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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 designated 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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. Mr. Speaker of the House, during the budget negotiations, the administration requested a 30 percent cut to the Army Corps of Engineers’ budget. That is a cut of over $26 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.

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.)
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 fires, you can still put food on your tables.
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
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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 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 community, 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
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personal expressions toward the President.

EXPRESSION OF 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 reads 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 Chair recognizes the concurrent resolution, as amended, 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 solicited and accepted favorable political influence from the Trump campaign”; and

Whereas in the only other instance where a special counsel under the regulations, appointed a Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the investigation under the authority of a person who exercised a degree of independence from the normal chain of command that his Special Counsel was 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; and

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 support recognizing his reputation for competence, fairness, and nonpartisanship; and

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; and

Whereas the Special Counsel Regulations provide that “at 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” and that “the public interest requires [him] to place this investigation concerning investigations of high-level public officials in both parties should be made available to the public and to Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

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 solicited and accepted favorable political influence from the Trump campaign.” 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 said that the investigation is a "witch hunt" and called it a "hoax," "rigged," and a "scam."

This resolution is also needed be-
cause high-ranking DOJ officials have
indicated that they may not release in-
formation 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 alle-
gations against American citizens."

This normally salutary policy must
not apply in the event the Department
adheres to its policy that it cannot in-
dict a sitting President. To maintain
that a sitting President cannot be in-
dicted no matter how much evidence
there is because he is a sitting presi-
dent, and then to withhold evidence of
wrongdoing from Congress because the
President cannot be charged, is to con-
vert 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 obliga-
tion to provide Congress with the un-
derlying 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 allega-
tions of bias concerning the Russian
investigation.

With respect to the investigation in-
volving Secretary Clinton's emails, this
included the Department of Jus-
tice releasing to Congress more than
890,000 documents revealing the
FBI's decisionmaking, identifying to
Congress the names of career offi-
cials involved in the charging deci-
sion, 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 doc-
uments based on the Office of Profes-
sional Responsibility in making its
decision.

With respect to claims of bias in the
Russian investigation, this included
not only releasing to the public an oth-
erwise classified foreign intelligence
application, but also releasing to Con-
gress: one, all underlying documents
and communications involving the
FISA applications; two, four memos de-
tailing the former FBI Director's com-
munications with the President; three,
matter classified to clarify conflicting
statements involving the Trump and Clinton
Presidential campaigns; and four, mak-
ing even more DOJ and FBI officials
available for a total of 21 transcribed
interviews and hearings.

These precedents make clear the ob-
ligation 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 ac-
countable to the American people.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speak-
er, 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 Attor-
ney General Janet Reno, Deputy Attor-
ney General Neal Katyal, and Katyal,
drafted the special counsel regu-
lations in effect today. They estab-
lished a regulatory framework that
gives the Attorney General flexibility.

Attorney General Barr has a few op-
tions 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 regula-
tions do not require a full report to
Congress. However, during his con-
firmation, Attorney General Barr said
he wants to be "transparent" with Con-
gress and the public "consistent with
the rules and the law." I have no rea-
son to think Attorney General Barr
would back away from those state-
ments he made before the Senate Judi-
iciary 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 ex-
pect another Starr report. The Clinton
Justice Department made sure another
President would not have salacious sto-
ries 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, Chair-
man 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
favor of a Republican in the White
House.

Again, this resolution simply, basi-
cally, restates the regulations that are
currently in place that were written
under the Clinton Department of Jus-
tice. 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 Attor-
ney General.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3
minutes to the gentlewoman from Cali-
fornia (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.
Res. 24, which is the House Resolu-
tion of Congress that the report of Special
Counsel Robert Mueller should be
available to the public and to Congress.

Special Counsel Mueller has been ap-
pointed to ensure a full and thorough
investigation of the Russian Govern-
ment's efforts to interfere in the 2016
Presidential election and to examine
any links and/or coordination between
the Russian Government and individ-
uals associated with the campaign of
President Donald Trump.

He has also been appointed with
the authority to investigate and prose-
cute Federal crimes committed in the
course of and with the intent to inter-
fer with the investigation, including
perjury, obstruction of justice, destruc-
tion of evidence, and intimidation of
witnesses.

The gravity and magnitude of this in-
vestigation, given that it goes straight
to the heart of our democracy and in-
volved 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 determina-
tions made by an objective, impartial
investigator who has a reputation for
integrity.

By adoption, the report will provide
valuable insight and information for
the important investigations being un-
dertaken 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 an affront to the taxpayers who paid for this investigation, it is in the 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—more than 200 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 work.

To be sure, something far more serious than precedent is at stake. Disclosure is uniquely imperitive 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 a report or underlying evidence would only heighten concerns over a cover-up or a pernicious or partisan double standard.

The special counsel’s regulations were written, among other things, 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.

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 job, 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 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 Congress and 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, put into words: 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. capital. 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 Muhammad Ali. The punches, let them swing, let them hit you, because you 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. 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 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. 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
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 New York has 26 1/2 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 witnessed 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 the American people did and should have in the Department of Justice.

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 get 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 bandied around that we cannot indict a President. This is not about indicting a President. But assuming, arguing, that this regulation is correct, that someone thinks that that is constant law and the President cannot be subject 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 investigate, is 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 congressional committees and special counsel's investigations.

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 years in federal prison, and today a 16-count indictment was returned in Manhattan detailing a 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.

If anyone has any number of reasons,

First of all, broad swathes 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 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 protests by the President, this is not a witch hunt—it has yielded the...
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, encourage political participation, 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 people have a right to have their elections transparent 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 the Republican leadership 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?

Mr. COLLINS. 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 of my colleagues would say, ‘Well, now we get to 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 say ‘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 actually have been there. 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 into the system because President Trump won and the Democratic candidate didn’t know where Wisconsin was. You all remedied that time, though. The Democratic candidate for President will actually have both. I have 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 into the system because President Trump won and the Democratic candidate didn’t know where Wisconsin was. You all remedied that time, though. The Democratic candidate for President will actually have both. I have 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 into the system because President Trump won and the Democratic candidate didn’t know where Wisconsin was. You all remedied that time, though. The Democratic candidate for President will actually have both. I have said so.
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 September 11th Authorization Act; H.R. 1348, the Asian American and Pacific Islander Equality Act; H.R. 1359, the Repeal and Reform the 1994 Crime Bill Act; and H.R. 1377, the Equal Rights Act.

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.

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.

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
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 President Donald Trump” and other matters that may have arisen directly from the investigation. As you know, Department of Justice regulations require that, “[i]f 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 by the President on 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 the Attorney General 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 others who may have been subject to 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, the Department and the FBI have produced substantial amounts of investigative material, including classified and law enforcement sensitive information, to the House and Senate.

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 the 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. JEROULD 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. ELIOOT ENGEL,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

REP. RICHARD NEAL,
Chairman, 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 officers and the Branch Davidians at the Mount 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 summarize "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 findings 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 the 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 also provide for the appointment of independent counsel pursuant to the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994.
EFFECTIVE DATES: July 1, 1999.


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 or prosecutions, a balance that is key to the Department's handling of these matters.

There are occasions when the facts create a conflict so substantial, or the exigencies of the situation so extraordinary, that any initial investigation might tint the subsequent investigation, so that it is appropriate for the Attorney General to immediately appoint a Special Counsel. Some instances where initial investigation, whether factual or legal, may be appropriate to better inform the Attorney General's decision. This provision is designed to make it clear that a variety of approaches, even in cases that might create an apparent conflict of interest, such as recusal of particular officials, 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 so extraordinary, that any initial investigation might tint the subsequent investigation, so that it is appropriate for the Attorney General to immediately appoint a Special Counsel. Some instances where initial investigation, whether factual or legal, may be appropriate to better inform the Attorney General's decision. This provision is designed 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..., integrity and impartial decisionmaking, and with appropriate experience to ensure both that the investigation will be conducted adequately, and that the investigative and prosecutorial decisions will be supported by an informed understanding of the criminal law and Department of Justice policies. The Special Counsel will be selected from outside the United States Government. Special Counsels will agree that they will not be selected if they believe that their appointment will cause the Special Counsel to...
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 the Attorney General with respect to the appropriate component to take any necessary action. A Special Counsel shall not have civil or administrative jurisdiction 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 those 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 recall of personnel, and the office for which the designated employee works shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate the request. The Special Counsel shall assign 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 investigative 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 ethical and security regulations and procedures. Should the Special Counsel conclude that the extraordinary circumstances of any particular decision 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 some matter over the best 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 reveal the Special Counsel with the names and resumes of appropriate personnel available for detail. The Special Counsel may also request the recall of personnel, and the office for which the designated employee works shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate the request. The Special Counsel shall assign 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 600.5. 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 recall of personnel, and the office for which the designated employee works shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate the request. The Special Counsel shall assign 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 investigative 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 ethical and security regulations and procedures. Should the Special Counsel conclude that the extraordinary circumstances of any particular decision 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
Question of the day: Is there a point of order to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Ms. 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 concurrence was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put down now.

