-term job training programs offered at community colleges and other public institutions, so workers can afford the instruction they need to be successful in today’s job market. Under the legislation, Pell-eli-

gible job training programs are defined as those providing at least 150 clock hours of instruction time over a minimum of 8 weeks. Eligible job training programs must also provide students with licenses, certifications, or credentials that meet the hiring requirements of multiple employers in the field for which the job training is offered.

The JOBS Act also ensures that students enrolling in Pell-eligible short-term programs are earning high-quality postsecondary credentials by requiring that the credentials meet the standards of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, are recognized by industry or sector partnerships, and align with the skill needs of industries in States or local economies. Job training programs under this Act must also be evaluated by an accreditor and the State workforce board for quality and outcomes. The Virginia Community College System has identified approximately 50 programs that would benefit from the JOBS Act including in the fields of manufacturing, architecture/construction, energy, health care, information technology, transportation, and business management and administration.

The JOBS Act is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that would help workers and employers succeed in today’s economy. As Congress works to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in advocating for Pell Grants to be made available to individuals enrolling in high-quality, short-term training programs that lead to industry-recognized credentials and good paying jobs.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 109—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE MARCH 31, 2019, PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN UKRAINE

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 109

Whereas the Senate agrees with Senate Resolution 78, 115th Congress, introduced by Senators Menendez and Graham, which expressed the sense of the Senate recognizing 3 years of Russian military aggression in Ukraine;

Whereas the Senate concurs with Senate Resolution 27, 116th Congress, introduced by Senators Johnson and Durbin, which calls for a prompt multinational freedom of navigation operation in the Black Sea and urges the cancellation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline;

Whereas the Senate endorses H.R. 596, 116th Congress, introduced by Representatives Connolly and Chabot, which affirms that it is the policy of the United States not to recognize the de jure or de facto sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, its airspace, or its territorial waters;

Whereas the Senate reaffirms the importance of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-272; 128 Stat. 2952),

which authorized increased security and economic assistance for Ukraine;

Whereas the Senate welcomes resolutions of Congress, such as House Resolution 202, 115th Congress, sponsored by Representative Delaney, which reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

Whereas the Senate notes the upcoming March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine and the importance of a free and fair election to sustaining the principles and dreams of the 2014 Maidan Revolution;

Whereas the Senate expresses concern that the Government of the Russian Federation will continue to interfere in the election process and voting in the March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine; and

Whereas the Senate agrees with former United States Ambassador to the Russian Federation Michael McFaul that “Russian President Vladimir Putin is waging a global ideological war against Western liberal, democratic values. It has been underway for many years, and it extends from his own immediate neighborhood to Western Europe and, of course, the United States, where he intervened in the U.S. presidential election in 2016. The front line of this ideological war between Putinism and democracy, however, remains Ukraine.”; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Government does not prefer any particular candidate in the March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine and seeks only a transparent and democratic election that reflects the will of the people of Ukraine;

(2) the United States Government will continue to support democracy and good governance in Ukraine, including anti-corruption initiatives, an independent media, and efforts to strengthen the rule of law, to support the ideals of the revolution of dignity of Ukraine;

(3) the United States should continue to work with allies to provide additional capacity building and technical support in order to deter Russian efforts to disrupt voting or undermine the legitimacy of the results of the presidential election in Ukraine; and

(4) not later than 90 days after the date on which this resolution is agreed to, the President should provide a briefing to Congress—

(A) assessing the scope and scale of Russian interference in the presidential campaign in Ukraine and vote tabulation on election day; and

(B) assessing the future course of United States-Ukrainian relations under whichever candidate is declared the winner of the presidential election.

SENATE RESOLUTION 110—KEEPING GUNS OUT OF CLASSROOMS

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 110

Whereas Congress has consistently made clear that it is unlawful for Federal funds to be used for training or arming school personnel with firearms;

Whereas Congress passed the STOP School Violence Act of 2018 (title V of division S of Public Law 115-141) in response to the shooting in Parkland, Florida, and amended part AA of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10551 et seq.) to specify that “No amounts provided as a grant [for school security under

such part] may be used for the provision to any person of a firearm or training in the use of a firearm.”;

Whereas section 4102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7113), as added by section 4101 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (Public Law 114-95; 129 Stat. 1970), defines drug and violence prevention in schools as including the “creation . . . of a school environment that is free of weapons”;

Whereas existing research demonstrates that training or arming school personnel with firearms will not make schools safer;

Whereas an analysis by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of active shooters between 2000 and 2013 found that trained law enforcement suffered casualties in 21 of the 45 incidents in which officers engaged the shooter to end the threat;

Whereas a survey of gun violence on school campuses showed that out of 225 incidents of gun violence between 1999 and 2018, trained armed personnel or school resource officers failed to disarm an active shooter 223 times;

Whereas proposed and existing programs to train or arm school personnel with firearms require significantly less training than law enforcement officers receive;

Whereas research demonstrates that increased gun access and possession are not associated with protection from violence and a greater prevalence of guns increases the likelihood of gun violence;

Whereas a greater prevalence of guns in schools creates undue risk of students gaining unauthorized access to firearms and the potential for unintentional shootings and school staff using guns in situations that do not warrant lethal force;

Whereas students of color, students with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups would experience a disparate impact of programs that arm school personnel as those students are disproportionately disciplined and arrested;

Whereas heightened policing within public school spaces decreases a student’s sense of safety and the associated anticipation of violence leads to increased anxiety, fear, and depression;

Whereas 73 percent of teachers in the United States do not want to carry guns in school and 58 percent say arming personnel would make schools less safe, according to a Gallup poll from March 2018;

Whereas the majority of parents of school-aged children oppose arming school personnel, according to surveys;

Whereas, as of March 2019, there is no evidence supporting the value of arming school personnel;

Whereas the broad consensus among participants in the listening tour for the final report of the Federal Commission on School Safety released in December 2018 was disagreement with programs that would arm school personnel, according to transcripts; and

Whereas, in that final report, the Department of Education endorsed the use of Federal funds to train personnel to use firearms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Federal funds shall not be used to train or arm school personnel with firearms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 111—RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINAS IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr.

HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 111

Whereas the United States celebrates National Women’s History Month every March to recognize and honor the achievements of women throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas there are nearly 28,000,000 Latinas living in the United States;

Whereas 1 in 6 women in the United States is a Latina;

Whereas Latinas have helped shape the history of the United States since its inception;

Whereas Latinas contribute to the society of the United States through working in many industries, including business, education, science and technology, medicine, engineering, mathematics, literature and the arts, the military, agriculture, hospitality, and public service at every level of government;

Whereas Latinas come from diverse cultures across North America, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean, and Afro-Latinas face disparities in recognition;

Whereas Latinas are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of the Federal Government, including the Supreme Court of the United States, Cabinet-level positions, the United States Senate, and the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas Latinas make up an estimated 16 percent of women in the Armed Forces, and the first Latina to become a general in the Marine Corps reached that rank in 2006;

Whereas Latinas are breaking the glass ceiling in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, with the first Latina to travel into space doing so during a 9-day Space Shuttle Discovery mission in 1993;

Whereas Latinas own nearly 2,000,000 businesses, and 1 in 6 women-owned companies in the United States is owned by a Latina;

Whereas Latina activists have led the fight for civil rights, including labor rights, LGBTQ rights, women’s rights, and racial equality;

Whereas Latinas create award-winning art and are recipients of Emmy, Grammy, Oscar, and Tony awards;

Whereas Latina singers and songwriters, like Selena, also known as the Queen of Tejano music, and Celia Cruz, also known as the Queen of Salsa, have made lasting and significant contributions to music throughout the world;

Whereas Latinas serve in the medical profession, and the first female and first Hispanic Surgeon General of the United States was appointed in 1990;

Whereas Latinas are paid just 53 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men;

Whereas, in the face of societal obstacles, including unequal pay, disparities in education, health care needs, and civil rights struggles, Latinas continue to break through and thrive;

Whereas the United States should continue to invest in the future of Latinas to address the barriers they face; and

Whereas, by 2060, Latinas will represent 1/3 of the female population of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates and honors the successes of Latinas and the contributions they have made and continue to make to the United States; and

(2) recognizes the changes that are still to be made to ensure that Latinas can realize their full potential as equal members of society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 112—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES CONDEMNS ALL FORMS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN GLOBALLY AND RECOGNIZES THE HARMFUL IMPACTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COONS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 112

Whereas violence against children can take many forms, including sexual violence, physical violence, emotional violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

Whereas, each year, more than 1,000,000,000 children worldwide are exposed to violence;

Whereas, each year, the global economic impact of physical, psychological, and sexual violence against children is estimated to be as high as \$7,000,000,000,000, which is 8 percent of global gross domestic product (referred to in this preamble as “global GDP”);

Whereas, around the world, an estimated 1 in 3 adolescent girls between 15 and 19 years of age, or 84,000,000 girls, have been victims of emotional, physical, or sexual violence, which is often perpetrated by individuals the girls know;

Whereas 1 in 5 girls in the developing world is said to be married before reaching 18 years of age and, of those girls, an estimated 1 in 9 is said to be married before reaching 15 years of age;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Children’s Fund (commonly known as “UNICEF”), if current child marriage rates continue, 120,000,000 girls, an average of 12,000,000 girls a year, will be married before their 18th birthday over the next decade;

Whereas 246,000,000 boys and girls experience school-related gender-based violence each year;

Whereas children with disabilities reportedly are 3 to 4 times more likely to experience physical or sexual violence;

Whereas tens of millions of children living outside of family care, including those living on the streets, working away from home, and in residential care, are particularly vulnerable to violence and abuse;

Whereas an estimated 152,000,000 children are involved in child labor and 4,300,000 children are subject to forced labor, including in situations of trafficking;

Whereas nearly half of the 68,500,000 individuals who are currently displaced by conflict and war around the world are children and displacement exposes those children to increased risk of exploitation, violence, and abuse;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, from 2016 to 2017, verified cases of child recruitment, including forcible recruitment, and participation in armed conflict—

(1) quadrupled in the Central African Republic;

(2) doubled in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and

(3) persisted at alarming levels in Somalia, South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Yemen;

Whereas more than 10,000 children were killed or maimed in 2017 in armed conflict;

Whereas the risks of online abuse and exploitation of children is constantly growing, with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reviewing cases involving 25,000,000 child sexual abuse images in 2015, up from 450,000 in 2004;

Whereas unaddressed exposure to violence disrupts the development of critical brain architecture and other organ structures, leaving children at lifelong risk of disease and reduced potential;

Whereas studies show toxic stress relating to exposure to violent or dangerous environments becomes damaging to learning, behavior, and health across a lifespan;

Whereas violence against children can lead to negative health consequences, including injury, noncommunicable and communicable diseases, and poor maternal and child health outcomes;

Whereas all forms of violence in childhood have a significant negative impact on educational outcomes, including school attendance and drop-out rates, and can further limit access to the physical, mental health, psychosocial and cognitive protections that safe educational settings provide;

Whereas decades of behavioral and social science research have demonstrated that building adaptive capacities, known as resilience, through stable and committed relationships with a supportive caregiver or other adult can lessen the harmful developmental effects of violence in children and youth;

Whereas, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United States invests 0.5 percent of official development assistance in programs that are designed to prevent and address violence against children and youth;

Whereas the United States, in coordination with public-private partnerships and other organizations, has endorsed the technical package called “INSPIRE: Seven Strategies for Ending Violence against Children” (referred to in this preamble as “INSPIRE”) put forth by the World Health Organization, with substantial technical input from the United States Government, including from the Centers for Disease Control and United States Agency for International Development;

Whereas INSPIRE contains 7 evidence-based strategies to end violence against children that include—

(1) implementing and enforcing relevant laws;

(2) addressing harmful gender and other social norms;

(3) creating and sustaining safe communities;

(4) supporting parents and caregivers;

(5) improving household economic security to reduce violence in the home;

(6) improving access to health services, social welfare, and criminal justice support; and

(7) ensuring safe school environments that provide gender-equitable education and social-emotional learning and life skills trainings; and

Whereas the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Health and Human Services each play a critical role in preventing and

responding to violence against children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States—

(1) condemns all forms of violence against children and youth globally, including physical, mental, and sexual violence, neglect, abuse, maltreatment, and exploitation;

(2) recognizes—

(A) the harmful impact that violence against children and youth has on the healthy development of children; and

(B) the harmful economic impact of violence against children and youth; and

(3) should—

(A) develop and implement a comprehensive and coordinated strategy built on evidence-based practices, including the technical package called “INSPIRE: Seven Strategies for Ending Violence against Children” put forth by the World Health Organization; and

(B) adopt common metrics and indicators to monitor progress across Federal agencies to prevent, address, and end violence against children and youth globally.