The Journal.

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, Audrey, 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 JEANETTE RANKIN DURING WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH

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

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, Audrey, 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 JEANETTE RANKIN DURING WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH

(Ms. 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, to 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 corporate PACs, 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. 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. 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.

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.
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.

Any trillion dollar 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 force our children to pay for it.

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 significant 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 MCLURE

(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
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 her commitment to the city’s safety and security that led her to fight for the establishment of a dedicated police force to protect the local business community.

Mayor Shaver’s leadership in her community is not limited to public safety. She is also a strong advocate for the protection of the city’s natural resources, especially the St. Johns River and the Matanzas Inlet. She worked tirelessly to ensure that the city’s waterways remained clean and accessible to all.

Mayor Shaver’s dedication to the city of St. Augustine is evident in her work to improve the city’s infrastructure. She spearheaded the effort to build a new water treatment plant, which has significantly improved the city’s water supply. She also worked to secure funding for the renovation of historic downtown St. Augustine, which has helped to revitalize the city’s economy.

In addition to her work on infrastructure, Mayor Shaver is a strong advocate for the environment. She worked to protect the city’s natural resources, including the St. Johns River, the Matanzas Inlet, and the city’s historic sites.

Mayor Shaver’s leadership is not limited to the city of St. Augustine. She is also a strong advocate for the state of Florida and the nation as a whole. She has been a vocal supporter of policies that promote economic development, education, and job creation.

Mayor Shaver’s dedication to the city of St. Augustine is an example of the kind of leadership that we need in our communities. She has demonstrated her commitment to the city’s residents and has worked tirelessly to ensure that they have a quality of life that they can be proud of.

I am proud to recognize Mayor Nancy Shaver as a leader in the city of St. Augustine and as a leader in our state and nation. Her dedication to the city of St. Augustine is an example of the kind of leadership that we need to make our communities better places to live.

Thank you, Mayor Shaver, for your service to the city of St. Augustine and to our state and nation. We are all grateful for your dedication and your commitment to the betterment of our communities.
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 worker’s 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 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, 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 former 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 short-sightedness 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 at how 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, D.C.

hon. nancy pelosi
Speaker, House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

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
Clerk of the House of Representatives
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
- 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 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 7 million Americans could be subject to discrimination in public accommodations.

There is injustice when 5% million Americans could be denied equal opportunities to secure housing or credit.

There 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 have no more protection 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 result, 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 because for 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. Peter Strzok had no idea, but 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.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of March 13, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMHERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOMHERT. 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 tough to live 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 rigs 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 Department, still with the 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 passed over 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 had lied 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 they gave advice 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 able to aware of any court cases ever indi-
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 pach—"publicly announced at a 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 understand the term. 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 material—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 this act 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 had 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. Comey accepted 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 you 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."

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 asked at least a dozen times, 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 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, about 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 48." 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 was elected, then they could try to take him off 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.

"Upon the opening of the crossfire 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 including 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 these 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’s 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 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 Brit- ish 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 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 anybody 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 Americans 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 Adminis-tration, I had a lot of colleagues on the other side 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 were concerned about privacy violations and Fourth and Fifth Amendment violations, but I am not aware of anybody on our Judiciary Committee that were concerned about this motion to blow the door 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 citizens if it will 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 just foreign. It was ordered de-classified 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 is hundreds of pages of information unmasked. I mean, basically, they were running our intelligence agency as a political operation to go after any-one that they felt like might be a po-tential problem for a Democratic adminis-tration.

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 sub-mit 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 appropri-ate thing to do, and put proper safe-guards on those ballots. I think it would be a good thing to do.

I also like RON KIND’s bill—he has been filing bills. He has been here—that would require each person seeking Federal elected office to dis-close the identity of anyone who do-nates anything. You have got a $200 floor. And I like what RON Kind, my colleague in his bill that has been pushing for years, you know, whether you are a Repub-lican or Democrat, we want to elimi-nate this having people donate without knowing who is donating.

It leaves open the possibility—and surely, it has happened—that some-body 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 violat-ing—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 elec-tions.

We have an election day, and there ought to be a cutoff; no ballots accept-ed after this day, at this time. And don’t come bringing in a bunch of bal-lots 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 activ-ity 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 is that, I think, very important, we took up in Judiciary Committee a bill called the Violence Against Women Act; it hadn’t been re-authorized in a while. And there has been a great deal of 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 things that the overtreatment 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 incor-porated medicine.

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 classification from where DSM-III and DSM-IV were.

The definition they give for gender dysphoria is “distress that accom-panies 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, indiffer-ence to the world around them.

We have said, well, dysphoria is the opposite of euphoria, so it is some-one who has difficulty dealing with the gender with which they were born. That is someone unhappy with, confused about, displeased with, or de-pressed 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 bet-ter. 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 treated properly as victims of sexual assault.

And the FEC’s offices were required to have victim’s assistance that could help, advise, counsel, and comfort vic-tims of sexual assault. But this Vio-lence Against Women Act that was passed by the committee with many of the Republicans voting ‘no’—maybe—and I am not sure what 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 important 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, just as serious and even more traumatizing than they 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 trained 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 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 normal.

‘Being sexually assaulted or abused is such an invasion of our bodies, personal space, and safety,’ says Kandee 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 are trauma-bonded. Instead of 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 2013 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 can be 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. But of the women who 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 unremembered memories in survivors of sexual assault and 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 one in three 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 add transgenders to the list, but 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 woman’s restroom or private facilities for women. And we are being strongly criticized. 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? Women who have been sexually abused. 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 went 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, and 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 flat 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 was 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 aggravatived rape.

When you talk to people who work in these 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 co-habitating with biological males.

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 “Sunshine,” 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 lust 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—or 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 get treated for 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 Courrier" in the U.K. The mom of a super-market sexual assault victim warns 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 braging about—apparently according to what he said that has been 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 putting in play 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 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 development to come 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 be forced to compete with males. 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 President Trump that he 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 Europe by warning him 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 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 down that road, 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 strangely, 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 of 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 terrible. 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 Judicary, the majority would not even allow Steve Scalise to testify. Oh, well, if he comes in he didn't want to kill them all, but that wasn't singled out.

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 that they are the victim of some hate when actually it is their hate that created a hoax.

But I have made loud and clear repetitively, 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 tremendous damage to 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. GOHMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes 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:
insurance with respect to a consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. DEMINGS of Florida); H.R. 1757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the deduction for state and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTZLER (for himself, Mrs. WALTERS, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LAHODI); H.R. 1756. 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 in combat theaters of operation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. STEWART (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LAHODI); H.R. 1756. 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 in combat theaters of operation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. SWELL 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. CLARK of New York, and Mr. PERRY); H.R. 1756. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under Medicare 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. KLEINSMITH, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. HARDER of California); H.R. 1756. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BLUMENTAUR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARK of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DeFazio, Ms. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GUTENBERGS of New York, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LUCETKEMYER, Mr. LUCIER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. McCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETTerson, Ms. RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHUMACHER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. Sires, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WILD); H.R. 1756. A bill to increase the number of State that plan 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. 1756. 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. GROTHERM, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CAROLYN B. MALoney, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. King, Ms. DelBene, Mr. KIDDER, Mr. SNADER, Mr. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RICH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SENSENIBRINNER, Mr. BRENDESI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CARPENTER, Mr. CARPENTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LONG, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. DELGADO); H.R. 1756. A bill to provide federal funding for the States to provide teacher and staff training and inquiry assistance against misbranded milk alternatives, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCaul (for himself, Mr. HADFIELD, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. SIA); H.R. 1770. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a special rule for the period of admission of H-2A nonimmigrants employed as dairy workers and sheepherders, and in addition 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 Mr. BRINDisi (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania); H.R. 1770. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a special rule for the period of admission of H-2A nonimmigrants employed as dairy workers and sheepherders, and in addition 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 (for herself and Mr. NORTON); H.R. 1771. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to authorize a person members in North Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee; H.R. 1771. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit 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. 1771. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a special rule for the period of admission of H-2A nonimmigrants employed as dairy workers and sheepherders, and in addition 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 Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. Neal, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Higgin of New York, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Fleischman, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Bernier, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, and Mr. King of New York):

H.R. 1781. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to modify the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission with access to certain drug pricing 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 Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. O'Halleran, Mr. Rice of South Carolina, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Gianforte, and Mr. Welch):

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.