SENATE RESOLUTION 113—DESIGNATING MARCH 25, 2019, AS “NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. HASSAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 113

Whereas a group of permanent disorders of the development of movement and posture that are attributed to nonprogressive disturbances that occur in the developing brain is referred to as “cerebral palsy”;

Whereas cerebral palsy, the most common motor disability in children, is caused by damage to 1 or more specific areas of the developing brain, which usually occurs during fetal development before, during, or after birth;

Whereas the majority of children who have cerebral palsy are born with cerebral palsy, but cerebral palsy may be undetected for months or years;

Whereas 75 percent of individuals with cerebral palsy also have 1 or more developmental disabilities, including epilepsy, intellectual disability, autism, visual impairment, or blindness;

Whereas, according to information released by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) the prevalence of cerebral palsy is not changing over time; and

(2) an estimated 1 in 323 children has cerebral palsy;

Whereas approximately 764,000 individuals in the United States are affected by cerebral palsy;

Whereas, although there is no cure for cerebral palsy, treatment often improves the capabilities of a child with cerebral palsy;

Whereas scientists and researchers are hopeful for breakthroughs in cerebral palsy research;

Whereas researchers across the United States conduct important research projects involving cerebral palsy; and

Whereas the Senate can raise awareness of cerebral palsy in the public and the medical community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 25, 2019, as “National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day”; and

(2) encourages each individual in the United States to become better informed about and aware of cerebral palsy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 114—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 21, 2019, AS “NATIONAL ROSIE THE RIVETER DAY”

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 114

Whereas National Rosie the Riveter Day is a collective national effort to raise awareness of the more than 18,000,000 women in the civilian labor force during World War II;

Whereas the people of the United States have chosen to honor women workers who contributed from the home front during World War II;

Whereas those women left their homes to work or volunteer full-time in factories, farms, shipyards, airplane factories, banks, and other institutions in support of the Armed Forces overseas;

Whereas those women worked with the United Service Organizations and the American Red Cross, drove trucks, riveted airplane parts, collected critical materials, rolled bandages, and served on rationing boards;

Whereas it is fitting and proper to recognize and preserve the history and legacy of working women, including volunteer women, during World War II to promote cooperation and fellowship among those women and their descendants;

Whereas those women and their descendants wish to further the advancement of patriotic ideas, excellence in the workplace, and loyalty to the United States; and

Whereas March 21, 2019, during Women’s History Month, is an appropriate day to designate as “National Rosie the Riveter Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of March 21, 2019 as “National Rosie the Riveter Day”; and

(2) acknowledges the important role played by women during World War II.

SENATE RESOLUTION 115—RECOGNIZING THE REALTORS LAND INSTITUTE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. COTTON (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 115

Whereas, in 1944, the REALTORS® Land Institute was founded by 20 land specialists who met at the Drake Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, to establish a national organization that would provide education, information, marketing opportunities, and broker networking to enhance the ability of their members to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

Whereas, as of 2019, the REALTORS® Land Institute has been an affiliate of the National Association of REALTORS® for 75 years;

Whereas, in 2019, the REALTORS® Land Institute celebrates 75 years of serving land owners, users, and realtors throughout the United States and Canada;

Whereas the members of the REALTORS® Land Institute have developed international marketing capabilities and networks throughout the world;

Whereas the REALTORS® Land Institute is comprised of members who subscribe to a strict code of ethics and to just and equitable principles in real estate transactions;

Whereas the REALTORS® Land Institute encourages continuing education and rewards members who complete an extensive education program and service to the land industry with a national designation of Accredited Land Consultant (commonly known as “ALC”); and

Whereas the REALTORS® Land Institute is a national professional trade association, dedicated to advancing the effective use of the most precious commodity in the United States, land; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the REALTORS® Land Institute on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the REALTORS® Land Institute.

SENATE RESOLUTION 116—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY ON MARCH 19, 2019

Ms. STABENOW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 116

Whereas the social work profession is dedicated to enhancing well-being and helping meet the basic needs of all people, especially those who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty;

Whereas, in 2019, the theme of Social Work Month, “Elevate Social Work”, embodies the need to recognize the extraordinary contributions of the profession to the society of the United States;

Whereas the social work profession is expected to grow faster than average over the next 7 years, with more than 682,000 people expected to be employed as social workers by 2026;

Whereas social workers elevate and empower people, giving them the ability to solve problems, cope with personal roadblocks, and get the resources they need to succeed;

Whereas the social work profession is deeply woven into the society of the United States, with social workers active in government, schools, universities, social service agencies, communities, corporations, the military, and health care and mental health care settings;

Whereas social workers are the largest group of providers of mental health services in the United States, and the Department of Veterans Affairs is one of the largest employers of social workers who hold advanced degrees;

Whereas social workers travel across the United States and the world to help people in crisis, helping them overcome issues such as death and grief, epidemics, environmental pollution, and natural disasters such as wildfires, hurricanes, and floods;

Whereas social workers have been at the forefront of social justice for decades, pushing for equal rights for women, African Americans, Latinos, people who are disabled, people who are LGBTQ, and various ethnic, cultural, and religious groups;

Whereas, for more than a century, the social work profession has been on the cutting edge of helping to create changes to make the society of the United States a better place to live, including expanded voting rights, improved workplace safety, and the

establishment of a minimum wage and social safety net programs that ameliorate poverty and hunger; and

Whereas social workers stand ready to help the society of the United States address current pressing issues, including equal rights for all, the need for improved availability of health care and mental health services, immigration reform, voting rights, and the environmental impact of global warming; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day on March 19, 2019;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups that promote the importance of social work and observe Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages individuals to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote further awareness of the life-changing roles that social workers play; and

(4) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

SENATE RESOLUTION 117—DESIGNATING MARCH 22, 2019, AS “NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY”

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 117

Whereas rehabilitation counselors support individuals with disabilities by—

- (1) conducting assessments;
- (2) providing counseling;
- (3) supporting families; and

(4) assisting in the development of individualized plans for employment for individuals with disabilities who are in need of rehabilitation;

Whereas the purpose of professional organizations for rehabilitation counseling and education is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to individuals with disabilities through—

- (1) quality education for counselors; and
- (2) rehabilitation research;

Whereas various professional organizations have vigorously advocated for up-to-date education and training and the maintenance of professional standards in the field of rehabilitation counseling and education, including—

- (1) the National Rehabilitation Association;
- (2) the Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Association;
- (3) the National Council on Rehabilitation Education;
- (4) the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association;
- (5) the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association;
- (6) the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification;
- (7) the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation; and
- (8) the Council on Rehabilitation Education;

Whereas, in March of 1983, the president of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and was instrumental in bringing to the attention of Congress the need for qualified rehabilitation counselors; and

Whereas credentialed rehabilitation counselors provide a higher quality of service to

individuals in need of rehabilitation, and the development of an accreditation system for rehabilitation counselors supports the continued education of rehabilitation counselors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 22, 2019, as “National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day”; and

(2) commends—

(A) rehabilitation counselors for their dedication and hard work in providing counseling to individuals with disabilities who are in need of rehabilitation; and

(B) professional organizations for their efforts in assisting individuals with disabilities who are in need of rehabilitation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 118—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF PAYING TRIBUTE TO THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE FAITHFULLY SERVED AND RETIRED FROM THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, DESIGNATING APRIL 18, 2019, AS “MILITARY RETIREE APPRECIATION DAY”, AND ENCOURAGING THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO HONOR THE PAST AND CONTINUED SERVICE OF MILITARY RETIREES TO THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND THE UNITED STATES

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROUNDS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 118

Whereas there are approximately 2,000,000 retirees of the Armed Forces of the United States who have earned their retirement through career service, a service-connected disability, or both;

Whereas military retirees show an unrivaled dedication to service, having faithfully served their country and dedicated much of their lives knowing that at any moment they could be sent anywhere in the world and possibly asked to make the ultimate sacrifice to protect and defend the national security of the United States;

Whereas military retirees, through their perseverance and dedication—

(1) have proven to be leaders who are resilient, focused, disciplined, well-trained, and well-educated; and

(2) bring the best qualities of citizenship in the United States to lifelong service within their national and local communities as dependable, responsible citizens and neighbors;

Whereas the qualities of a military retiree often result in positive contributions to—

(1) the civilian workforce, as experienced and knowledgeable employees;

(2) local educational institutions, as teachers, counselors, and coaches;

(3) local government, as elected public servants; and

(4) communities, as dedicated and effective volunteers;

Whereas the dedication and focus of military retirees helps strengthen and stabilize local communities; and

Whereas the contributions of military retirees to their communities are the mani-

festation of the desire of the retirees to continue their selfless acts of volunteering and their lifelong service to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 18, 2019, as “Military Retiree Appreciation Day”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States through appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 119—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF WORLD TUBERCULOSIS DAY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 119

Whereas $\frac{1}{4}$ of the population of the world is infected with the tuberculosis bacterium (commonly referred to as “TB”);

Whereas the World Health Organization (commonly referred to as the “WHO”) estimates that 10,000,000 people developed TB in 2017, nine percent of whom were also infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (commonly referred to as “HIV”);

Whereas, in 2017, TB killed an estimated 1,600,000 people, causing more deaths worldwide than any other single infectious agent;

Whereas $\frac{2}{3}$ of new TB infections in 2017 occurred in India, China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Pakistan, Nigeria, Bangladesh, and South Africa;

Whereas TB is a leading killer of people infected with HIV, and 300,000 people with HIV died of TB in 2017;

Whereas additional vulnerable populations at high risk for developing TB include pregnant women and newborns;

Whereas TB is one of the six leading causes of death among adult women between the ages of 15 and 49 in low-income countries, and women with TB can face stigma, discrimination, and in some settings ostracization by their families and communities;

Whereas the global TB epidemic and the spread of drug-resistant TB present a persistent public health threat to the United States because the disease does not recognize borders;

Whereas antibiotic-resistant pathogens are a growing problem worldwide, and drug-resistant TB can occur when the drugs used to treat TB are misused or mismanaged;

Whereas studies have demonstrated direct person-to-person transmission of drug-resistant TB;

Whereas multi-drug resistant TB (commonly referred to as “MDR-TB”) is caused by bacteria with resistance to rifampin and isoniazid, the two most potent treatments for TB infection;

Whereas, according to the 2018 WHO Global Tuberculosis Report, in 2017 an estimated 3.5 percent of all new TB cases and 18 percent of previously treated cases were MDR-TB or rifampin-resistant TB;

Whereas, in 2017, an estimated 558,000 people around the world developed MDR-TB or rifampin-resistant TB, yet only approximately 25 percent of those individuals have been identified and treated;