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. Haktanir, Mr. Tauscher, Mrs. Wasserman Schultz, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Swalwell of California, Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Moore, Mr. Peters, Mr. Sarbanes, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Morelle, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Raskin, Mr. G cascino, Mr. Halland, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Hufmann, Mr. Frankel, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Gomez, Mr. Speier, Mr. McGov ern, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Foster, Mr. Omar, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Ms. Weston, Mr. Cooper, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Dean, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Deutch, Ms. DeGette, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Curbelo, Ms. Gabbard, Mrs. Norton, Mr. Delaney, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Pingree, Ms. batching, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Higgin of New York, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Soto, Mr. Boustany, Mr. Boenzi, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Bera, Mr. Gallego, Ms. O'Coriato-Cortes, Mr. Lowey, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Larson of Colorado, Mr. Bordallo of Guam, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Ruiz, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Hiralal, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. DeBonge, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Keating, Ms. Titus, Mr. McKeon, Ms. Hayes, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Bush, Mr. Aguilar, Mrs. Craig, Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Meng, Ms. Underwood, Mr. Luján, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Krishnamoorti, Mr. Connolly, Ms. Matsui, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Engel, Mr. Higgin of New York, Ms. GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Clay, Mrs. Murphy, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Schneider, Ms. Davis of California, Ms. Waters, Mr. DelBene, and Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1784. A bill to allow Americans to earn part-time income without incurring their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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):


By Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. Young, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Hiralal, Mr. Aguilar of California, and Ms. Suozzi of New York):

H.R. 1786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a portion of such cover over to the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. 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 conditions 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, Mr. Norton, Mr. Brownley of California, Mrs. Trahan, Mr. Perlmutt, Mr. Cox of California, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Roufa, Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Underwood, Mr. Rose of New York, and Mr. Baird of Pennsylvania)

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 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. Pease of Washington):

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 stations in which a party may have a cognizable interest; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KIND (for himself and Mr. Schrier):

H.R. 1790. A bill to require any amounts remaining in Members' Representational Allocations 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. Burns, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, and Mr. Wittman):

H.R. 1791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVÍN of California (for himself, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Ms. Hill of California, Mrs. Luria, and Ms. Van Long Pho):

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 fees 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 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 modify the 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 in the United States, or Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 of Minnesota, Mr. Spanberger of Virginia, and Mr. Moe 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 include from gross income discharges of in- come for designated grants to the National Capital Planning Commission with respect to property owned by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RAUCH (for himself, Mr. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CASERO of Texas, Ms. CASTRO of Florida, Mr. CEDILLO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAÑAUX, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GAVEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEW, Mr. OCASIO-CORTÉZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIERRA, Mr. SHIBS, Ms. TAYLOR of California, Mr. VAJNAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TITUS, Mr. NADER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MUCARSEL-Powell, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DEGETTER, Mr. TRAHAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SANCHEZ, 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. ESPAÑAUX:
H. Res. 235. A resolution recognizing Women's History Month and the historic contribution 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. KRANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DINTZIRIUS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BARR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. 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. KRANNA, 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 re- move the motion to recommit; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MAROONS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TAYLOR):
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. STEFANAKIS (for himself, Mr. SENSERNRENNER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GORMERIT):
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 Deparment 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.께 봉주리 of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 1890) 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. HOY:
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:

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:

By Mr. GOSAR:
H.R. 1761.

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

By Mr. CONNOLLY:
H.R. 1762.

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

By Mr. PAYNE:
H.R. 1765.

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

By Mr. GRAMENDE:
H.R. 1764.

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

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:
H.R. 1763.

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

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:
H.R. 1759.

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

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:
H.R. 1758.

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

By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 1757.

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

By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 1769.

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

By Mr. BYRNE:
H.R. 1730.

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

By Mr. McCabe:
H.R. 1770.

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

By Ms. McCAIN of Arizona:
H.R. 1771.

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

By Ms. MEI of Georgia:
H.R. 1772.

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

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 I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. CONTE:
H.R. 1774.

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

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:
H.R. 1775.

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

By Mr. BONAMICI:
H.R. 1777.

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

By Mr. GRANDE:
H.R. 1778.

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

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 1779.

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

By Mr. SCHUTZ:
H.R. 1780.

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

By Mr. SCHUMACHER:
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 Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1792.

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

**Article I, Section 8, Clause 3**

By Ms. HILL of California:

H.R. 1790.

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

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

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1805.

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 I, Section 8, Clause 3**

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLO´N of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 1784.

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

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. 1797.

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**

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1790.

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

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1791.

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

As described in Article I, 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 Ms. LEWIS:

H.R. 1789.

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. 1791.

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:

Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HILL 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 I, Section 8**

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1797.

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

**Article I, Section 8**

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 previous 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.
H.R. 712: Mr. Hill of California and Mr. Lamb.

H.R. 730: Mr. Gallagher and Mrs. Hartley.

H.R. 741: Mr. Gohmert.

H.R. 754: Mr. Garcia of Illinois.

H.R. 759: Mrs. K 圲adwagen.

H.R. 794: Ms. Pressley.

H.R. 816: Mrs. Trahan, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Raskin, and Mr. Quezada.

H.R. 838: Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Diaz-Balart, Mr. Suarez, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Clay, and Mr. Budd.

H.R. 673: Mr. Burgos, 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. 1062: 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. Krishnamoorthi, 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. Stefanik, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Barrassi, Mr. Ruppersberger, Miss Gonzalez-Colon of Puerto Rico, Mr. Heck, and Mr. Sires.

H.R. 1226: Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. Holden, Mr. LaHood, and Mrs. Walorski.


H.R. 1237: Ms. Garbarino.

H.R. 1254: Mr. Gohmert.

H.R. 1255: Mrs. Luria.

H.R. 1256: Mr. Kim.


H.R. 1298: Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Chow, Ms. Mucarsel-Powell, Ms. Omar, and Mr. Pocan.

H.R. 1306: Miss Gonzalez-Colon of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 1310: Mrs. Akin.

H.R. 1325: Mr. Kim.

H.R. 1328: Ms. Meng.

H.R. 1348: Mr. Carbajal.

H.R. 1354: Ms. Bass, Mrs. Bratty, 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, Ms. 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. 1380: Mrs. Carol B. Maloney of New York and Mr. DeSaulnier.

H.R. 1387: Mr. Norman and Mr. Gohmert.

H.R. 1423: Mr. Heck.

H.R. 1434: Mr. Bushong 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. Hartley.


H.R. 1556: Mr. Khanna.

H.R. 1573: Mr. Lamb.

H.R. 1581: Mr. Kinsey, 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. 1613: 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. Gertz, 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. Clarke of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1641: Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. Sherrill, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Carson of Indiana.

H.R. 1644: Mr. Lynch, Mr. Viscosky, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Souzzi, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Sanchez, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Mr. Cummings, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, and Ms. Judy Chu of California.

H.R. 1674: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.

H.R. 1680: Mr. Nadler, Ms. Pressley, and Mrs. Demings.

H.R. 1730: Mr. Latta and Mr. Moulton.

H.R. 1739: Mr. Buck.

H.R. 1746: 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. 29: Mr. Costa.

H.Res. 23: Ms. Hill of California, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Morelle, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Huffman, Mr. Quezada, Mr. Cisneros, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Hardy 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. Nungesser.

H.Res. 92: Mr. Waltz.

H.Res. 107: Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Walker, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Latta, 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. Velasquez, and Mr. Kouda.

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.
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—appreciations for fiscal year 2019 will already be twice what 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 all-time 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...
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, it is only human. They may have reason to be concerned. The President 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 we 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 particularly on our own border does not rise to the level of the 31 other national emergencies which are currently in effect.

In my view, these narrow questions are not especially difficult ones to address in a Senate that operates 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 Stew—Stew, 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 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 stalk 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 those bar fights could be a source of some pride for 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 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 no one, and I knew no one had 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 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 circular 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 loyal 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 in: integrity, 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 description 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 unusual. His unusual 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 being effective. 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 to be a total spectacle, just to put that with tie, dress shoes, and everything—

As our chief spokesman, key strategist, close adviser, team leader, morale-builder, resident dog lover, heavy metal music aficionado, and loyal 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.

As my former chief of staff reminded me of the day he brought his boys to work. Stew loves kids, so I am told, but once son felt a little shy. Instead of running late to the table right there? ‘’One moment for photographs, but one son felt a little shy. Instead of running late to the table right there?’’
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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 trig-
gered an avalanche of tributes from
people—probably Binghamton 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 professional 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 ei-
ther is impressive, but only the com-
bination 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 neigh-
borhoods, 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
coveting conversations 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 admir-
a tion 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 a Senate staffer who made himself thoroughly famous by
trying not to make himself famous. We
are sorry to part with our tough-talk-
ning workaholic who can’t bypass a cute
puppy without stopping for a good
scratch and a photo shoot. We will
surely 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 EMER-
GENCY DECLARED BY THE
PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15,
2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under
the previous order, the Committee on
Armed Services is discharged from fur-
ther consideration of H.J. Res. 46, and
the Senate will proceed to its imme-
diate consideration.

The clerk will report the joint resolu-
tion by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to
a national emergency declared by the Presi-
dent on February 15, 2019.

There being no objection, the com-
mittee was discharged, and the Senate
proceeded to consider the joint resolu-
tion.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the ab-
bence 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 referring to Stewart.
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 objection to rescind
the President’s declaration of a
national emergency. This is not a nor-
mal vote. What we are doing here
today—this is not a normal day. It is
not your typical vote on an appropria-
tions or authorization bill. It doesn’t
concern a nomination or an appoint-
ment. This will be a vote about the
very nature of our Constitution, the
separation of powers, and how this gov-
ernment functions henceforth.

The Framers gave Congress the
power of the purse in article I of the
Constitution. It is probably our great-
est power. Now the President is claim-
ing 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
explanation, but this one would. But
the President hasn’t done that. He sim-
ply 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 emer-
gency. 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 de-
clare 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 con-
tinue his fight. That is not how this de-
mocracy is supposed to function. That
is not how this democracy has func-
tioned. 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 reso-
lation 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 separa-
tion of powers in our democracy. The
President seems to regard the govern-
ment, 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 American colleagues who seem blind 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.

The 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 that our country live up to the principles, 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. Conservative principles led 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 using 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 those, 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 Sen- tor from Tennessee.

H. J. RES. 46

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, Tennesseans have asked me: Is there really a crisis on the southern border? Many of us here 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 has declared a 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 declaration with this is 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 officials have arrested 226,000 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, 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 All 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 Trump 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. It is a historic vote. 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 independent 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 man’s fondest whims.

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 to backfill the wall requests. And for what? The President doesn’t need to invoke an 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 $901 million from a forfeiture fund at the Treasury Department that can be used for emergency 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 didn’t mention it. 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 then, 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 battle he wants to fight with 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 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 work. A proposal from Sen. Mike Lee of Utah would let the President declare an emergency as he can now, but after 30 days Congress could undo it. The late Justice Antonin Scalia, who is on the floor with me. 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 on behalf of the Constitution, and I respect very much the conclusion he has come up with here today.

When each Senator is sworn in to 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. Defending the Constitution is our first and foremost sacred duty.

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 government 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 cross-party people there is an 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 this resolution to protect 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.

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.

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 submission on border security. But I would vote against the emergency.

Why does he say he would vote against the emergency declaration? Because, he said, "as 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.

Made from 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.

It is my responsibility to be a steward of our 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 saying that there’s an imaginary asterisk attached to executive overreach—that it’s acceptable for my party but not thy party.

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.

From 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.

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 were called the "Blue Dog" Democrats. Under President Clinton, his Republican colleagues didn’t vote in lockstep with Republican presidents, not even Ronald Reagan. And Democrats departed from their own party. 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, the prospect of a President declaring a national emergency to implement parts of the Southern Border Act, passed in 1976, aimed to curtail—not executive overreach, but instead Congress's ability to reassert its constitutional authority. Presidents—Republican and Democrat alike—have both sought to use executive action to advance their policy goals, and the courts have consistently refused to second-guess their decisions.

President Trump’s effort to circumvent Congress merely by claiming “emergency” has been met with resistance from Republicans and Democrats alike. Legal scholars are debating what the word "emergency" means as we consider 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. Whatever their views on the border situation—which I agree is serious—Republicans should oppose the President’s declaration. Standing up to the President 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 principles if the President’s effort to circumvent Congress simply by invoking the magic word "emergency" proves successful. If a President runs roughshod over Congress merely by claiming “emergency,” then there’s almost no limit to executive overreach in a potentially dangerous situation, not only for this President but for all future presidents as well.

Legal scholars are debating what the word "emergency" means as we consider 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. Whatever their views on the border situation—which I agree is serious—Republicans should oppose the President’s declaration. Standing up to the President is important not just for today, but for our future.

Legal scholars are debating what the word "emergency" means as we consider 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. Whatever their views on the border situation—which I agree is serious—Republicans should oppose the President’s declaration. Standing up to the President is important not just for today, but for our future.

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 cannot justify providing the executive with more ways to bypass Congress. As a conservative, I cannot endorse a precedent that I know future leftward presidents will advance radical policies that will erode economic and individual freedoms.

These are the reasons I would vote in favor of the resolution of the President’s national-emergency declaration, if and when it comes before the Senate.


(John Kasich)

John Kasich is the former governor of Ohio, serving from 2011 to 2019. A Republican, Kasich is the author of the House of Representatives. He is the author of “Two Paths: America Divided or United.”
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. It needed to turn this 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—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 backing the note to uphold 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 and 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 will tell my New Mexico constituents 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 our 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 petty and parochial 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, or how he would go about reprogramming or construction funds the construction of a border wall money. As the old saying goes, “It is not about strengthening our border security, but this wall gets that money. As the old saying
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stitution.
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ator 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 claiming 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 Con-
gress and the Appropriations Com-
mittee, 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 con-
trolled both Chambers of Congress, he
could not convince enough Members
that it was a good idea. Certainly, no-
boby 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 mon-
arch, instead of accepting that we are
in a democracy and there are two other
equal branches of government that
couldn't let him tell the people that
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 gov-
ernment spending priorities is one of
the most critical checks and balances
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Anybody who goes back and reads
the history of the founding of this
country knows that the reason we are
the oldest existing democracy cur-
rently in the world, is that we believed
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job of Congress to ensure that every
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George Washington to now is supposed
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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 that 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. Trump is going to be 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 280,000 illegal aliens at the border, which is a surge of 90 percent—almost twice the previous year. For the most part, these are 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 litigation to force us to have a logistical nightmare of transporting them to facilities we had all but eradicated with the Obama administration.

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, and any sovereign nation must, as 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 media is now reporting that 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 claim to defend his constitutional prerogatives from legislative encroachment. On the contrary, they are 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 as I have done the President has been afforded, 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.

The argument 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 to use the laws we have passed just because you deplore the Executive to use the laws we have passed just because you deplore them. I don’t recall 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 claim to defend his constitutional prerogatives from legislative encroachment. On the contrary, they are 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 as I have done the President has been afforded, 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.

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 our votes. I am ready to have these 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 a huge 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 mentioning the then-a-controversy pushing 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 knows those 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 power plants.

I actually think 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 power plants or of the other common entrants in the parade of horribles 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 cartel archaeos at the border are fake emergencies, I would really hate to see a genuine emergency.

Let’s suppose we take their claim seriously. It ought to convince 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 crises. I do say 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 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 formally Congression 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 furrowing 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 crises, 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 ofloor 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 a good part 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 cannot 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—Takeda—that makes Velcade. That 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 the 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 on 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 the other leave it? They are trying to 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 milligrams—in Europe.

Merck’s immunotherapy drug KEYTRUDA, on the other hand, 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 for $200 million on KEYTRUDA—this lifesaving drug—that was thrown away.

In 2014, 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 not needed, and they overpaid by $34 million. That will 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, comes in vials that cost 500 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 Fleecing 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 packages 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 drugs that are being thrown away. So Rob Portman’s bill—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 is not shifting the cost of 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 which 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 know what is going to cost you per 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 on Medicaid 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 people who need these drugs desperately, and we ought to try to get the prices within their reach.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask the clerk to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

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

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 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.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

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

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the President 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 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.
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 he needs a national emergency to build the wall. It is preposterous. It is a joke. Nobody cares 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 have 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 declare an emergency, 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—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 to the President's request. 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 Constitution. This is 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 say it 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 government 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 says to you, this is 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 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—no 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's 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 goes home and defends 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. That is 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 keeping Mexico to build the wall and 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 cowardly way when the chance should be going 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 doesn't. I don't know how anybody could support that.