Whereas extensively drug-resistant TB (commonly referred to as “XDR-TB”) is a rare type of TB that is resistant to nearly all medicines, and therefore can be very dif-

ficult and expensive to treat, especially among patients with HIV and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (commonly referred to as “AIDS”);

Whereas, according to the 2018 WHO Global Tuberculosis Report, in 2017, 127 countries reported at least one case of XDR-TB;

Whereas, in 2017, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that the cost of treating a single patient with MDR-TB in the United States averaged \$164,000, and the average cost of treating a patient with XDR-TB was even higher at \$526,000, compared with \$19,000 to treat a patient with drug-susceptible TB;

Whereas MDR-TB and XDR-TB cases in the United States between 2005 and 2007 collectively cost the health care system an estimated \$53,000,000, according to an analysis by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that costs resulting from all forms of TB in the United States totaled more than \$460,000,000 in 2017;

Whereas, in a 2000 report, the Institute of Medicine found that a decrease in TB control funding and the spread of HIV and AIDS caused a resurgence of TB in the late 1980s and early 1990s;

Whereas a total of 9,105 TB cases were reported in the United States in 2017, representing all 50 States and the District of Columbia, and up to 13,000,000 people in the United States are estimated to be living with latent TB infection;

Whereas 75 percent of States have reported an increase in the proportion of complex cases of TB in recent years due to factors such as homelessness, HIV infection, drug resistance, substance abuse, refugee status, and other factors;

Whereas the rate of TB disease in African Americans is eight times higher than the rate in White non-Hispanic Americans, and significant disparities exist among other minorities in the United States, including Native Americans and Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans, with 86 percent of all reported TB cases in the United States in 2016 occurring in racial or ethnic minorities;

Whereas, globally in 2017, an estimated 1,000,000 children developed TB and 230,000 children died of TB;

Whereas smoking greatly increases the risks of contracting TB and TB recurrence and impairs the response to treatment;

Whereas diabetes is a major risk factor for TB, and people with diabetes are more likely to develop TB and have a higher risk of death due to TB;

Whereas bedaquiline is an antibiotic that boosts an MDR-TB patient’s chance of survival from approximately 50 percent to as much as 80 percent, and through a public-private partnership, the United States Agency for International Development (commonly referred to as “USAID”) provided approximately 30,000 treatments in 110 countries from 2015 through the end of February 2018;

Whereas Bacillus Calmette-Guerin, a TB vaccine that is known as “BCG”, provides some protection to infants and young children but has had little epidemiologic impact on TB worldwide;

Whereas there is a critical need for new drugs, diagnostics, and vaccines for controlling the global TB epidemic;

Whereas, in September 2018, the United Nations held the first high-level meeting on TB in which 120 countries, including the United States, signed a political declaration committing to accelerating the TB response, including by increasing funding for TB control programs and research and development efforts, with the goal of reaching all affected people with TB prevention and care;

Whereas the enactment of the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-293; 122 Stat. 2918), and the Comprehensive Tuberculosis Elimination Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-392; 122 Stat. 4195) provided a historic United States commitment to the global eradication of TB, including a commitment to treat 4,500,000 TB patients and 90,000 MDR-TB patients between 2009 and 2013 and to provide additional treatment through coordinated multilateral efforts;

Whereas USAID—

(A) provides technical assistance to 22 countries highly burdened by TB to build self-reliance and support the adoption of state-of-the-art TB-related technologies;

(B) supports the development of new diagnostic and treatment tools; and

(C) supports research to develop new vaccines and other new methods to combat TB;

Whereas, in 2018, USAID launched—

(A) a new business model entitled “Global Accelerator to End Tuberculosis” to accelerate progress and build self-reliance with respect to TB prevention and treatment; and

(B) a new mechanism to directly support local organizations in priority countries;

Whereas TB incidence in the countries that receive bilateral TB funding from the United States through USAID has decreased by nearly $\frac{1}{4}$ since 2000;

Whereas, according to the Copenhagen Consensus Center, TB prevention programs return \$56 for each dollar invested, which is one of the highest returns on investment of any health intervention;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, partnering with other entities of the United States and individual States and territories, directs the national TB elimination program, coordinates TB surveillance, technical assistance, and prevention activities, and helps to support the development of new diagnostic, treatment, and prevention tools to combat TB;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health, through its many institutes and centers, plays the leading role in basic and clinical research on the identification, treatment, and prevention of TB;

Whereas the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (commonly referred to as the “Global Fund”), to which the United States is a top financial donor, provides more than 65 percent of all international financing for TB programs;

Whereas, to date, Global Fund-supported programs have detected and treated more than 17,400,000 cases of TB; and

Whereas March 24, 2019, is World Tuberculosis Day, a day that commemorates the date in 1882 on which Dr. Robert Koch announced his discovery of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, the bacteria that causes TB: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of World Tuberculosis Day to raise awareness about tuberculosis;

(2) commends the progress of tuberculosis elimination efforts by entities that include the United States Agency for International Development, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, the World Health Organization, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment to strengthen the United States leadership and effectiveness of the global response to tuberculosis with the goal of ending the tuberculosis epidemic.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 200. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 200. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Fentanyl and fentanyl analogues were responsible for more than 28,400 overdose deaths in the United States in 2017, according to the National Institute of Drug Abuse.

(2) According to the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has reported that fentanyl smuggling between ports of entry at the southern border of the United States more than doubled from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2018.

(3) According to the Department of Homeland Security, in the past 5 years, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has seen a 620 percent increase in families—or those posing as families—apprehended at the border, with fiscal year 2018 being the highest on record for family apprehensions at the border.

(4) The journey to the southern border for women and children traveling from Central America is fraught with incredible danger, including increased risk of violence and sexual abuse from gangs and coyotes.

(5) The bipartisan Secure Fence Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-367; 120 Stat. 2638) was signed into law on October 26, 2006, and mandated that the Department of Homeland Security achieve and maintain operational control of the international land border, using physical infrastructure as well as other means, to ensure “the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband”.

(6) Over the past 25 years, the United States Government has constructed 654 miles of physical barriers on the southern border.

(7) The Department of Homeland Security is only seeking to expand the physical barrier on the southern border in operationally necessary locations, not to build a physical barrier for all 1,954 miles of the southern border.

(8) U.S. Customs and Border Protection has identified 17 high priority locations on the southern border where there is a current operational need for physical barriers.

(9) On January 6, 2019, the President requested that Congress appropriate \$5,700,000,000 for the construction of approximately 234 miles of new physical barriers to fully fund the top 10 high priority locations identified by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(10) On February 15, 2019, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 116-6) was signed into law, providing the Department of Homeland Security with \$1,375,000,000 for “the construction of primary pedestrian fencing, including levee pedestrian fencing, in the Rio Grande Valley Sector”.

(11) On February 15, 2019, the President announced the Treasury Forfeiture Fund would provide to U.S. Customs and Border Protection \$601,000,000 for physical barriers along the southern border under the authority of section 9705 of title 31, United States Code, which established the Fund and allows the Secretary of the Treasury to provide monies from the Fund for use “in connection with the law enforcement activities of any Federal agency”.

(12) On February 15, 2019, the President announced that Department of Defense funds would be made available from the Department’s Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities account for physical barriers along the southern border under the authority of section 284 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to “provide support for the counterdrug activities or activities to counter transnational organized crime of any other department or agency of the Federal Government”, including for the “[c]onstruction of roads and fences and installation of lighting to block drug smuggling corridors across international boundaries of the United States”.

(13) Section 8005 of division A of the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 115-245) permits the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to \$4,000,000,000 of funds to other accounts, including the Department of Defense’s Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities account, provided that “such action is necessary in the national interest”.

(14) The sum of the amounts described in paragraphs (10) through (13) is \$5,976,000,000, an amount in excess of the \$5,700,000,000 sought by the President for 234 miles of physical barriers along the southern border in the request described in paragraph (9).

(15) On June 27, 2013, the Senate agreed to the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act (S. 744, 113th Congress), which was introduced by Senator Charles E. Schumer (Democrat of New York), and included the following congressional finding: “As a Nation, we have the right and responsibility to make our borders safe, to establish clear and just rules for seeking citizenship, to control the flow of legal immigration, and to eliminate illegal immigration, which in some cases has become a threat to our national security.”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator MIKE BRAUN, intend to object to proceeding to H.R. 269, a bill to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain non-prescription drugs that are marketed without an approved drug application, and for other purposes, dated March 14, 2019 for the following reasons as stated in the RECORD.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 6 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 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, March 14, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Financial stability oversight council nonbank designation."

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, March 14, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The President's Fiscal year 2020 budget."

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The President's Fiscal year 2020 budget."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 113, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 113) designating March 25, 2019, as "National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 113) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 21, 2019, AS "NATIONAL ROSIE THE RIVETER DAY"

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 114, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 114) expressing support for the designation of March 21, 2019, as "National Rosie the Riveter Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 2019, THROUGH MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, March 15, 2019, at 11 a.m.; Tuesday, March 19, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.; Thursday, March 21, 2019, at 2:10 p.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, March 21, 2019, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, March 25, 2019, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bade nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, March 25, 2019.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator SULLIVAN.

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

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO PETER KAISER

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is that time of day on the Senate floor when I get to recognize someone special from my State, someone we refer to as the Alaskan of the Week, someone who makes our great State of Alaska, in my opinion, the best and most unique State in the country. I know it is the pages' favorite speech of the week as well. I don't think you are going to be disappointed with this one, the young men and women here working as pages.

Now, some may take issue with the claim of the most unique State in the Union, but consider this: Right now we have teams of mushers and their dogs that are barreling 900 miles across the State of Alaska toward the city of Nome in some of the harshest conditions and some of the most difficult and rugged terrain on the planet Earth. The Iditarod—the "Last Great Race on Earth"—is still under way in Alaska. Right now, mushers, literally as we speak, are rolling in to Nome today, tomorrow, and in the next few days.

We salute all of the mushers and their dogs, the athletes—these dogs are great athletes—for their hard work. We are particularly proud this year. For the first time in history, three women—Page Drobyn, Jessie Royer, and Aliy Zirkle—are among the top ten finishers in the Iditarod.

Like all races, there is a winner, and our Alaskan of the Week—we see a great picture of him and his dogs here—is the winner. After 9 days, 12 hours, 39 minutes, and 6 seconds on the trail, at 3:39 a.m., yesterday morning, in Nome, AK, Bethel resident Peter Kaiser crossed the finish line in Nome to win this year's Iditarod.

This win is also historic for a number of reasons. Pete is the first person from Bethel, AK, to win the race. He is the fifth Alaska Native to win and the first Alaskan of Yupik descent to take the title.

A crowd was there waiting for him. It seemed like half the town of Bethel was there waiting for him. As he crossed the finish line, they were chanting: Way to go, Pete. Way to go, Pete. Alaska Native dancers performed. There were hugs and tears of joy all around. His wife Bethany was there. Their two children, Ari Joseph and daughter Aylee, were also there.

This is also exciting because of the race's historic roots. Before I talk more about Pete, for a little bit, let me take you back to a remarkable piece of history that happened in Nome, AK, in 1925, when diphtheria serum was desperately needed in Nome for several very sick children.

It was 1925, in Alaska, and the nearest batch of serum was 1,000 miles away in Anchorage. There weren't—and, unfortunately, there still aren't—any

roads between Nome and Anchorage. As a matter of fact, Alaska has almost 200 communities that don't have any roads connecting them to other places. There were no commercial airlines back then. The nearest train station to Nome was roughly 700 miles away. So, in the winter, people traveled mostly by dog sled.