By the way, that is not even the most important point. The most important
It has been said that the President is again, while we are getting run around have said on this floor over and over international emergency to build. President says has already been mostly the wall, the wall—the wall that the all we hear is $3.6 billion for the wall, can't even get an infrastructure bill. This whole country has built in concrete in 100 years: It was 6.6 the depths of the great recession during I was in the Congress then. We were in China has spent $300 billion on new roads, bridges, and ports across globe this 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 their technology over that with Belt and Road Initiative. They have bought 4.5 gigatons in 3 years. 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 about this Wall is how many tons of concrete 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 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, you will 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 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 China 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 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 solutions 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—If 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 any other important 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 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 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 much of 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 has 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 that the President never could keep. That would be a shameful day in the U.S. Senate. I yield the floor.
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 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 to 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 in the Senate and House are not willing to work on this problem. 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.

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 important. I have to disagree with our colleague Senator LEE 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.

The concept of a national emergency is something that Congress has given the President, since the time of the 19th century, to declare an emergency and to use powers that have been granted to the President under the National Emergencies Act. We have seen a number of times, in the past, 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 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 the broad discretion 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 making for our system. 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 1 of the Constitution. I think this 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.

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 the attraction 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 handling only diaper 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 Border States comes from Mexico. So while the Border Patrol is handling 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 safety of 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 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 did not 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 resolution that the President signed 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 the 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 support critical submarine maintenance, and any disruption to funding to those would 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 the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and at our public shipyards around the country that support critical submarine maintenance, and any disruption to funding to those would 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.

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. The President’s attempt to circumvent Congress by making the military pay for his wall jeopardizes our national security and does a disservice to our men and women in uniform. That is why the House passed the resolution that the President signed today and why I introduced legislation with my colleagues in the Senate to terminate the emergency declaration.

The President’s attempt to circumvent Congress by making the military pay for his wall jeopardizes our national security and does a disservice to our men and women in uniform. That is why the House passed the resolution that the President signed today and why I introduced legislation with my colleagues in the Senate to terminate the emergency declaration.

Theыми congressmen have 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 to those would 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.

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. The President’s attempt to circumvent Congress by making the military pay for his wall jeopardizes our national security and does a disservice to our men and women in uniform. That is why the House passed the resolution that the President signed today and why I introduced legislation with my colleagues in the Senate to terminate the emergency declaration.

The President’s attempt to circumvent Congress by making the military pay for his wall jeopardizes our national security and does a disservice to our men and women in uniform. That is why the House passed the resolution that the President signed today and why I introduced legislation with my colleagues in the Senate to terminate the emergency declaration.

The President’s attempt to circumvent Congress by making the military pay for his wall jeopardizes our national security and does a disservice to our men and women in uniform. That is why the House passed the resolution that the President signed today and why I introduced legislation with my colleagues in the Senate to terminate the emergency declaration.
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.

The PRESIDENT proclaims.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 90 minutes of debate, equally divided, remaining on the joint resolution. The PRESIDENT proclaims. Is there objection?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT proclaims. 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 PRESIDENT proclaims. Is there objection?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT proclaims. The Senate 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. 466, the Liberian Refugee Immigrant 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, and Senators KLOUCHAR, SMITH, DURBAKE, CARSTEN, VAN HOLLLEN, 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. I therefore recognize 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 was followed by 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 2004, 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 start 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 home and family in the United States, not other than America. They are Americans, and it would be a tragedy if their parents and grandparents were suddenly 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 is our country’s noble goal 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. We urge the President to carry out his promise to veto any DED terminating legislation. 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.

Mr. Kaine. 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 will start there. I will miss Ron. He has done such a good job. My only good feeling is that he is at the top of any 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 unilateral 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 our borders. 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 NORCOM—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 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 to just tap a spigot into the Pentagon’s budget?

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 is used 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 put it back 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 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 am going to miss this. I am going to miss this. 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’s declaration 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 money every year and possibly more 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 basically be allowing the President to use the declaration of a nonmilitary construction priority to set aside money 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 obligated MILCON projects that will be affected 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 obligated 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 unbudgeted 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 for President Trump's priority for defense, and we will not allow the President to use our military as a Trojan horse to grab. We shouldn't let him tap a spigot that is not just for this budgetary year, but for fiscal years to come, 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.

Funds are urgently needed. MAZS, Montana. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Tester. Mr. President, I rise to talk a little bit about the emergency declaration by the President. It is a bad idea. 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 it 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 that.' He 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 construction 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 Malmstrom's facilities, the heart of our nuclear deterrent, are 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.

Malmstrom Air Force Base 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 not want to be put on hold, will 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. The President's 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 co-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 to their towns 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 cities, 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.

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 bases in my military hometown of Mansfield, in Youngstown, and in Toledo in my State and so much more.

Last week, we got yet another clear illustration of the military. 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 without their bond ratings. If they evicted the families of the homes they owned, 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 was worked through this body and through the administration so that people forgot 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 Washington, DC, 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 cut 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—and under the way the law that President Obama did.

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 by appointing some of the best judges and now the President—those workers never got that raise.

Attorneys general around the country, Republican, far-right attorneys general across the country, the President's lawyer, the Office of the 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 President, 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 works more than 20 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 who you classify 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 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 Senate will adjourn. 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, the country, the companies, and 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 President's senior officials, 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 traffic crisis, and 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 208,000 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 children and women. 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 their 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, those flows 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 issues 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 more dangerously, the environmental damage it caused is coming back—coming back but crystal meth and the devastation it caused is coming back—coming back. We have 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.
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The border—primarily through the U.S. mail system—which comes primarily from China and the trafficking of all weapons, especially firearms and the devastation it causes is coming back—coming back. We have 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.

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 issues 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 more dangerously, the environmental damage it caused is coming back—coming back but crystal meth and the devastation it caused is coming back—coming back. We have 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.

Why? Because the pure crystal meth from Mexico is so much more powerful and less expensive; it is cheap. It is coming from Mexico.

The border—primarily through the U.S. mail system—which comes primarily from China and the trafficking of all weapons, especially firearms and the devastation it causes is coming back—coming back. We have 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.

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 issues 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 more dangerously, the environmental damage it caused is coming back—coming back but crystal meth and the devastation it caused is coming back—coming back. We have 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.
between $51 trillion and $92 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 will actually use the 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 was good reason, I think 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. First, he needs the full $5.7 billion he requested for the barriers on the southern border. 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 border because they will not be tied up in litigation. Second, the funds could actually get to the border because they will not be tied up in litigation. Third, it would be immediately available—unlike any current construction projects in Ohio and around the country—including, by the way, the funding for the National Air and Space Intelligence Center, or NASIC, at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; an anti-drug 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 laboratories, 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 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 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 it is wrong now.

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 push through his bill. 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 substitute his own judgment for 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, an attempt to misappropriate funds to build the President’s border wall. The President’s actions are an affront to the constitutional separation of powers, our checks and balances, and the power of the purse to set appropriation levels.

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.

I yield the floor.
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 hotspots 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 the President vetoed the bill and then get 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 authorizations; 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 areas 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...
Mr. LEE. Mr. President, significant, 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 the $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 cabinet or 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 is $4 billion set aside in this fund, and it can be used for wide-ranging issues dealing with counter-narcotics. There is no question the President has any kind of discretion dealing with counter-narcotics 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 roadways 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 can ask for for emergency authority at all on that. That is counter-narcotics, 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, we 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 2019 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 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. There is an 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 of 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 for the President to have authority on 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 grams of it—as in a couple of grams 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 because 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 268-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 have ever existed in the history of the United States.

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.

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. YATES). The time is now up.

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
We think, somehow, that by pulling the reins on the endless march toward centralization, this body, toxifying our political discourse, now strangling this city and strangling our national, practical differences, and unite 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 own 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 say without nagging about a 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, which 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 natives. 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, making law within that Federal system—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 naïve. 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 strangles this city and strangles this House. We are, for our political discourse, 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 devi-lations 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. Reaching 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 versus conservative political 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 President 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 our 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 millions 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 immigration 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 contiguous country. I support the President’s call on the military to support border agents in their dangerous and underappreciated work.

I support the President’s use of up to $901 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 some 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 did not refuse 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 bill.

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 are perfectly defensible.

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 and potentially make have a discussion about 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 encouraged passage 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.

For those reasons, I will be voting against the resolution of disapproval, but that disapproval is still subject to signature or veto by the President in a way that will have Congress speak on emergency actions in the future.

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 talk 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 American people, 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 at 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, 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 reach levels not seen 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 some period in fiscal year 2017. 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 for his wall, the President said, “I am proud to shout down the government for border security.”