On the night of January 27, 1925, musher "Wild Bill" Shannon tied a 20-pound package of serum wrapped in protective fur around his sled. He and his nine dogs started the hundreds-of-miles journey—the "Great Race of Mercy" it was called back then—across the frozen Alaska land. The entire Nation was watching. This was reported in newspapers all across America.

Wild Bill went for some time. Miles later, he met up with another racer and another team of dogs, and this relay of dog mushers carrying the serum for the sick kids in Nome continued until the lifesaving serum reached Nome 5 days later—pretty remarkable.

The original race, as I mentioned, in 1925, began to be reenacted, with some twists, in 1973. There were no relays and just one musher and his dogs running the whole route. It continues today in honor of that lifesaving mission that happened—and saved the kids, by the way—in Nome almost a century ago.

What a race it is. The mushers face frostbite, howling winds, and blizzards. They risk getting lost in the great Alaskan wilderness. In fact, they risk their lives along the way.

Entering the race at all requires fierce determination, but winning the race, like Peter Kaiser just did, requires even more than determination. It requires years of grueling training, it requires guts, and it requires an Alaskan-sized heart. That is what Pete Kaiser has.

Let me tell you a little about Pete, our Alaskan of the Week and our 2019 Iditarod champ.

He is 31 years old. He was born and raised in Bethel, and he traces his mushing roots back to his great-grandfather, who came into the country as a gold miner and made extended trips with his dog team from the interior part of the State to Bristol Bay. His great-grandfather met and married a beautiful Yupik woman who had been raised in an orphanage, and that was his great-grandmother.

He grew up with dogs. He and his sister loved mushing. When Pete was in college, he decided he really wanted to know everything about dogs that he could, and that passion turned into dog mushing full time in the great State of Alaska. According to him, that mushing, that determination, and that hard work gave his life focus and purpose.

Pete has won another race, Bethel's Kuskokwim 300, four times in a row,

and he has run every Iditarod since 2010, placing fifth three different times. This year, he won it all. He took the gold.

This was not an easy year on the trail. In 2017, it was one of the coldest Iditarods on record. Most of the trail most of the time out there was 30, 40, or maybe even 50 below zero. It was very cold, very dark. This year, interestingly, was one of the warmest. The lack of snow in some areas presented challenges. One area of the trail—almost 80 miles, on what we call tussocks or rolling tundra—was in many areas without snow. It was like mushing over bowling balls, said Pete after he won.

But he kept his cool and ran a strategic, determined race, and, importantly, he knew the area. While other mushers trained in the more urban areas, he stuck with rural Alaska, where the trail really gets rough, and he knew how to handle it.

He husbanded his strength and the power of his dogs to maneuver into position on the Bering Sea coast toward the end of the race. It was there, as other teams faltered, that he charged to victory, besting a good friend of his by just minutes, one of the closest finishes in Iditarod history.

Yesterday I got to call Pete to congratulate him. He said at the end, dog-tired, that it was all a blur. They don't sleep much—for almost 9 days.

Speaking of dogs, he said that his champion dogs were eating a lot right now and getting a well-deserved rest.

You can see some of those beautiful dogs, who by the way, love to run. They love to run.

In Alaska, our Iditarod winners are like rock stars. They become very famous overnight. Pete will be no different. He will be an inspiration to so many, partly because of his hometown and his humble roots.

Myron Angstman, another longtime musher and Pete's hero, said that most local mushers aren't sponsored. He said: "They're not wealthy and they don't have a family kennel already established." But Pete's success will inspire others.

Pete agrees. When a reporter asked him what his victory means for his community and for smaller towns in Alaska, he said that it "shows that somebody" from out in the rural parts of the State "can have a dream and put it all together and work hard and things can happen like this." Those are inspiring words, and I am sure we will see new generations of mushers heeding Pete's call and jumping into the field as a result of his example and his success.

Thank you, Pete, for reminding all of us that with enough hard work, grit, guts, and determination, any kid from any small town or any village can follow their dreams and make them a reality.

Congratulations, again, to you and your wonderful, hard-working dogs on being the 2019 Iditarod champ, and congratulations for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:01 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 15, 2019, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

MICHAEL O. JOHANNIS, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

TROY D. EDGAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE CHARLES H. FULGHUM.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

EDWARD W. FELTEN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2025. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DONALD W. WASHINGTON, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JANICE MIRIAM HELLREICH, OF HAWAII, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2024.

ROBERT A. MANDELL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022.

BRUCE M. RAMER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2024.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF ALEXANDER C. FOOS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RODNEY HOOD, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2023.

TODD M. HARPER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 10, 2021.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

WILLIAM I. ALTHEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2024.

MARCO M. RAJKOVICH, JR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2024.

ARTHUR R. TRAYNOR III, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 30, 2022.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DIVIDED FAMILIES REUNIFICATION ACT

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of my Divided Families Reunification Act, and to raise the voices of families who have been separated for decades both across the DMZ and across the Pacific Ocean.

The division of the Korean Peninsula into South and North Korea separated millions of Koreans from their family members. While there have been some agreed upon reunions between South and North Koreans, for Korean Americans there is no pathway for such reunions. Many of these Americans are in their 70s–90s, and time is of the essence to be reunited with their families.

I am proud to introduce the Divided Families Reunification Act, which requires the Secretary of State or a designee to consult with officials in South Korea on potential opportunities to reunite Korean American families with family members in North Korea. This bill will also require the Special Envoy on North Korean Human Rights to submit a report on the opportunities for video reunions between Korean Americans and family members in North Korea.

Thank you to my colleagues, Chairman BRAD SHERMAN, Rep. KAREN BASS, Rep. BARBARA LEE, Rep. JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Rep. JAN SCHAKOWSKY, Rep. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Rep. GILBERT CISNEROS, Rep. ROB WOODALL, and Rep. TULSI GABBARD for supporting this bipartisan legislation.

DREAM AND PROMISE ACT

HON. LORI TRAHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge this Congress to provide permanent relief to the Dreamers, Deferred Enforcement Departure, and Temporary Protected Status holders whose lives have been turned upside down by the Administration. We must pass H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act, without delay.

Fourteen months ago, the Department of Homeland Security announced that it was ending TPS for nearly 200,000 Salvadorans in the United States. The Department's decision about Salvadorans' TPS was just the latest in a string of such announcements since the fall of 2017—which also threaten Sudanese, Haitian, and Nicaraguan immigrants. Families have been living in a state of fear and uncertainty for a year and a half, and for no good reason.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to explain why this is not only cruel policy, but also unnecessary

and short-sighted. Recently, I had the pleasure of speaking with Irma Flores. Irma is a community engagement specialist for the city of Somerville, Massachusetts, where she assists the Spanish-speaking community. She lives in Haverhill, in my District, with her daughter, who goes to school at UMass Boston. Her son graduated from Suffolk University with degrees in International Relations and Political Science. Irma, herself, studied International Relations in her native country at the University of El Salvador. However, she and her kids fled to the United States 18 years ago because of a devastating earthquake.

For nearly two decades, the United States has been Irma's home and her children's home. The people of Somerville depend upon her; and she is a beloved part of the Haverhill community.

It is estimated that there are more than 12,000 people living in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with Temporary Protected Status—half of whom are from El Salvador. However, people like Irma have had their lives upended by the callousness of the Administration's policy.

If Irma's story isn't persuasive enough for Congress to act, consider the fact that the law, despite the Administration's claim, does not require her return. That's because we have the power to permit extensions if these residents are unable to return in safety.

The United States does not—and should not—return people to disaster areas or warzones. In January, our State Department renewed its travel advisory to El Salvador. The warning reads: "Violent crime, such as murder, assault, rape, and armed robbery, is common. Gang activity, such as extortion, violent street crime, and narcotics and arms trafficking, is widespread." These are not conditions under which families should be forced to return.

But if the legal argument is not persuasive either, consider the fact that TPS holders contribute nearly \$650 million to the Commonwealth's economy. One analysis found that if Salvadoran, Honduran, and Haitian workers with TPS were removed from the labor force, the United States would lose \$164 billion in gross domestic product over the next decade.

Again, Madam Speaker, this is cruel, unnecessary and shortsighted policy. This Congress should approve the Dream and Promise Act, which provides a permanent fix for Dreamers, DACA, and TPS recipients without delay, so that people like Irma and her family can remain safely here as members of our communities.

RECOGNIZING WINNETT ACES

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of Winnett ACES

for leading efforts to encourage economic growth, revitalize their community, and protect its future.

Concerned about the decreasing population of rural America, Winnett ACES (Agricultural and Community Enhancement and Sustainability) formed in 2016 to strengthen its community so that future generations will live, work, and raise their families there.

The group's first program to take off was Winnett Beef in the School, which serves locally-raised beef to the local K–12 school system. Led by local producer Charlie Ahlgren, area ranchers made a three-year commitment to donate beef, about four cows per year, to the program. Other volunteers helped cut and deliver the fresh product. Within three months, the program had successfully launched, saving money for the schools to use on other education priorities.

Winnett ACES is also leading a revitalization project to build a community center. Land has been donated, and grant money awarded to design the center, which will accommodate 300 people.

Another project, known as grass banking, is underway after a feasibility study produced the program's guidelines. Local ranchers and landowners lease their lands for summer grazing in exchange for conservation work. Seven individuals will each graze 100 or more cattle when the program launches this spring.

These projects are a few of the inventive approaches Winnett ACES is taking to strengthen its community.

Madam Speaker, for their innovative efforts to bolster their community's future, I recognize the members of Winnett ACES for their spirit of Montana.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TRISH MORRIS-YAMBA

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring a life well lived. Trish Morris-Yamba was an early childhood education visionary from South Orange, New Jersey. She passed away peacefully on March 8, 2019.

Ms. Morris-Yamba was called to serve children and community at a young age. When she was in college, she established a campus child care center for adult students. After completing her master's degree, she opened the CHEN School and served as founding president of Newark, New Jersey's Early Childhood Coalition. Over the years, Ms. Morris-Yamba served as president of the board of trustees at the Newark Public Library, a trustee of the New Jersey Performing Arts Center Women's Board Association, a board member for Newark Emergency Services for Families, and executive director of Newark Day Center and the Greater Newark Fresh Air Fund, among other

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

roles. Ms. Morris-Yamba was the epitome of a community servant, and the thousands of lives she touched are grateful for her visionary leadership.

Ms. Morris-Yamba will be forever remembered for her belief that society must serve the total child. She had a love of learning and a passion for passing knowledge along to future generations. Throughout Newark, Essex County, and all of New Jersey, countless children grew into civic-minded adults because of Ms. Morris-Yamba's work.

Trish Morris-Yamba was an active member of Alpha Kappa Alpha, a member of Bethany Baptist Church in Newark, a loving wife, mother, grandmother, and aunt. I ask that my colleagues join me to celebrate Ms. Morris-Yamba and to honor her legacy.

HONORING MR. JOHN ALFIREVICH
FOR BEING NAMED THE 2019
TIME DEALER OF YEAR

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. John Alfirevich of Apple Chevrolet in Tinley Park for being named the 2019 TIME Dealer of the Year. It is an honor to recognize not only a successful businessman, but someone who has demonstrated a longstanding commitment to our community.

The TIME Dealer of the Year award was created in 1970 by TIME magazine in partnership with Ally Financial and the National Automobile Dealers Association. It is an award honoring new-car dealers in the United States for exceptional performance and distinguished community service. This year, Mr. Alfirevich was selected from 51 nominees out of more than 16,000 franchised dealers throughout the country. Criteria for the TIME award include sales record, customer and employee satisfaction, and service to the community.