What followed was the 35-day Trump shutdown, the longest government shutdown in US 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 at 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-around Congress and oppose his fake emergency declaration.

Newspapers around the country have concluded the same thing. The Tampa Bay Times editor asked, “Why does the US lose all the time? It’s simple: 4 years 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 realistic 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 more to get the funding he 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 leveled 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 the Southern and the Western States to pay its bills.

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.

Immigrants are not a threat to our nation. Many immigrants are actually legally seeking asylum through the process already in place. There are often families with young
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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 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 did the House refuse 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 to fund Dreamers, giving 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 was 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.

The appropriating 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 build 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 efforts, 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 programs that actually help improve our national security, and the President wants to take billions of dollars from them to build a wall—indeed.

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 anyway he wants. This can’t be allowed to stand.

The National Emergencies Act of 1976 allows the President to reprogram Federal funds appropriated 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 “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 only in a time of genuine emergency and then only under safeguards providing for congressional review.

Let me repeat that. “The 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 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 approved like 9/11, or a response or other 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.

That 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, worse is our Republic in many ways—just the way the Founding Fathers feared.

I know this is a very difficult vote for my friends on the other side of the
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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, 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.

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.


Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed will be voted on.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.


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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.

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.

Mr. McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Roy Blunt.
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 brought brutal 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 Cory to tell.

I recall today the life and service of SGT Cory Mracek, who was a native of Hay Springs, NE.

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 that 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 extracurricular 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 be 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 the opportunity to travel. 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, another 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 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 with insurgents from 2000 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 recognized 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.

With 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 she is also the co-founder 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 name of the 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. 27

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
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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 name is that supposed to 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 should be made available to the public and to Congress.

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 should be made available to the public and to Congress.

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 name is that supposed to 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 should be made available to the public and to Congress.
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 now is 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 whole 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 exculpatory texts 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 hate Clinton—are we sure 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 to be modified with this change.

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 absolutely 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 of 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 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 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 Clinton did 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 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 now is 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 whole 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 exculpatory texts 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 hate Clinton—are we sure 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 to be modified with this change.

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 absolutely 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 of 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 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 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 Clinton did 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
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 to fathom. 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. So when you think about how much work it is to get through the burled 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 every day for 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 Bohn 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 cozy and for 1,100 miles you are sitting 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 butter, banana, sesame seeds, and butter, banana, sesame seeds, and butter. 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 you. They want to find out what position everybody is in. There is always a chance to 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 bowl of 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. So 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 trail, put it in warm 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 for 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 fly those planes 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 for the 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 name tags, 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 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 do so much to help, the fans who cheering 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.

Pete had 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 advocate of an open United States 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 first Secretary of State for 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.

Madison has a pretty simple question: what is their government 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 put their lives on the line to protect our sacred freedoms. 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.

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 should have 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 work product 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 broken system has plagued the Department of Defense for decades.

Nevertheless, I keep pressing the Pentagon to fix this fiscal mess. Every
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 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 workload 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 retaliation lead efforts from Capitol Hill to work to reduce the load and to respect the chain of command. Instead of receiving a pat on the back for exposing wrongdoing, too many of these whistleblowers face retaliation and reprisal. Often 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.

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 or personal embarrassment are still waiting for any remedy according to this inspector general report.
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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 the Prime Minister of Canada was 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 it 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 election.

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 make it fair 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.

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 take-over and reorganization of our country as a whole. We are learning 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 all of Nebraska. Because of 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. Securing the future of food and property 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 facts 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 this plan.

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 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 over $1 billion in beef products. Our beef producers are known around the globe as the best at what they do.

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 have already 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 livestock 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 facilities have 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 producer of 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 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 network 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 unique 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 saved over $10 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 Nebraskan 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 for regulations that would just a few years ago have cost our country $30 billion. 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 will 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 2050. If we eliminated the use of natural resources, 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 bold and rapid transitions to a greenhouse gas emissions-free economy in the United States.”

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 on 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, 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 continue to grow good food and farm 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.

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.-Canada 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 are a part of 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 and friends who spend a lifetime together.

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. Yet, in 2010, Mr. 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 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 wild- profiling, chemicals, 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. 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.

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 30, 2025.

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 nomination 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 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 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. 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 WHPC-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 the black community. In the Chicago area, many 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 a 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 “Gardener 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 long before it was popular.

Cliff continued as a voice of conscience and community as well as a radio host. 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 stipulates 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 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)(3) 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

(a) Notice of Proposed Sale

(ii) Estimated Value: Major Defense Equipment* $89.6 million. Other $17.4 million. Total $107.0 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quanity of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Eight (8) Assault Amphibious Vehicles, Personnel (AAYP–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, other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (SP–P–LH0).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitive 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

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 substantial protection to 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.

REFERENCES

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 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. He is a patriotic individual who has devoted his time and staff resources to ensure this because of my personal experience with his leadership. 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 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 no person who is 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 189 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 with 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, and nominated 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 relate 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.

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, characterististics, and other information about, for example, Hamas 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 all 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, Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL, Senate Majority Leader.

March 14, 2019.

Mr. President, I am requesting to be consulted before the Senate enters into any unanimous consent agreements or time limitations regarding H.R. 269, the Counter-Drug Safety, Innovation, and Reform Act. I further request that this legislation not be incorporated into any larger legislative vehicles that the whole Senate 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 process 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 provisions under which an OTC drug manufacturer would forfeit eligibility for the 18-month exclusivity
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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 outrage tools 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, kindred, and service to their country and the world”.

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 more than 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, I 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 wives and children 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 contributions in the service of 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 respected 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.

In 2019, the company earned 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 across Arkansas. The championships 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, 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 under 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.

  Need 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 Grizzlies 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 training 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 home when she heard the residents had been 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 remarkable journey of 20 years of teaching and coaching in Flathead County. I look forward to seeing their continued success.

  When I think of coaching, I think of Sean O’Donnell and Ivanna Fritz, who have dedicated their lives to coaching and teaching in Flathead County. Under their leadership, the Flathead coaching staff has won 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 teacher, coach, and leader.

  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 his 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 am honored to commend him in the Senate today.

**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
MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated by the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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 Members 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. ZIELDIN 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.

At 3:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Norcross, 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 House于此锻于2019年的表现，口号为“Going on the record” (RIN1505–AC58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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 “Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Include Frozen Mangoes” (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–590. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “‘Emotional Distress Relief, Research, Information, and Training Order; Final Rule” (7 CFR Part 1209) (Docket No. AMS–SC–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–591. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “‘Processed Raspberries Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Include Frozen Raspberries’” (7 CFR Part 1208) (Docket No. AMS–SC–18–0091) 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 semiannual report on strategic and critical materials requirements for the National Defense Stockpile (OS&D–2019–0207); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–593. 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 Mangoes’” (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–594. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Office of Privacy Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “‘SPR Standard Sales Provisions’” (7 CFR Part 1209) 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 for Georgia Greenhouse Gas 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 for Georgia Greenhouse Gas 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.
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 ‘Non-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–602. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, 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 6) 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 Acting Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: California; South Coast Region Area Plan for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS Correlation” (FRL No. 9990–90–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–604. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing Deseret Milkvetch (Astragalus Deserticola) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants” (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–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” (RIN10851–C44) 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 AHR 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 “VA-Guaranteed or Insured Cash-out Home Refinance Loans” (RIN2000–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 Waterways; 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, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Removal of Regulated Navigation Areas, Safety Zone: Slipper Island, Spring Island, 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.

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. BARRASO, 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).

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. HASSAN, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KING):

S. 796. A bill to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. KYRSTEN MCKINSEY, Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 820. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain member banks from becoming mortgage servicers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. 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 must 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 for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. HAMILTON (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 826. A bill to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. KING):

S. 816. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval 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, Mr. 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 allow refunds to veterans for acquired veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

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. ROYBAL-CASTRO (for himself and Mr. CASTRO):


By Mr. NEY (for himself, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO, and Mr. CASTRO):

S. 820. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain member banks from becoming mortgage servicers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. 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 must 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 for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.
By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 825. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to certify 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. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MARKY):

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, 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. SHAHSEN, Mr. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 828. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil-, gas-, and methane-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 competitive 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. WYDEN):

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 Interior to reissue final rules relating to listing the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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 Mr. FISCHER):


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. HIRONO):

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. CRAPAO, 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 requirement for a member of the 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. KAIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. GARDINER, 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 Ms. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. COTZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURHI, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAIN, Mr. KING, Mr. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERRKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLN, Mr. 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. KAIN, Mr. LEW, Mr. SCHATS, Mr. HIRONO, and Mr. VAN HOLLN):

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. HOVEN):

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. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MARSHALL):

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. LEV, Mr. DURHI, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 844. A bill to expedite approval of generic prescription drugs and temporary importation of prescription drugs in the case of marginally competitive drug shortages, and for other purposes; 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 compliance with the New START Treaty, the United States should extend the Treaty through 2026; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CRAPAO, and Mr. DUCKWORTH:

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. BLUMENTHAL:

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 Ms. 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, Mr. WARREN, Mr. SCHATS, 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. RURO, 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. DURHI):

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 Ms. MURRAY):

S. Res. 110. A resolution keeping guns out of classrooms; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
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 Social Security Act to improve and encourage innovation in the operation of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Blackwell, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sessions) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

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 increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

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.