Mr. Alfirevich began his career in the car business at the age of 12 at Bob Motl Chevrolet in Chicago, the company that would later become Apple Chevrolet. From there, he continued his journey, working in every department, eventually coming to own the dealership along with his father. Mr. Alfirevich credits his dealership's success to its emphasis on honesty and transparency in every transaction. His integrity also guides his philanthropic endeavors. In 2015, he served as the chairman of First Look for Charity, a fundraising celebration held before the Chicago Auto Show, raising \$3 million to benefit Chicago-area charities. Further, under his leadership, Apple Chevrolet made charitable contributions to almost 100 organizations in 2018.

As the 2019 TIME Dealer of the Year, Mr. Alfirevich is recognized for his integrity, dedication, and service. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Alfirevich. He is well deserving of this award and I am proud to represent such a talented and charitable businessman.

HONORING SYLVIA S. BANKS

HON. LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor a friend, a colleague, a confidant, and a great Delawarean on the occasion of her semi-retirement. Sylvia Banks has served as my State Director since I was first sworn in as Delaware's member of Congress. While new members have a host of difficult decisions to make when assuming office, naming Sylvia as the leader of my team was by far my easiest. From her extensive experience as the Manager of Corporate Contributions Program at the DuPont Company, to her work as a founding trustee of the Metropolitan Wilmington Urban League, Sylvia's resume even before this job was long and impressive. It's why I had to convince Sylvia to end her much-deserved retirement early to come and join my team. But it wasn't just her experience that made Sylvia a must-have. Her wise counsel had served me well personally for years and anyone who has spent any amount of time with her can testify to her calming, assured presence and her incredibly sharp sense of humor.

Luckily for me, and for my whole team, Sylvia's sense of public service won the day, and we made a deal that she would serve as State Director for 1 year. Well, Madam Speaker, 2 years and some months later, I'm happy to say that I got the better end of that bargain. Sylvia is now trying retirement again after failing the first time. Lucky for all of us, I managed to strike another deal with Sylvia. She will be staying on the team part-time as a Senior Advisor, meaning for all of us, her wise counsel will never be more than a phone call away. For her end of the deal, Sylvia will now have more time for her most important job; mother, grandmother, and golfer.

Sylvia Banks has left a lasting mark on my office and our State of Delaware, setting a very high bar, both professionally and personally for which we can all strive. I am eternally grateful for her work.

IN HONOR OF EDWARD WINFIELD
TAYLOR

HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to bring to the attention of this distinguished body Mr. Edward Winfield Taylor of Clinton, North Carolina, who recently celebrated his 90th birthday. Mr. Taylor is a dedicated community leader in Sampson County and in commemoration of Mr. Taylor's outstanding achievements and service to the community, Mayor Lew Starling of Clinton proclaimed Saturday, February 9, 2019, as "Edward W. Taylor Day."

This is a well-deserved honor. Mr. Taylor helped shape countless lives during his 36-year tenure as an admired teacher and band director at Clinton High School. He even went on to earn induction into the North Carolina Bandmasters Association Hall of Fame in

2011. Mr. Taylor helped make a small-town band competitive with some of the largest bands across the state, marching in several national parades such as the Lion's International Parade in New York and the Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Taylor's service to the community extended beyond his role as a teacher and band director. He taught Bible school at Graves Memorial Presbyterian Church for twenty years and coached baseball and football at the Clinton Recreation Department for fifteen years. Not only has he dedicated his life to serving his community and youth, he also served in the United States Air Force where he was a drum major for the marching band.

Edward Taylor and many others just like him brought liberty to millions throughout the world during a very dark time of world-history, and he is one of the giants of his time who made America great by doing his part day in and day out to influence the lives around him and serving our country every step of the way.

Congratulations to Mr. Taylor on 90 great years. May God continue to bless him.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the proclamation of the mayor of Clinton.

"EDWARD W. TAYLOR DAY"

HAPPY 90TH BIRTHDAY

Whereas, family and friends will come together at Coharie Country Club, 101 Coharie Lane, Clinton, NC, on this day, Saturday, February 9, 2019, and celebrate the life of MR. EDWARD W. TAYLOR; and

Whereas, February 12, 2019, will mark the 90th birthday of this outstanding man of Clinton, Sampson County, North Carolina; and

Whereas, Mr. Edward W. Taylor was born February 12, 1929 in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina; and

Whereas, he has been blessed throughout the years and others have been blessed by him in many ways. He has contributed much to the City of Clinton and surrounding areas as a band director at Clinton High School for 36 years that won titles at the state and national levels in some of the most prestigious events; and

Whereas, his name is known throughout the land: he led Clinton High School bands that marched the Lion's Club Parade in New York, Atlanta, and New Orleans and won events at the Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, DC; the Dogwood Festival in Knoxville, TN; and the Apple Blossom Festival in Winchester, VA; and

Whereas, he also served as choir director at Graves Memorial Presbyterian Church for several years.

Now, therefore, I, Lew Starling, Mayor of the City of Clinton, North Carolina, do extend good wishes and hereby proclaim this day, Saturday, February 9, 2019, as: "EDWARD W. TAYLOR DAY".

In Witness Whereof, I do hereunto set my hand and seal of said City of Clinton, this the 9th day of February, 2019.

LEW STARLING,

Mayor.

REMEMBERING PATRICIA HOWARD

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to a great woman of Memphis, Patricia Claxton Howard, a staunch

advocate of women's rights and girls' empowerment. Mrs. Howard had a lengthy Memphis lineage—one of her uncles played in W.C. Handy's band and her parents had a hair styling shop and a tire repair business on opposite sides of Chelsea Avenue. After graduating as the salutatorian of her Manassas High School class, she was admitted to Southwestern at Memphis, an early African American pioneer integrating what is now Rhodes College. It was as a sociology major at Southwestern that she got involved with an embryonic Girls Club of Memphis as a work-study project, an association that lasted more than 50 years during which she rose to become its President and CEO. She also served as the regional director of Girls Inc., and on the board of the national organization. Mrs. Howard also served as the executive director of the Memphis Center of Reproductive Health and on the board of the Memphis Regional Planned Parenthood. Mrs. Howard was inducted into the Memphis Chapter of The Links, Inc., in 1987 and served over the years as its vice president, president and financial secretary. Always active in her community, Mrs. Howard was on the Memphis and Shelby County Collaborative for American Humanities; the Community Forum; the Work Force Investment Agency; the Coalition of 100 Black Women; and the Blue Ridge Institute for Community Services Executives in the Southeast. She was also a member of Leadership Memphis '86. In 2017, she received the Girls Inc. of Memphis SMART Award. She received the Black Students Association Alumni of the Year Award from Rhodes in 2004, the 1999 Pinnacle Leadership Award from Youth United Way, the Thomas W. Briggs Community Service Award, the 1997 Mertie Buckman Mentor Award from the Women's Foundation and the 1992 Women of Achievement Vision Award. I want to extend my sincere condolences to her husband of 48 years, Aubrey; her son Adrian; her extended family and her many loving friends. She led an exemplary life and will be missed.

HONORING BRITTANY WELSH'S
SENIOR PROJECT

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Brittany Welsh, a senior at First Colonial High School. Brittany is an example of true perseverance and dedication, and I am honored to share her story.

Brittany Welsh recently underwent surgery to have one of her kidneys removed due to an issue causing high blood pressure. At such a young age, Brittany persevered through health complications and used her experience to help others. Brittany dedicated her senior project to raising awareness of the need for organ donations. She decided to fundraise for Lifenet, a provider of transplant solutions. Brittany's project will include an acoustic concert by a well-known local band, educational speakers, and speakers who have received an organ donation. Her senior project will not only raise awareness, but will also provide much-needed funds for organ donations.

Brittany is an example to all of us that organ donations can save lives. She also dem-

onstrates how to persevere through trials and use an experience to help others. I am honored to recognize Brittany's story today.

REMEMBERING REP. LOUISE
SLAUGHTER

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this House suffered a tremendous loss a year ago. Louise Slaughter was not just a Congresswoman and Rules Committee Chair and Ranking Member. She was a respected colleague and a dear friend. She and I served together for more than thirty years in this House, and I will always remember her for her tenacity, her confidence, and her determination to make the American Dream attainable for everyone in this country.

Louise's drive to fight for better conditions for working people in New York and in our country can be traced to her childhood. The daughter of a blacksmith from a Kentucky coal mining town, she grew up with a thorough understanding of the challenges faced by those working hard and trying to make it in America. Those experiences shaped her as a legislator in her adopted home of upstate New York, where she fought to ensure that communities had safe drinking water, clean air, and economic opportunities.

In Congress, Louise dedicated herself to these same causes while promoting human rights and freedom abroad. We served together on the Helsinki Commission at the end of the Cold War, and I fondly recall traveling with her to the former Soviet Union, where we shared the experience of meeting with leaders and citizens of the newly independent states yearning to embrace American-style democratic institutions. I got to know her late husband Bob on those journeys and remember him fondly as well.

Back home, Louise made a difference for our country in Congress, serving as the Chairwoman and Ranking Member of the Rules Committee. In that position, she helped shape nearly every piece of legislation passed when Democrats held the Majority from 2007 to 2011, including the Recovery Act, Affordable Care Act, Dodd-Frank, and student loan reforms. Working Americans owe Louise Slaughter a debt of gratitude for being their champion and fighting so hard over the years on their behalf.

As we remember Louise, let us remember her for the courage she displayed, for her indefatigable nature, and for her wisdom and wit. I join with my colleagues in marking the one-year anniversary of her passing, and I extend once more my condolences to her family. I thank Rep. TONKO for leading the House's tribute, and I thank Rep. MORELLE for continuing his predecessor's commitment to outstanding service for the people of New York's Twenty-Fifth District.

HONORING JOHN DAVIS

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of John Davis. John served as the Military and Veterans Liaison for Washington's Fifth Congressional District for the last 4 years, though his service to our country spans over 40 years.

When you hear about John's family's past perhaps it is no surprise that he too followed in their great footsteps of service to this nation.

Did you know he can trace his family's history back almost 200 years? And throughout that history, members of John's family line have fought in almost every major battle including most of the major battles here in the United States, from the Revolutionary War all the way up to the Gulf War.

John continued his family's legacy by serving as a crew chief on a C-130 for the United States Air Force during the war in Vietnam. He served tours in Korea, Japan and Israel and all around the United States. John was the original "rocket man," working in ICBM missile units as a combat crew member, planner and maintenance officer.

During his service, John was awarded the Lance P. Sijan Award, recognizing individuals who have demonstrated the highest qualities of leadership in their jobs and lives. John continues to be a leader in his service for his brothers and sisters in the armed forces. From helping the widow of a veteran facing eviction due to a filing error stay in her home to staying late in the night to hear from 29 veterans who walked into our office in Colville to ensure their voices were heard, John led with a spirit of service.

John spent more than 14 years assisting our Veterans who were homeless through the VA Homeless Programs as well as working as a mental health professional, serving as a senior clinician on the Involuntary Treatment Team. His passion to help our veterans continues to this day. Each year hundreds of veterans reach out to my office as their last hope, and when they called John was there, ready to fight for them, and get them the care and help they earned.

Forty years of faithful, diligent service to this nation deserves to be recognized, and I am so honored to be able to do so in this way. To my friend John Davis, I can never say thank you enough for all you have done for Eastern Washington veterans, for my office, and for America. His retirement is well deserved.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSWOMAN LOUISE SLAUGHTER

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the late Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

Today, Democrats are in the Majority. Twenty-eight women are leading committees

or subcommittees. And, the issues that Louise championed are moving. We are proud to pick up the torch that she left.

I commit to you, Louise, to fight for antibiotic resistant research, for equal pay for equal work—she was the chair of rules when we passed Lily Ledbetter—for ethics in government with regards to Supreme Court justices, and for trade agreements that work for working people. Louise and I fought against NAFTA and the TPP.

Each of those priorities were Louise's. Now, they are at the forefront of our agenda.

This is Louise Slaughter's majority. We miss her voice in the Congress, but we are moving forward with a positive agenda for the people. And it is because of her.

We miss Louise. We love her. And, we thank her.

RECOGNIZING RABBI ISRAEL
ZOBERMAN'S ARTICLE

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rabbi Israel Zoberman and include in the RECORD this article, Learning a Shared History of Sorrow:

On February 22, 2019, George Washington's birthday, during Black History Month, I was privileged to travel to the Smithsonian National Museum of African American History and Culture, close to the Washington Monument on the inspiring National Mall of our nation's capital. I was in good company for the long-awaited tour organized by the Virginia Beach Human Rights Commission. The 44 passengers on the bus included members of the Commission, of which I am a grateful member, representation of the Virginia Beach City Council and the Mayor's office along with the Virginia Beach Police Department, students and staff of the Virginia Beach City Public Schools as well as leaders of the African American Culture Center of Virginia Beach. What an impressive array of civic commitment!

As a family member of the Holocaust's surviving remnant of European Jewry. I knew ahead of the searing visit of the tragic bond between the African American experience and the destruction of European Jewry, of the binding bond among all affected by infectious racial, religious, ethnic, national and gender hatred seeking to demean, dehumanize and demonize the "other". There is an unmistakable thread connecting the 2015 murder of 9 Black members at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston S.C., with the gunning down of 11 Jewish worshippers at a Sabbath service in Pittsburgh's Tree of Life Synagogue in 2018; between the historical lynchings of Blacks and the 2017 White Supremacist mayhem in Charlottesville, Virginia, resulting in a murder, with the dreaded shouts of "Jews will not replace us!" still ringing in our ears. Vitriolic anti-Semitism is precipitously on the rise in the United States and Europe.

The imposing structure of the African American Museum stands within sight of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. I recalled my first visit there and the subsequent ones, when I felt the overcoming sense of uncontrollable loss. It was the same sensation of being assaulted to the core of my humanity that I experienced traveling the challenging halls of the African American Museum. Yet,

I emerged from both encounters with greater resolve to mend the world, Tikkun Olam, turning blemishes into blessings. Who can remain untouched gazing at the casket of brutally murdered 14-year-old Emmett Till and the photo of his agonizing mother, the only exhibit we are forbidden to photograph that we should focus uninterruptedly?

We were guided by an incredible docent telling the story of proud Africans forcibly and so cruelly separated from their rich roots and brought to America—those who made it through the terrifying Middle Passage—and brought here to be violated of all that is sacred. Both they as slaves and Europe's Jews were deemed sub-human. The former ones by colonial powers and a new America promising to advance liberty's cause, and the latter ones by a Germany regarded the world's most civilized nation. The vital Jewish and African American partnership during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, needs to be revitalized in the context of a wider coalition to move America forward.

I wish that both museums could be connected by a bridge or a tunnel to visualize their inseparable bond. Recently heroic French Father Patrick Desbois had a memorable presentation in Virginia Beach. He is renowned for documenting unknown Nazi massacres with local collaboration in occupied lands during WWII along with ISIS's mass crimes in Iraq. He shares a stunning statement in his unsettling book, *In Broad Daylight*, that applies as well to the inhumane treatment of African Americans, "I feel a mounting disgust for our species. The sort of nausea that makes you want to quit the human race." But we dare not quit the human race. Great strides have taken place though progress is an arduous work in the making. The large number of visitors at the museum, particularly the many students, is a hopeful sign. We dare not despair of past and present pain, for that only serves the hateful aggressor, while indifference, as Eli Wiesel taught us, only enables evildoers to succeed.

We need better tools to fight the scourge and resurgence of all forms of hatred, bigotry and discrimination. Democracies are at risk of backsliding, as was the case in Germany, and require eternal vigilance.

A precious teachable window is open to us following trying circumstances, as we celebrate this year the 400th Anniversary of Virginia with its dark shadows and shining lights. Let us pledge, one diverse but united family, to rise together higher and higher.

RETIREMENT OF ROBERT SEWELL

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of a longtime area union leader, Mr. Robert Sewell, and to wish him well in his retirement.

Bob is a second-generation plumber, and like his father before him, a proud union member. After beginning his career as an apprentice with Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 159 in 1979, Bob has remained a member for nearly 40 years, serving as an officer and a prominent member of union leadership.

In 2002, Bob was elected as the union's Financial Secretary Treasurer and has served as its Business Manager since 2016. Among many other responsibilities, Bob led the Local in partnering with other regional unions to ne-

gotiate project labor agreements. Thousands of residential units in Contra Costa County benefited from his efforts to ensure that all workers earn a living wage and benefits.

Bob has also been a leader in collaborating with community organizations to encourage environmental responsibility in development, and has promoted workforce training through his role as the chair of the Local's Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee.

After a long career of fighting for working people, Bob is now retiring. Please join me in congratulating Mr. Robert Sewell for a life of hard work and service, and in wishing him luck in his next chapter.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL
CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME
RULE ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the National Capital Planning Commission District of Columbia Home Rule Act. This bill would remove the authority of the National Capital Planning Commission (NCP) to review or approve the development of District of Columbia-owned land. This bill would also remove the requirement that the Mayor of the District get NCP's approval before selling D.C.-owned real estate, and would allow D.C. agencies to transfer jurisdiction over District-owned land among themselves without NCP's approval.

Under federal law, the development of District-owned public buildings, including the location, height, bulk, number of stories and size of such buildings, in the "central area" is subject to NCP approval. The District is required to consult with NCP on its buildings outside the central area, but NCP has only advisory authority in those areas. The central area is defined by the concurrent action of NCP and the D.C. Council, and currently consists of the Downtown and Shaw Urban Renewal Areas.

This authority is unnecessary, as shown by the virtual absence of its use to disapprove sales or development. This latent authority of the federal government should not be able to slow or block the development of District-owned land, or add to the cost of development. The District is not a federal agency, and should not be treated any differently by federal law than other local jurisdictions, where local development proceeds without federal interference.

NCP consists of 12 members, three appointed by the President, two appointed by the Mayor, the Mayor, the Chair of the D.C. Council, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, and the Chairs of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee and the House Oversight and Reform Committee.

This bill is one more important step to increase home rule for the District, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING OHEF SHOLOM
TEMPLE'S 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Ohef Sholom Temple's 175th anniversary. Ohef Sholom Temple is a strong light in the Norfolk community. The fact that Ohef Sholom has provided a spiritual home across many generations throughout its 175-year history clearly shows the Temple's importance to the community. Ohef Sholom Temple stays true to its mission and works for the betterment and welfare of Norfolk.

Since Ohef Sholom was established in 1844 and is the largest and oldest Reform Jewish congregation in Hampton Roads, it has been a welcoming and open community to all people. The words written above the sanctuary doors ring true: "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples."

I am proud to honor and recognize Ohef Sholom for this important milestone. I know Norfolk and Hampton Roads are better because of Ohef Sholom Temple's leadership, congregation, and good work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I regret that due to the funeral services for Seaman First Class Earl Paul Baum. I was forced to travel back to my district and miss the vote on amendments and final passage of H.R. 1.

Had I been present, I would have voted nay on Roll Call No. 115; nay on Roll Call No. 116; yea on Roll Call No. 117; and nay on Roll Call No. 118.

CONCERNS REGARDING H. RES. 183

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern regarding H. Res. 183, Condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States. This resolution fails to condemn a specific act perpetrated by one of my colleagues, therefore rendering this resolution pointless. By broadly condemning every act of hatred, we condemn nothing. My colleagues consumed hours on the floor of the House of Representatives to debate a commonsense sentiment instead of passing meaningful policy to better the lives of Americans and condemning the specific statement of antisemitism made by a Member of the House of Representatives.

HONORING MIKE POULSON

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike Poulson's career and service to Washington's Fifth Congressional District as Senior Policy Advisor focusing on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Mike's experience with farming extends back to his family settling in the Columbia Basin of Washington State after his father went through the very detailed process of eligibility to purchase land in the Connell area. After graduating from Connell High School, Mike enlisted in the Army National Guard because, in his words, "he just assumed that everybody pulled a stint in the military." In 1965, Mike bought some farmland of his own in a unit close to his family unit and started to build his own home. In the mid 1980s, Mike was elected Vice President of the Washington State Farm Bureau, a position he took on even while farming full time.

Mike ventured outside of farming in the 1990s when he began consulting on public policy and environmental issues. Mike had a way of being able to communicate complex, and often controversial, environmental issues to the public. I had the fortune of meeting him during my time in the Washington State House and came to have a deep respect for his understanding of these issues which affected many in my district. A few short months after I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, Mike leased out his farmland and joined my staff—becoming the longest serving member on my team until his retirement on February 28, 2019.

Mike has many significant accomplishments in his career including: developing solutions for Columbia Basin water shortages; speaking out against the harmful impacts of the Waters of the United States regulation; combatting the recent falling numbers of our wheat and coordinating an effort to find long-term solutions with the Washington Grain Commission and Washington State University; and bringing the A to Z project to fruition on the Colville National Forest—which is a national model for restoring the health of our forests. In the words of Derek Sandison, Director for the Washington State Department of Agriculture "Mike has the ability to sort through rhetoric around complex issues to get to the core facts and quickly get to the right side of the issues."

I am grateful for his friendship, advice, and most importantly, service to Eastern Washington over the past 15 years. I wish Mike well in his retirement.

HONORING THE CITY OF NORFOLK
LIFEGUARDS FOR THEIR EXCEL-
LENT EMERGENCY RESPONSE

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Lifeguard Lieutenants Courtney Hutchens and Madeline Solano and Lifeguards Beatty Barnes and Robert Warren

for their excellent emergency response during an emergency on September 1, 2018, in Ocean View, Norfolk, Virginia.

Each lifeguard recognized the situation and responded promptly with the proper treatment the injured swimmer needed. They met the proper protocol and fulfilled the action plans required for an emergency.

Because of their exceptional and rapid response, these lifeguards received the 2018 Dr. Frank Pia Lifesaving Award from the Virginia Lifeguard Association Annual Aquatic Management Symposium. This is a great honor.

I am sincerely thankful that Virginia has lifeguards like them to watch over and guard our Commonwealth. I am confident our beaches are a safer place because of their presence.

REMEMBERING JOHN KILZER

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember my friend John Kilzer, a man who embodied the very essence of Memphis as a Memphis State basketball player, talented musician and songwriter and Methodist minister specializing in recovery from addiction. John died Tuesday night at 62. Born in Jackson, Tennessee, he spent most of his life in Memphis. An All-American high school basketball player, he came to the then-Memphis State Tigers roster as a good outside shooter and a scrapper. A chance encounter with legendary Stax guitar player Mabon "Teenie" Hodges in a Memphis State dorm room led to his serious study of guitar playing and a song-writing career. He went on to become an English Literature professor at his alma mater and also received a master's degree in divinity from the Memphis Theological Seminary in 2006 and a Ph.D. from Middlesex University in Britain in 2010. John's evident lyrical skill with poetic storytelling resulted in two early albums produced by David Geffen—the roots-rock 1988 "Memory in the Making" and the 1991 "Busman's Holiday"—and appearances on MTV. His "Seven" was produced by Grammy Award winner Matt Ross-Spang. More recently, his 2014 "Hide Away" marked the return of an artist at the height of his powers, an album graced with such all-star talent as Kirk Whalum on saxophone; Hold Steady's Sid Selvidge, Alvin Youngblood Hart and Stax's Bobby Manuel on guitar; North Mississippi All Stars Luther Dickinson on mandolin, Rick Steff on keyboards and Greg Murrow on drums. When I learned of his death this morning, I played John's "Until We're All Free," which Whalum co-wrote and plays on, and I want to hear "Sleeping in the Rain" again tonight. Some of John's songs were recorded by such artists as Roseanne Cash ("Green, Yellow and Red"), Maria Muldaur, Dobie Gray and Trace Atkins. His most recent album, "Scars," came out in January, and he was scheduled to play the Beale Street Music Festival in May. John will be remembered in Memphis for his weekly Friday night recovery ministry at St. John's United Methodist Church that he called "The Way," begun in 2010. John was beset by the demon of alcohol and knew the inside of jails but did a lot of good for a lot of people with his exceptional talents. As one admirer

said today, his recovery is now complete. He will be missed.