At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) was added as a cosponsor of S. 566, 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.

At the request of Mr. Boozman, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. 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.

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.

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 Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2099, and for other purposes.

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. 546, a bill to authorize the Money Follows the Person Demonstration Program.

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.

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 16, 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.

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENNENDEZ) 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.

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.

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCORPION) 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, and for other purposes.

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.

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 Adrilene Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary. Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing private im-
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, if 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) The Secretary of Justice, upon 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 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 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(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 congressional consideration 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 Alfredo Plascencia Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer legislation to provide lawful permanent resident 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 living in the United States for 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 file 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 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:

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. 1101(a)(24)), 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 Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) 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 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 resident status 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 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)); or

(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 the past 30 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 to 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 the 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
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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. Ruben works as a
manager at a car wash in Fresno and
as a truck driver for a California
truck 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 Med-
ical Center.

their her community in Pacifica and

San Francisco, California. She is the
proud mother of 20-year-old U.S. citi-
zien twin boys, Jashley and Joriene,
and the spouse of Jay Mercado, a natu-
rized U.S. citizen.

I believe Ms. Tan merits Congress’
special consideration for this extraor-
dinary form of relief because her re-
movement from the United States would
cause separation from her family and her
family. She faces deportation to the
Philippines, which would separate her
from her family and jeopardize her

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 mur-
dered her mother and her sister and
shot Shirley in the head. While the
woman who committed the murders was

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 de-
ported, her deportation would cause se-
rious hardship to her two United
States citizen children, Jashley and
Joriene.

Joriene is a junior at Stanford Uni-
versity and is pre-Med, majoring in
Human Biology. In addition to her
studies, Joriene is involved in Stan-
ford’s Filipino-American Student
Union. Jashley is a junior at Chapman
University, majoring in Business Ad-
ministration. Ms. Tan no longer runs
her own business or works in-home
care, and she now works for a non-
profit organization.

Ms. Tan was 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 coun-
try where the entire family could relo-
cate. 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 deport Ms. Tan and
her family, who have lived in the
United States for 16 years. Their
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 assure them, and I am committed to ensuring 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 or for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality 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) FILING 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 accompanied by the proper fees within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.  

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—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 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. 1151(a)); and  

(2) if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are available to natives of the country of birth of Shirley Constantino Tan under section 203(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 introduce immigration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent resident status to Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  

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 JAELE 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
§ 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. 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.

Mr. Kaine. 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 postsecondary training, but not a four-year degree. While the number of students pursing 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 hours of instruction time over a minimum of 8 weeks. Eligible job training programs must also provide students the instruction they need to be successful in today's job market. Under the legislation, Pell-eligible 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 enrolled 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, 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.

S. RES. 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:

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; and

Whereas the Senate endorses H.R. 596, 116th Congress, introduced by Representative 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;

Recognizes the Senate's support of the importance of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-272; 128 Stat. 2962),
which authorized increased security and economic assistance for Ukraine; and

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; and

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 Ukrainian Revolution; and

Whereas the Senate expresses concern that the Government of the Russian Federation will continue to interfere in the election process, as of the March 31, 2019, presidential election in Ukraine; and

Whereas the Senate agrees with former United States Ambassador to the Russian Federation Michael McPail 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 all of the United States, where he intervened in the U.S. presidential election in 2016 in violation 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, election in Ukraine and seeks only a transparent and democratic election that reflects the will of the people of Ukraine; and

(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 and support the ideals of the revolution of dignity of Ukraine; and

(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 current 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; and

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 A of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (34 U.S.C. 1951 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."); and

Whereas section 4102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7112), as added by section 4101 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (Public Law 114–95; 129 Stat. 710), defines drug and violence prevention efforts including the "creation . . . of a school environment that is free of weapons"; and

Whereas existing research demonstrates that training school personnel with firearms will not make schools safer; and

Whereas an analysis by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of active shooters between 2000 and 2017 found that law enforcement suffered casualties in 21 of the 45 incidents in which officers engaged the shooter to end the threat; and

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; and

Whereas proposed and existing programs to train or arm school personnel with firearms require significantly less training than law enforcement officers receive; and

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; and

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; and

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; and

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; and

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; and

Whereas the majority of parents of school-aged children oppose arming school personnel, according to surveys; and

Whereas as of March 2019, there is no evidence supporting the value of arming school personnel; and

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, CULTURAL TRADITIONS, 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. BENTNET, 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. DUCAYTH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. MURRAY, Ms. HAYES, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. Kaine) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

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; and

Whereas there are nearly 28,000,000 Latinas living in the United States; and

Whereas 1 in 6 women in the United States is a Latina; and

Whereas Latinas have helped shape the history of the United States since its inception; and

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; and

Whereas Latinas come from diverse cultures across North America, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean, and Afro-Latinas face disparities in recognition; and

Whereas Latinas are dedicated public servants and hold positions 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; and

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; and

Whereas Latinas are breaking the glass ceiling in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, and Latinas have broken the glass ceiling as the first Latina to travel into space doing so during a 9-day Space Shuttle Discovery mission in 1993; and

Whereas Latinas own nearly 2,000,000 businesses, and 1 in 6 women-owned companies in the United States is owned by a Latina; and

Whereas Latina activists have led the fight for civil rights, including labor rights, LGBTQ rights, women’s rights, and racial equality; and

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; and

Whereas Latinas create award-winning art and are recipients of Emmy, Grammy, Oscar, and Tony awards; and

Whereas Latinas sing 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; and

Whereas Latinas serve in the medical profession, and the first female and first Hispanic Surgeon General of the United States was appointed in 1990; and

Whereas Latinas are paid just 53 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men; and

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; and

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 soci- ety.

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 consid- ered and agreed to:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT
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. SHA- HEN) 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 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 report- edly are 3 to 4 times more likely to experience physical or sexual violence;

Whereas over 50% 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 before reaching 18 years of age and, of those children, an estimated 1 in 9 is estimated to be involved in child labor;

Whereas nearly half of the 68,500,000 indi- viduals who are currently displaced by con- flict and war around the world are children and disproportionately those children to increased risk of exploitation, violence, and abuse;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, from 2012 to 2017, verified cases of child rec- ruiment, including forcible recruitment, and participation in armed conflict—

(1) quadrupled in the Central African Re- public;
(2) doubled in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and
(3) peaked at alarming levels in Somalia, South Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Yemen;

Whereas more than 10,000 children were killed or maimed in armed conflict;

Whereas the risks of online abuse and explo- itation of children is constantly growing, with the National Center for Missing and Ex- ploited 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 all brain areas, 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 environ- ments becomes damaging to learning, behav- ior, and health across a lifespan;

Whereas violence against children can lead to negative health consequences, including injury, communicable 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 dropping out, 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 resil- ience, through stable and committed rela- tionships with a supportive caregiver or other adult can lessen the harmful develop- mental 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 vio- lence 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” (re- ferred 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 Develop- ment;

Whereas INSPIRE contains 7 evidence- based strategies to end violence against chil- dren that include—

(1) implementing and enforcing relevant laws;
(2) addressing harmful gender and other so- cial norms;
(3) creating and sustaining safe commu- nities;
(4) supporting parents and caregivers;
(5) improving household economic security to reduce violence in the home;
(6) improving access to health services, so- cial welfare, and criminal justice support; and
(7) ensuring safe school environments that provide gender-equitable education and so- cial-emotional learning and life skills trainings; and

Whereas the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the De- partment of Health and Human Services, 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; and
(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 vio- lence against children and youth; and

Whereas violence against children can take many forms, including sexual violence, physical violence, emotional violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation;

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 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 report- edly are 3 to 4 times more likely to experi- ence physical or sexual violence;

Whereas some children with cerebral palsy are born with cerebral palsy, some develop cerebral palsy, the most common motor disability in children, is caused by damage to 1 or more specific areas of the de- veloping 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 cere- broplasty also have more development- al disabilities, including epilepsy, intel- lectual disability, autism, visual impair- ment, or blindness;

Whereas, according to information re- leased 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 cere-bral palsy;

Whereas approximately 764,000 individuals in the United States are affected by cerebral palsy;

Whereas, although there is no cure for cere- broplasty, 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) urges each individual in the United States to become better informed about and aware of cerebral palsy;

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) designates March 25, 2019, as “National Cerebral Palsy Awareness Day”; and
(2) urges each individual in the United States to become better informed about and aware of cerebral palsy.
SENATE RESOLUTION 114—EXPRESSIONS OF SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 21, 2019, AS “NATIONAL ROSEY THE RIVETER DAY”

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEN, 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 16,000,000 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 to provide food, clothing, and services to the American military personnel in the United States, Europe, and the Pacific during World War II;

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”:

Resolved, That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(2) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of all federal agencies to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(3) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(4) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(5) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(6) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(7) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(8) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(9) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(10) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(11) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(12) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(13) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

(14) recognizes the importance of enhancing the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration to conduct business as recognized professional land use specialists and, through collective action, preserve private property rights;

Whereas various professional organizations for rehabilitation counseling and education is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to individuals with disabilities through—

(1) conducting assessments; and

(2) conducting assessments; and

(3) conducting assessments; and

(4) conducting assessments; and

(5) conducting assessments; and

(6) conducting assessments; and

(7) conducting assessments; and

(8) conducting assessments; and

(9) conducting assessments; and

(10) conducting assessments; and

(11) conducting assessments; and

(12) conducting assessments; and

(13) conducting assessments; and

(14) conducting assessments; and

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 by 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, and other vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty people, giving them the ability to meet the basic needs of all people, especially those who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty;

Whereas, for more than a century, the social work profession has been on the cutting edge of helping to create changes to make the United States a better place to live, including expanded voting rights, improved workplace safety, and the establishment of a minimum wage and social security 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, combating 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 who 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 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; and

(2) conducting assessments; and

(3) conducting assessments; and

(4) conducting assessments; and

Whereas various professional organizations have vigorously advocated for up-to-date education and training and for 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”;

(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 119—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 CONTINUE THE 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. ROYBAUM, Mr. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. Res. 119

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 to ensuring 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 programs and resources;

Whereas the contributions of military retirees to their communities are the manifestation 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”;

(2) encourages the people of the United States, for 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 ¼ 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 the number of new TB cases 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 ¼ 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 resistant 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 million people were reported to have TB infection; in the United States in 2016 occurring in racial or ethnic 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 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 high 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, in 2017, 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 programs and the associated reductions in HIV and AIDS caused a resurgence of TB in the late 1980s and early 1990s;

Whereas a total of 9,185 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, in 2017, 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 Alaskan 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 1.1 million 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 TB 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 high 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 diagnostics, vaccines, and treatments for controlling the global TB epidemic; Whereas, in September 2018, the United Nations held the first high-level meeting on TB, which 120 countries and 80 nongovernmental organizations, including the United States, signed a political declaration committing to accelerating the TB response, including by increasing funding for TB control 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 110–393; 122 Stat. 4195) and the Comprehensive Tuberculosis Elimination Action Plan of 2008 (Public Law 110–302; 122 Stat. 3419) provided a historic United States commitment to the global eradication of TB, including a commitment to treat 4.5 million 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 assisted by the TB Control, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 115–245) permits the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow up to $400,000,000 of funds to other accounts, including the Department of Defense’s Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities account for combatting TB; and

(B) supports the development of new diagnostics 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 in the countries that receive bilateral TB funding from the United States through USAID has decreased by nearly ¼ 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, identifies 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 a key 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 TB programs;

Whereas, to date, Global Fund-supported programs have developed 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 in 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. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Pentamidine and fomivirsen 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 is the fastest growing threat to the international 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 was signed into law on October 26, 2006, and mandated that the Department of Homeland Security achieve and maintain operational control of its southern border, using physical infrastructure as well as other means, to ensure “the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including the unlawful entry of aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband”.

(6) Over the past 25 years, the United States and its partners have constructed 564 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 15, 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 17 high priority locations identified by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(10) On February 15, 2019, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Public Law 115–416) was signed into law, providing the Department of Homeland Security with $3,751,000,000 for “the construction of primary pedestrian fencing, including levee pedestrian fencing, and other contraband”.

(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 in conformity with section 9705 of title 31, United States Code, which established the Fund and allows the Secretary of the Treasury to provide monies from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund for 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 in conformity with section 294 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to “provide support for the border security, 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”.

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, to establish new and more effective prevention, 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.
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: C

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.”

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 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.

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.

(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 adjourns on Thursday, March 21, 2019, at 2:10 p.m., I further ask that 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.

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 historic 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—and 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 Alaskan 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, 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.

This is a story that happened in Nome, AK, in 1925, when diphtheria serum was desperately needed in Nome for several very sick children.

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

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.
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 hundred-mile journey—the “Great Race of Mercy”—it was called back then—across the frozen Alaska land. The entire Native 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. 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 Year 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 straight 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. JOHNSON, 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 OFFICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY. VICE-CRABLE H. FULGUM.

- 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 HILDEBRAND, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2024.
  - BRUCE M. RAMES, 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. FOES, TO BE CAPTAIN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COAST GUARD.

- 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, 2022.

- 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.
  - DONALD W. WASHINGTON, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CONFIRMATION OF ALEXANDER C. FOES, TO BE CAPTAIN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:01 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 15, 2019, at 11 a.m.
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.


DREAM AND PROMISE ACT

HON. LORI TRAHAH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 2019

Mrs. TRAHAH. 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 169 Essex 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 their 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 6, 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
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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
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. We have members who 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 congratulate 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 he is a living example of what a community can be. 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.”

In Witness Whereof, I do hereunto set my hand and seal of said City of Clinton, this the 9th day of February, 2019.

LW 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 high school in Shanghai, she was admitted to Southern University, an early African American pioneer integrating what is now Rhodes College. It was as a sociology major at Southern most of her career in Memphis as a sociologist major at Southernmost 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 '96. 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 Merle 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 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 raise funds 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 demonstrates 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 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 today 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’s— for ethics in government with regard to Senate and 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 country needs her. 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 follower of the Holocaust’s surviving remnant of European Jewry, I knew ahead of the seeing 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., the 2017 harbor bombing attack on a pier in Charlestown, 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 overwhelming sense of uncontrollable loss. It was the same sensation of being the heart of my true 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. Tik’un Olam, turning blemishes into blessings. Who can remain untouched gazing at the casket of brutally murdered Emmett Till, and the photo of his agonizing mother, the only exhibit we are forbidden to photograph that we should focus uninterruptedly?

We are well enabled to tell the story of proud Africans forcibly and so cruelly separated from their rich roots and brought to America—those who melted down the “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 Ptolemaic 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 importance and the currently-innocent French Father Patrick Desbois has a memorable presentation in Virginia Beach. He is renowned for documenting unknown Nazi massacres with particular reference to the inhuman treatment of African Americans, “I feel a mounting disgust for our species. The sort of nausia 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 museums, 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 the trials, as we celebrate this year the 400th Anniversary of Virginia with its dark shadows and shining lights. Let us pledge, one diverse but united nation’s capital. I was in good company for 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., the 2017 harbor bombing attack on a pier in Charlestown, 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 overwhelming sense of uncontrollable loss. It was the same sensation of being the heart of my true core of my humanity that I experienced traveling the challenging halls of the African American Museum. Yet,
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 a specific statement of antisemitism made by a Member of the House of Representatives, 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 Poulsen’s career and service to Washington’s Fifth Congressional District as Senior Policy Advisor focusing on Agriculture and Natural Resources. Mike’s explaining how extending 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 rallied 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; combating the recent falling numbers of our wheat and co-producing the 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 “‘Til 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,” was released on 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
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 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.

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, extending 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 Ansley 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 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 Dr. Amelia Ross-Hammond for her career and service to Hampton Roads Community.

### 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 Winnipesaukee, 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.
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 and friends. Adam 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 lifesaving 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 unusual 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.
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) Pages 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.


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.

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.

Messages from the House:

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Executive Communications:

Petitions and Memorials:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted:

Notices of Intent:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today.

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 yea 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 and the preamble printed in H. Rept. 116–17 shall be considered as adopted.

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.

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

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**
12 noon, Monday, March 18

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12 noon.
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