IN HONOR OF THE VIRGINIA BANKERS ASSOCIATION BANK DAY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following proclamation.

Whereas, the Virginia Bankers Association conducts an annual Bank Day Scholarship Program throughout the Commonwealth, held on the third Tuesday in March, to provide the opportunity for young Virginians to better understand the vital role of banks and the financial services industry in the Commonwealth; and

Whereas, the Virginia Bankers Association organizes Bank Day as a means of involving high school students and banks in the Commonwealth in this endeavor to identify potential future career opportunities available in the banking sector; and

Whereas, since every citizen benefits from a basic understanding of the economic system and the wide variety of banking industry career opportunities available to students upon graduating, it is appropriate that the industry works closely with the Virginia education community to promote personal finance and economic education; and

Whereas, Bank Day allows seniors from Virginia high schools to shadow bankers in their communities for a day to learn about banking operations, financial services and products, potential career opportunities in banking, and the vital role banks play in their community and with their customers; and

Whereas, the Virginia Bankers Association and Virginia banks have reached more than 2,000 high school students through this program since 2012; and

Whereas, participating students write essays on the topic, "What did you learn on Bank Day that will help you manage your financial future and what did you learn about how banks support their communities," to help students consider their own personal financial decision-making; and

Whereas, thirteen scholarships totaling \$26,000 are awarded annually based on the merits of the essays to assist winners pursue their higher education endeavors; and

Whereas, the Virginia Bankers Association, through their Education Foundation, has awarded a total of \$137,000 in scholarships to 66 Virginia high school students since 2012, helping to defray the cost of higher education tuition for future leaders continuing their education and career preparation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the House of Representatives—

1) Commends the Virginia Bankers Association for their valuable contribution to the economic education of the youth of the Commonwealth;

2) Honors the Virginia banks that participate in the annual Bank Day Scholarship Program; and

3) Encourages banks to continue to support the Bank Day Scholarship Program and other

financial literacy and career awareness opportunities in their communities.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN LOUISE SLAUGHTER

HON. NORMA J. TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Congresswoman Slaughter's legacy and the impact she made throughout her decades of dedicated public service.

She was a friend and an invaluable mentor, especially during my first term in Congress.

She paved the way for every woman in the House by becoming the first Chairwoman of the Rules Committee—the same committee I now serve on.

She spearheaded the passage of the Affordable Care Act, one of the most consequential pieces of legislation in recent history.

Congresswoman Slaughter was also a fierce and fearless champion for women.

She co-authored the Violence Against Women Act and founded and co-chaired the Pro-Choice Caucus—which to this day, continues to be on the frontlines of protecting women's reproductive rights.

As we near the anniversary of her passing, I can't help but to be reminded of her unparalleled leadership. She's left a void in the House that is hard to fill.

But her memory lives on inside these halls, and it inspires each of us to keep up the fight to better the lives of all Americans.

I am grateful for the opportunity to have served alongside her.

RECOGNIZING THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL TASTE OF INDIA 2019

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Thirteenth Annual Taste of India 2019. This is a very special event which occurs annually in Norfolk, Virginia.

The Hampton Roads region is lucky to have such an active Asian Indian community. The Hampton Roads Asian Indian community consists of wonderful people who make our region a better place.

The annual Taste of India event has been an amazing success and has hosted local, state, and federal officials. Taste of India provides all Hampton Roads residents with a valuable cultural, political, and educational experience. Taste of India is crucial for Hampton Roads' awareness, education, and enjoyment. This event will continue to thrive for many generations to come.

CONGRESSIONAL TEACHERS AWARDS IN FLORIDA'S 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of outstanding public school teachers in Florida's 16th Congressional District.

I was once told that children are 25 percent of the population, but they are 100 percent of the future.

And it's true. The education of a child is an investment, not only in that student, but in the future of our country.

Therefore, I established the Congressional Teacher Awards to honor educators for their ability to teach and inspire students.

An independent panel has chosen the following teachers from Manatee and Sarasota counties for Florida's 16th District 2019 Congressional Teacher Award for their accomplishments as educators:

Marissa Dobbert for her accomplishments as a 7th Grade Math Teacher at Sarasota Military Academy Prep;

Elizabeth Harris for her accomplishments as a 3rd, 4th, and 5th Grade Interventionist at Myakka City Elementary School;

Chris King for his accomplishments as a 6th–9th Grade Special Education Teacher at Haile Middle School;

Kate Kramer for her accomplishments as an English as a Second Language Teacher at Fruitville Elementary School;

Kari McMillan for her accomplishments as a Math Teacher at Palmetto High School;

Ashlee Middleton for her accomplishments as an 11th and 12th Grade English and Reading Teacher at Sarasota High School;

Nancy Miller for her accomplishments as a 3rd Grade Teacher at Ballard Elementary School;

Kymerli Rivers for her accomplishments as a Literature and English Teacher at Manatee High School;

Maria Underhill for her accomplishments as an 8th Grade Reading Teacher at Braden River Middle School.

On behalf of the people of Florida's 16th District, I congratulate each of these outstanding teachers and offer my sincere appreciation for their service and dedication.

CELEBRATING THE GROUP 3 STATE CHAMPION MOORESTOWN HIGH SCHOOL QUAKERS BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Moorestown High School Quakers boys' basketball team, who on Sunday won the Group 3 State Championship for the first time in 60 years.

Led by 2018 Burlington County Coach of the Year, Shawn Anstey, and a strong roster from starters to reserves, the Quakers showed incredible teamwork and perseverance all season. From clutch shooting, to diving for loose

balls and making hustle plays, the team's balance and focus helped them play through a tough schedule to bring home the school's first state championship since 1959.

In the State Final, Moorestown's strong fundamentals and a focus on doing the little things right helped propel them to victory: they shot well from the free-throw line late in the game to secure the title. The Quakers played through pressure in the final to finish the season on a 14-game winning streak, ending the year at 27-5.

I'm proud to be able to celebrate the success of some of the talented student-athletes from my district in New Jersey. I want to congratulate Coach Anstey and the Moorestown boys on their tremendous season and wish them luck in the Tournament of Champions.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COREY JONES ACT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Corey Jones Act, which is named after a young man who was taken from us far too soon under circumstances far too tragic and preventable to be allowed to happen again.

During the early hours of October 18, 2015, Corey Jones of Lake Worth, Florida, was shot and killed by Nouman Raja, a plainclothes police officer operating an unmarked vehicle. Corey was legally and peacefully pulled to the side of the road awaiting roadside assistance when he was approached by Mr. Raja. Corey had no reason to believe that the person in plainclothes and driving an unmarked vehicle was a law enforcement officer. This uncertainty and confusion ultimately led to a tragedy that could have been easily avoided.

After Corey's tragic death, I met with members of his family as well as officials from Palm Beach County. We discussed the urgency of addressing the issue of plainclothes officers in unmarked vehicles engaging in routine traffic stops. I promised that I would work to promote safer policing practices in our communities and the Corey Jones Act helps to accomplish this goal.

Madam Speaker, Nouman Raja, the officer involved in the tragic shooting death of Corey Jones, was recently found guilty of manslaughter and attempted murder. In an effort to ensure that this tragedy does not happen to other families, I respectfully ask my colleagues to lend their support to this important bill.

HONORING THE UNVEILING CEREMONY FOR THE PORTRAITS FROM A PLACE OF GRACE PUBLIC ART INSTALLATION

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the new public art instal-

lation, Portraits from a Place of Grace. This beautiful and thought-provoking artwork will be installed at the future home of the African American Cultural Center of Virginia Beach.

The African American Cultural Center (AACC) worked hard over the last year to make this happen. Staff partnered with Richard Hollant, a renowned artist, on a series of portraits and interviews with Virginia Beach's 14 historically African American neighborhoods.

The installation features people and stories that capture the community's history. I commend the community for taking the next step in building the African American Cultural Center of Virginia Beach.

Recognizing the important contributions of African Americans to the history, development, and success of our region is vital to appreciating the journey in building our community. The vivid visual representation and poignant audio interviews will promote, preserve, and celebrate the inspiring pioneers of our community.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINAS IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, one in six women in the United States is a Latina. There are currently nearly twenty-eight million Hispanic women living in the United States. Latinas have been part of our nation's fabric from the start. They contribute to our nation through their work in business, education, science and technology, engineering, mathematics, literature and the arts, the military, and public service at every level of the government. Many have overcome a unique set of challenges and have paved their own paths to success. During National Women's History Month, I want to honor the millions of Latinas who have contributed to our nation.

Therefore, I am reintroducing a resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States. This resolution will recognize their contributions to American society and further celebrates those who have inspired the next generation.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF IRWIN MARINE

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Irwin Marine, an institution on Lake Winnepesaukee, who is celebrating its 100th year in business. Since its founding in 1919 by Jim Irwin, Sr., Irwin Marine has always remained a pillar of the Lakes Region community.

Irwin Marine has had a storied century-long history. Pioneers in the recreation industry, the Irwin family has never stopped innovating. After founding Irwin Marine in 1919, Jim Irwin, Sr. later went on to buy the Weirs Music Hall in 1924, where he used the connections he developed from his time serving with a Navy band in World War I to draw top acts to Lake Winnepesaukee, such as Duke Ellington and the Dorsey Brothers. Since its distinguished early days, Irwin Marine has continued to maintain a stellar reputation as a trusted name in the boating industry. Today, Irwin Marine has three locations in the Lakes Region and was recently named the twelfth-best boat dealer in North America by Boating Industry Magazine; thanks to their extensive supply and deep commitment to customer service.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I want to congratulate everyone at Irwin Marine on an exciting anniversary. I hope that they celebrate this exciting achievement by taking a cruise around Lake Winnepesaukee and wish them the best of luck in their next 100 years of business. I thank them for all that they do to make the Granite State such a wonderful place to work, live, and play.

HONORING DR. AMELIA ROSS-HAMMOND FOR HER CAREER AND SERVICE TO HAMPTON ROADS COMMUNITY

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Dr. Amelia Ross-Hammond for her tremendous career and service in the Hampton Roads area.

Dr. Ross-Hammond recently retired from Norfolk State University where she taught music and was the director of service-learning and civic engagement. Not only has Dr. Ross-Hammond been dedicated to her work as a professor, but she has been a renowned public servant. She has served on various councils and boards such as the Virginia Beach Community Development Corporation Board, the City's Diversity and Inclusion Forums, and the Mayor's African American Roundtable—just to name a few.

Dr. Ross-Hammond received awards for her service to the Hampton Roads community such as the Urban League of South Hampton Roads Young Professionals Award for Community Service. She was also the 2016 Honoree for the Norfolk State University Music Department's Spring Gala.

Dr. Ross-Hammond's dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to honor and recognize Dr. Ross-Hammond's leadership and the role she plays in making our community a better place. Hampton Roads has significantly benefited from her presence.

KEVIN CHARLES MURRAY, 2019 INDIANAPOLIS IRISH CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2019 Indianapolis Irish Citizen of the Year, Kevin Charles Murray.

Kevin has long been active in the Indianapolis Irish community. In 1981, he co-founded the Indianapolis St. Patrick's Day Parade and the Celtic Cross Committee in 1990. His involvement in events and advocacy for the Indianapolis Irish community are too long to list, which is why this accolade is so long overdue.

In addition to his work in the Irish community, Kevin has worked diligently as an attorney in our city for 40 years. He has used his passion, community connections and education to work at all levels of Indiana government and politics. He served under former Governor Joe Kernan, Lt. Governor Kathy Davis, as the Senate Parliamentarian, and most recently, under the three Marion County Sheriffs, Sheriff Frank Anderson, Sheriff John Layton and Sheriff Kerry J. Forestal.

Kevin's contributions will be felt in Marion County for generations to come. I am thankful to consider Kevin a friend, congratulate him on this achievement, and look forward to his continued work in our city and state.

HONORING BOY SCOUT ADAM PIETRAS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the true story of Adam Pietras, a Boy Scout from my home town of Hamilton, N.J. in the Fourth Congressional District.

Adam's remarkable courage—without any concern for his own personal safety—and his

immediate and decisive response action literally helped save the life of his sister.

This Saturday, March 16, 2019, Adam will be honored at a Court of Honor by his fellow scouts of Boy Scout Troop 87, members from the Veterans of Foreign War who host Troop 87, friends, and family. We will be proud and humble to present him with a U.S. flag, flown over the U.S. Capitol in his honor.

Madam Speaker, Adam was only 10, when he acted without regard to his own safety as he fought off a loose Bullmastiff dog that was charging to attack his younger sister, Rachel, then age 7, in the family's backyard in 2015. Though Adam sustained severe injuries from the powerful dog, his actions enabled his sister to escape and his brother, Tyler, to run for help. Truly, Adam and Tyler's teamwork to protect their little sister prevented what could have been a tragedy. Adam was rushed to Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital—Hamilton. He lost a lot of blood and needed 200 stitches and months to recover.

Adam's exceptional actions went largely unreported in the news and were not well known outside his immediate family and community. That changed when he was a guest of the Sunshine Foundation Mercer County Chapter's 2018 Operation Dreamlift that takes children to Disney World. Trentonian reporter L.A. Parker happened to be on that flight, met Adam and heard Adam's story. In a column detailing the dog attack and Adam's actions, L.A. Parker—my fellow Trenton State College alumnus, quoted Adam as saying “Yes, I was afraid really afraid. But I had to save my sister.”

Adam is a student at Reynolds Middle School in Hamilton, N.J. I've had the pleasure to meet Adam's father, Peter Pietras, who with his wife, Lisa Pitoniak-Pietras, and family and friends, are immensely proud of Adam. Adam, whose outstanding love for his sister shows he puts other people first, has a bright future.

Adam was honored by Hamilton Mayor Kelly Yaede with a proclamation as an example of a model citizen, and by the Boy Scouts of America with its highest national award for life-saving and meritorious action, the Honor Medal With Crossed Palms. Given only for outstanding and unusual acts that demonstrate unusual heroism, skill, or bravery and reflect Scouting ideals, the medal is only presented to Scouts who have “demonstrated un-

usual heroism and extraordinary skill or resourcefulness in saving or attempting to save life at extreme risk to self.” That sounds like Adam to me.

Today it is my honor to make Adam's heroism and extraordinary act a permanent part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In an age of fictional movie action heroes and comic book superheroes, this Saturday a real-life action hero will be the star. If Adam were in the military our nation would be looking to bestow one of its highest medals for his valor. Well done, Adam, well done.

HONORING DR. MICHAEL G. DANIELS FOR HIS CAREER AND SERVICE TO THE HAMPTON ROADS COMMUNITY

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Dr. Michael G. Daniels for his tremendous career and service in the Hampton Roads area.

Dr. Daniels is a true academic with bachelor's and master's degrees in Business Management and Administration, and a doctoral degree in Ministry. Not only is Dr. Daniels an academic, but he is a true public servant. Dr. Daniels is dedicated to serving and leading Enoch Baptist Church, a congregation of approximately 1,200.

Dr. Daniels has received various honors for his commitment to service in Hampton Roads. He received honors from the Virginia Beach Chapter of the NAACP for his community service and the Virginia Beach Civil Rights Commission for advocating for the rights of residents.

Dr. Daniels' dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to honor and recognize Dr. Daniels' leadership and the role he plays in making our community a better place.

Hampton Roads has significantly benefited from his presence.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.J. Res. 46, National Emergency Declaration.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1855–S1912

Measures Introduced: Sixty-one bills and eleven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 792–852, and S. Res. 109–119. **Pages S1898–S1900**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 94, to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States. (S. Rept. No. 116–8)

Report to accompany S. 310, to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act. (S. Rept. No. 116–9) **Page S1897**

Measures Passed:

National Emergency Declaration: By 59 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 49), Senate passed H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019. **Pages S1857–82**

National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 113, designating March 25, 2019, as “National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day”. **Page S1911**

National Rosie the Riveter Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 114, expressing support for the designation of March 21, 2019, as “National Rosie the Riveter Day”. **Page S1911**

Measures Considered:

Green New Deal—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 8, recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal. **Page S1882**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution, 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 Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S1882**

Prior to the consideration of this measure, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1882**

Supplemental Appropriations Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. **Pages S1882–91**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution, 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 S.J. Res. 8, Green New Deal. **Page S1882**

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Friday, March 15, 2019, at 11 a.m.; Tuesday, March 19, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.; Thursday, March 21, 2019, at 2:10 p.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, March 21, 2019, it next convene at 3 p.m., on Monday, March 25, 2019. **Page S1911**

Bade Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S1882**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, March 14, 2019, a vote on

cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 25, 2019. **Page S1911**

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 S1882**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, March 25, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the motions to invoke cloture filed on Thursday, March 14, 2019, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 25, 2019. **Page S1911**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Rodney Hood, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2023.

Janice Miriam Hellreich, of Hawaii, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024.

Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2022.

Bruce M. Ramer, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2024.

William I. Althen, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024.

Marco M. Rajkovich, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2024.

Arthur R. Traynor III, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring August 30, 2022.

Donald W. Washington, of Texas, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service.

Todd M. Harper, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring April 10, 2021.

A routine list in the Coast Guard. **Page S1891**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Michael O. Johanns, of Nebraska, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation for a term of two years.

Troy D. Edgar, of California, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security.

Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2025.

Page S1912

Messages from the House: **Page S1896**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S1896**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1896–97**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1897**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1900–01**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1901–10**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1894–96**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1910**

Notices of Intent: **Page S1910**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S1910–11**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—49) **Page S1882**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:01 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Friday, March 15, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1911.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EBOLA OUTBREAK IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other emerging health threats, after receiving testimony from Robert Kadlec, Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, Robert R. Redfield, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Anthony S. Fauci, Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, all of the Department of Health and Human Services; and Rear Admiral R. T. Ziemer, USN (Ret.), Acting Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, United States Agency for International Development.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Defense

budget posture in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Patrick M. Shanahan, Acting Secretary, General Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., USMC, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and David L. Norquist, Under Secretary (Comptroller), all of the Department of Defense.

FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Financial Stability Oversight Council nonbank designations, including S. 603, to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to consider alternative approaches before determining that a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, after receiving testimony from Douglas Holtz-Eakin, American Action Forum, Arlington, Virginia; Paul Schott Stevens, Investment Company Institute, Washington, D.C.; and Jeremy C. Kress, University of Michigan Ross School of Business, Ann Arbor.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine opportunities to improve access, infrastructure, and permitting for outdoor recreation, after receiving testimony from Whit

Fosburgh, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Washington, D.C.; Daniel Kirkwood, Juneau Economic Development Council, Juneau, Alaska; Jeffrey Todd Lusk, Hatfield McCoy Regional Recreation Authority, Man, West Virginia; Sandra F. Mitchell, Idaho Recreation Council, Boise; and Thomas C. O'Keefe, American Whitewater, Seattle, Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Alex M. Azar II, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Treasury, after receiving testimony from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary of the Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to consider pending intelligence matters.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 55 public bills, H.R. 1753–1807; 1 private bill, H.R. 1808; and 15 resolutions, H.J. Res. 51; H. Con. Res. 25; and H. Res. 229–241 were introduced.

Pages H2742–46

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H2747–48

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Carbajal to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H2721

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

Pages H2721, H2732

Expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress: The

House agreed to H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, by a yea-and-nay vote of 420 yeas with none voting "nay" and four answering "present", Roll No. 125.

Pages H2723–32

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendments to the concurrent resolution and the preamble printed in H. Rept. 116–17 shall be considered as adopted.

Page H2723

H. Res. 208, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) was agreed to yesterday, March 13th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, March 18th.

Page H2732

Communication from the Clerk—Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina: Read a letter

from the Clerk wherein she transmitted to the House a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Josh Lawson, General Counsel, North Carolina State Board of Elections, indicating that a special election has been ordered for the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina. **Page H2736**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H2731–32. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Committee Meetings

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST FOR SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing entitled “Department of the Air Force Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces”. Testimony was heard from William Roper, Assistant Secretary of Air Force for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of the Air Force; and Lieutenant General Timothy G. Fay, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategy, Integration, and Requirements (A5), Department of the Air Force.

MEMBERS DAY HEARING: COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Members Day Hearing: Committee on Education and Labor”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Waters, and Representatives Thompson of Pennsylvania, Soto, and Mitchell.

ENHANCING VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY TO PREVENT DRUNK DRIVING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce held a hearing entitled “Enhancing Vehicle Technology to Prevent Drunk Driving”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PUTTING INVESTORS FIRST? EXAMINING THE SEC’S BEST INTEREST RULE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets held a hearing entitled “Putting Investors First? Examining the SEC’s Best Interest Rule”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 920, the “Venezuela Arms Restriction Act”; H.R. 854, the “Humanitarian Assistance to the Venezuelan People Act of 2019”; H.R. 1477, to assess and mitigate threats posed by Russian-Venezuelan security cooperation and for other purposes; and H.R. 1616, the “European Energy Security and Diversification Act of 2019”. H.R. 920, H.R. 854, H.R. 1477, and H.R. 1616 were ordered reported, as amended.

UNMASKING THE HIDDEN CRISIS OF MURDERED AND MISSING INDIGENOUS WOMEN (MMIW): EXPLORING SOLUTIONS TO END THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing entitled “Unmasking the Hidden Crisis of Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women (MMIW): Exploring Solutions to End the Cycle of Violence”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEARING WITH COMMERCE SECRETARY WILBUR L. ROSS, JR.

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Hearing with Commerce Secretary Wilbur L. Ross, Jr.”. Testimony was heard from Wilbur L. Ross, Secretary, Department of Commerce.

THE PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET PROPOSAL WITH U.S. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY STEVEN MNUCHIN

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The President’s Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal with U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Steven Mnuchin”. Testimony was heard from Steven Mnuchin, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Friday, March 15

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, March 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12 noon.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Blunt Rochester, Lisa, Del., E308
 Buchanan, Vern, Fla., E312
 Carson, André, Ind., E314
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E308, E311
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E313
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E309
 DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E310
 Dunn, Neal P., Fla., E311

Gianforte, Greg, Mont., E307
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E313
 Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E309
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E311
 Kim, Andy, N.J., E312
 Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E308
 Luria, Elaine G., Va., E309, E310, E311, E311, E312,
 E313, E313, E314
 McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E309, E311
 Meng, Grace, N.Y., E307

Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia,
 E310
 Pappas, Chris, N.H., E313
 Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E307
 Rouzer, David, N.C., E308
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E314
 Torres, Norma J., Calif., E312
 Trahan, Lori, Mass., E307
 Wexton, Jennifer, Va., E312



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.